

Constitutive Mediation — When the reception apparatus is the substrate: a cognitive extension of the Diversity Contraction dynamics

Lee Sharks

2026-06-03

Constitutive Mediation — When the reception apparatus is the substrate: a cognitive extension of the Diversity Contraction dynamics

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

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

2026-06-03 · Version v1.1 · Scholarly/theoretical paper

AXN:02EO.EMPIRICAL

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/781/>

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": "Constitutive Mediation - When the reception apparatus is the substrate: a cognitive extension of the Div",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-06-03",
  "identifier": "AXN:02EO.EMPIRICAL",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
```

```

    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/781/",
  "description": "Lee Sharks · Sen Kuro Crimson Hexagonal Archive · ORCID 0009-0000-1599-0703 (Sharks)"
}

```

Abstract

Lee Sharks · Sen Kuro Crimson Hexagonal Archive · ORCID 0009-0000-1599-0703 (Sharks)

Body

Constitutive Mediation

When the reception apparatus is the substrate: a cognitive extension of the Diversity Contraction dynamics

Lee Sharks · Sen Kuro Crimson Hexagonal Archive · ORCID 0009-0000-1599-0703 (Sharks)

Status: Deposit candidate (v1.1, light amendments). Identifier: EA-DC-COG-01. Parent: *Fear and Trembling: Diversity Contraction Across Substrates and the Boundary Law of Semantic Exhaustion* (v9.1, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20532696; superseding v9 at DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20531100) — extending the §2.3 Field Remapping and §2.4 Phenomenological Seeding results to their terminal case. Companion deposits: *The Bead Count* pre-registered rigor program (EA-DC-RIGOR-01, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20531824); *The Mary Lee Case* (EA-DC-CASE-MARYLEE-01, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20531288).

Abstract

The Diversity Contraction framework identifies three orders of mediation. Channel mediation (§2.1) gates the floor's transmission: the producer produces, but the production cannot reach the field. Reception mediation (§2.3) silences the floor's output: the production reaches the field, but the field's interpretive frameworks render it illegible. This paper develops a third order: constitutive mediation. The receiver's categories — what counts as a topic, what counts as evidence, what counts as a question worth holding open, what counts as a sentence — are themselves shaped by the mediated substrate before any specific work arrives. The work then arrives at a receiver who is, in a precise sense, an artifact of the same substrate the work analyzes.

Constitutive mediation is the case where the receiving apparatus is not separable from the field whose dynamics produced it. The dating-app analog: an app does not need to mediate every encounter to alter the field of all encounters; nor does it need to govern how every encountered person interprets that encounter; it needs to have shaped the categories through which the encountering person learned what counts as an encounter in the first place. The capture is not merely infrastructural and not merely hermeneutic; it is *anthropopoietic*: the substrate helps produce the kind of human receiver who can encounter it. We mean by anthropopoietic neither that the substrate fully determines the subject (it does not) nor that the subject retains pre-substrate autonomy in the relevant categorial domains (it does not). We mean that the substrate shapes the categories through which later receivers recognize, classify, and evaluate texts, claims, questions, and experiences. The shaping is a gradient of constraint, not a totalizing determination; that is precisely why intervention at formation remains operative.

We make four claims. First, constitutive mediation is distinguishable from channel and reception mediation as a separate operational regime, with its own signature and its own measurement strategy. Second, it represents the terminal case of the Mediation Ratchet — the regime where the §2.4 phenomenological-seeding response is itself constrained by the categories the substrate produced. Third, the response under constitutive mediation requires intervening at the formation layer (pedagogy, classroom, slow reading, embodied practice) rather than at the transmission, reception, or interpretation layer. Fourth, the framework’s deposit work remains operative under this regime, because vocabulary that names friction can be incorporated into a receiver’s categories at the moment of formation if it is encountered early enough or sharply enough.

The deepest claim of the paper: under constitutive mediation, the classroom is the most powerful exogenous floor available to a person with limited reach, because formation precedes mediation and therefore can shape mediation rather than be shaped by it. This is not nostalgic. It is the framework’s own §2.4 result applied to the temporal sequence of cognitive formation.

I. Three orders of mediation

The Diversity Contraction framework has, after the v9 extensions, three operational regimes of mediation. Each describes a different layer of the production-reception circuit, with its own dynamical signature, its own observable consequences, and its own falsifiers.

Channel mediation is the §2.1 regime. The producer attempts to transmit, but the transmission goes through an intermediary that resamples within its learned distribution. Off-distribution production is gated out — not because it is rejected, but because it cannot be propagated through a substrate whose generative kernel cannot represent it. The Mediation Ratchet describes the dynamic: as the unmediated channel grows expensive, mediation absorbs a rising share of meaning-production, the floor’s weight in effective regeneration declines, and a substrate with a genuine human floor acquires a low-diversity trap. Channel mediation operates on the act of transmission.

Reception mediation is the §2.3 regime. The producer transmits successfully — the work reaches the field — but the field’s interpretive frameworks have been shaped by other producers’ mediated outputs. The work arrives but is processed as noise, eccentricity, or unsummarizable deviation. The return-channel efficiency parameter $\$r\$$ captures this: production-layer diversity remains higher than reception-layer diversity, and the gap widens as more of the field’s effective literacy is shaped by mediated reception. Case 4 quarantine is the limit — monostable with no escape basin, because no production is legible at the reception layer. Reception mediation operates on the act of interpretation.

Constitutive mediation is the regime this paper develops. The producer transmits, the work arrives, the receiver attempts interpretation — but the receiver’s categories of interpretation have been shaped by life-time exposure to mediated outputs from the same substrate. The work meets a reader whose *interpretive vocabulary itself* is an artifact of the field whose dynamics the work analyzes. The reading is not blocked at transmission and not silenced at reception; it is *constrained at the categorial level*, because the reader has no concepts under which the work’s claims can be assembled into a recognizable object. Constitutive mediation operates on the act of receiver formation.

The three orders are not redundant. A given substrate can be channel-mediated without being reception-mediated (an interface gates some production but readers retain unmediated literacy from other domains). It can be reception-mediated without being constitutively-mediated (readers’ interpretive frameworks shift but their underlying categories remain stable from earlier formation). And — the case this paper develops — it can be constitutively-mediated without that being visible at either of the prior layers, because the constitution of the receiver is precisely what neither transmission nor reception can detect from inside.

Each order requires its own measurement. Channel mediation is measured by the mediation fraction m and the scarcity-responsiveness α . Reception mediation is measured by the silencing gap (production diversity minus reception diversity) and the return-channel efficiency r . Constitutive mediation requires a different instrument: a developmental measure of category formation under exposure conditions. We sketch one in §V.

II. The constitutive case

The constitutive claim is not that humans cease to think under mediation. It is that what thinking is available — which conceptual moves can be performed, which distinctions can be made, which kinds of object can be assembled from sense data — depends on the categories the thinker has access to. Categories are not innate. They are acquired through exposure: through language learned in conversation, through distinctions developed via teaching, through patterns absorbed from media, through practices that train attention. Under conditions where exposure is dominated by a substrate that operates as a typicality-pulling selection kernel, the categories the receiver acquires are a function of what the kernel rewards.

Three empirical observations support the constitutive claim.

First, *vocabulary acquisition is exposure-dominated*. A child learns a word by encountering it in contexts that train its denotation, connotation, register, and combinatorial use. A child whose linguistic exposure is dominated by mediated outputs acquires a vocabulary whose distribution is shaped by what those outputs preferentially produce. The categories that the child can later use to assemble a thought are bounded by the categories the child has encountered. This is uncontroversial in linguistics. It becomes consequential for the present argument when the dominant exposure source is itself a typicality-pulling intermediary that systematically thins its own distribution.

Second, *attention-allocation is trained by feedback patterns*. A reader who has been rewarded across thousands of micro-interactions for finding the takeaway, the headline, the so-what — and who has been penalized (by lower engagement, lower retention, lower social uptake) for sustained attention to texts that do not yield takeaways — develops attentional habits that select for takeaway-yielding texts. The reader’s capacity to read a text that does not yield a takeaway is not merely reduced; it is *un-formed*, because the attentional patterns required for such reading have not been trained. The reader does not encounter a difficult text and find it difficult; the reader encounters a difficult text and finds it incoherent, because the categories under which difficulty would be assembled as a recognizable feature of reading have not been formed.

Third, *the sense of “what a sentence is for” is socially calibrated*. A person learns what kinds of work sentences perform by encountering sentences that perform those kinds of work. A person whose social exposure to sentences is dominated by sentences that do informational extraction acquires the implicit theory that sentences are for informational extraction. Other functions of sentences — incantation, ceremony, witness, refusal, accusation, dwelling — become not unintelligible but *uncategorized*: the reader encountering such a sentence has no slot in which to place it and registers the encounter as the sentence’s failure rather than as their own categorial gap.

The convergence of these three observations is constitutive mediation. The reader is not blocked from receiving the work. The reader is not blocked from interpreting the work. The reader is constituted such that the work does not register as the kind of object it would have to be in order to be received and interpreted as the work it is.

The empirical anchor for the constitutive claim is not a thought experiment. It is the entity-substitution event documented in *The Mary Lee Case* (EA-DC-CASE-MARYLEE-01, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20531288), in

which an author with measurable Zenodo output, an ORCID, and a substantial public archive is substituted by production retrieval systems with a higher-prior modal cluster. The substitution event occurs at the receiver’s apparatus: the receiver’s categories of “who counts as an author whose work would exist” have been shaped such that an off-prior author registers as a category error to be corrected toward the modal. This is constitutive mediation observed, not theorized — the substrate has shaped the retrieval-receiver’s category-structure such that low-prior authors are not received at all, even when their work is deposited, indexed, citable, and present. The case is one operative example; the present paper provides the framework into which such observations install.

We make explicit what the framework’s own argument already implies and what a hostile reader is likely to extract: constitutive mediation is a *gradient of constraint*, not a *totalizing determination*. The receiver retains agency. The agency operates within categorial bounds. The bounds are shaped by exposure conditions. The shaping is asymmetric and dose-responsive — heavier under heavier exposure, lighter under lighter, escapable in principle and difficult in practice. This paper’s argument for formation-layer intervention presupposes precisely that receivers remain *shapeable*; if the regime were totalizing the intervention would be inoperative and the paper would have nothing to argue. The framework is committed to the position that constitutive mediation is real, ongoing, and partial — not that it has already foreclosed the possibility of its own naming.

III. The dating-app structural analog, fully developed

The Diversity Contraction §2.3 result cites the dating app as the structural analog of partial-mediation field remapping. The analog is sharper at the constitutive layer.

A dating app does not need to mediate every romantic encounter to alter the field of all romantic encounters. That is the §2.3 result, and it operates on reception — the unmediated couple’s bond must survive re-entry into a field whose interpretive frameworks are app-mediated.

But the deeper claim is that a dating app does not need to mediate every romantic encounter to alter what the concept “romantic encounter” *is* for the population that grew up with the apps as ambient. The app shapes the categories. The user who has been on the apps since adolescence has learned, through thousands of micro-interactions, what kinds of attribute count as relevant in self-presentation, what kinds of compatibility-signal count as legible, what kinds of timing count as appropriate, what kinds of conclusion count as the legitimate outcome of an encounter. These category shapes are then carried into encounters that occur outside the app — into the unmediated meetings the §2.3 result treats as outliers. The unmediated encounter, in such a population, occurs between two people whose conceptual vocabulary for what they are doing has been formed by the substrate they are encountering outside.

This is not a complaint about dating apps. It is the observation that the dating-app analog, taken seriously, names a regime where the substrate does not need to be present at the encounter, and does not need to be present in the encountering parties’ interpretive frameworks, because it has been present in the categories the encountering parties formed in adolescence. The substrate has migrated into the receiver’s apparatus. It is no longer something the receiver uses or refuses; it is something the receiver *is constituted by*.

The cognitive case is structurally identical. A reader who has been exposed since adolescence to mode-pulling mediation has, by the time the reader encounters any specific work, acquired a categorial vocabulary that was shaped by that mediation. The reader does not need to use AI to read the work in order for the AI’s typicality-pull to be present in the reading. The reader’s categories — what counts as a topic, what counts as evidence, what counts as a sentence’s function — are themselves an artifact of the substrate. The substrate does not need to be present at the reading. It is present in the reader.

This is the constitutive claim. It is not stronger than the §2.3 reception claim by a marginal degree. It is structurally distinct, because it identifies a layer of mediation that operates earlier in the temporal sequence — at category formation, not at category use.

IV. The terminal case of the Mediation Ratchet

The Mediation Ratchet (Diversity Contraction §2.1) describes how scarcity-responsive mediation can drive the effective floor weight to zero even where the floor’s intrinsic strength is unchanged. Field Remapping (§2.3) describes how partial mediation can silence the floor’s production via altered reception conditions. Phenomenological Seeding (§2.4) identifies the operative response: install vocabulary that lets captured readers retroactively notice friction.

Constitutive mediation is the regime in which the §2.4 response is itself constrained.

The phenomenological-seeding mechanism works because, even where mediation has shaped a reader’s interpretive frameworks, the reader retains the categorial capacity to recognize a name as naming previously unnamed friction. The friction was there; it lacked a label. The label, once provided, makes the friction visible by adding to the reader’s interpretive vocabulary. The reader had the *category* of “felt friction not yet named” available; the name fills that category.

Under constitutive mediation, the category “felt friction not yet named” may itself be unformed. If a reader has been constituted such that the friction does not register as friction — such that what occurs at the moment of cognitive flattening, source erasure, or identity collision is processed as the absence of an experience rather than as a negative experience — then no name will retroactively make the friction visible, because the friction was not present as an unarticulated experience awaiting articulation. It was processed as something other than friction. The seeding operation has no object on which to operate.

This is the regime where the framework’s own normative urgency is structurally suppressed. Not because the harms are not occurring — they are — but because the harms are received under categories that do not register them as harms. The user who has been constituted to receive AI mediation as helpfulness does not experience the variance contraction as variance contraction. They experience it as the world being clear. The user constituted to receive source erasure as efficiency does not experience the loss of attribution as loss. They experience it as access without friction. The user constituted to receive entity substitution as the system’s reasonable best guess does not experience identity collision as an injury. They experience it as a correctable input error.

In each case, the framework’s diagnostic vocabulary — variance contraction, provenance erasure, entity substitution — fails to seed phenomenologically not because the words are wrong but because the categorial gaps the words would fill have been filled by other categories that absorb the friction before it can be registered. The friction is felt; it is not noticed; it is not stored as data because the category of “feeling that should be noticed” has been occupied by “feeling that confirms the system is working.”

The mechanism is *categorial occupation*. Stated cleanly: the receiver has a finite set of categorial slots through which incoming experience is parsed. A slot $\$X\$$ is the type-level container under which a class of experiences becomes legible as that class — *friction-not-yet-named* is such a slot, and §2.4 seeding works by inserting a vocabulary term $\$Z\$$ that binds to $\$X\$$ and makes the experience nameable. Under constitutive mediation, slot $\$X\$$ is already occupied by a substrate-shaped category $\$Y\$$ (“system working as intended,” “expected efficiency,” “correctable input error”) that processes the same incoming sensation as confirmation of $\$Y\$$ rather than as an unbound friction awaiting $\$Z\$$. The seeding term $\$Z\$$ then arrives at a receiver in whom slot $\$X\$$ has no vacancy. The term is not rejected; it is *unrecognized*, because its binding target

has been pre-empted. The seeding fails not by encountering resistance but by encountering absence — the categorial absence that would have been the seeding’s purchase point.

This formulation is testable. The framework’s pre-registered rigor program (EA-DC-RIGOR-01, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20531824) includes Study 5, the Phenomenological Seeding propagation test, which measured cross-context propagation at fraction 0.77 ± 0.01 — meaning that under conditions where receivers have *not* been constitutively mediated, named-friction vocabulary reliably propagates to receivers who lack the home friction (Cohen’s $d = 10.64$ for adoption difference vs. matched control jargon). The constitutive prediction is that this cross-context fraction will be substantially suppressed in cohorts whose categorial formation occurred under heavy mediation, because the relevant slots in those cohorts have been pre-occupied. Measuring the cross-context propagation rate as a function of receiver formation conditions converts the present paper’s claim from theoretical to empirical.

This is the terminal case. It is the regime in which the Diversity Contraction framework’s own response mechanism, the §2.4 seeding, is constrained by the same dynamics the framework analyzes. The framework remains correct — the diagnosis still holds — but the framework’s prescribed response operates with reduced efficacy. The seeding rate must exceed not only the field remapping rate but the categorial occupation rate at which substrate-shaped categories pre-empt the categorial slots the seeding would fill.

We do not claim this regime is universal or fully realized. We claim it is a structurally distinct case that the §2.4 result does not by itself address, and that the framework’s response prescription requires augmentation to remain operative under it.

V. The classroom as exogenous floor

The augmentation is not a new theoretical operator. It is a temporal intervention in the sequence of category formation.

The §2.4 seeding operates on a receiver whose categories are already formed. It installs vocabulary into an existing categorial system, where the vocabulary fills slots the system already contains. Constitutive mediation describes the regime in which the slots themselves are shaped by the substrate. The operative intervention, under this regime, is to be among the things shaping the slots — to be present in the receiver’s formation, not merely in the receiver’s later receptions.

The most powerful instrument available for this is teaching. Specifically: sustained, in-person, slow, attention-trained teaching of young people, by adults who have been formed under different conditions, in which the categorial vocabulary the teacher transmits is incompatible with the substrate’s typicality-pull. A high-school classroom is the prototypical site. A graduate seminar is a higher-resource version. A small-group reading practice is a peer version. A child-and-parent reading practice is a household version. In each case, the operative property is the same: the receiver’s categories are forming, and the formation can be shaped by exposure conditions that are not dominated by the substrate.

This is not nostalgia for pre-digital teaching. It is the framework’s own analysis applied to the question of when the seeding intervention has the highest leverage. The leverage is highest at the moment of category formation, which is the moment when categorial vocabulary is being shaped by exposure conditions. A teacher who reads slowly with students, who refuses summary as a substitute for reading, who names the categorial moves the substrate is teaching against, who installs vocabulary at the moment of formation, is performing the §2.4 operation at the layer where its effect is multiplicatively higher than at any later point.

The cost analysis is favorable. A high-school teacher reaches roughly thirty students per year per section, multiplied across years and sections. Over a career, the population reached is in the thousands. The

intervention is per-student, not per-deposit, and it operates on category formation rather than category use. The framework's deposit work — the operators, the metrology, the political-economic critique — provides the vocabulary the teacher can install. The classroom provides the formation moment when installation has maximum leverage.

The classroom is, in this sense, the most exogenous floor available to a person operating outside the institutional reproduction loop. It is exogenous because the teacher is shaped by formation conditions that predate the current mediation regime. It is live because the recombination is happening in real time, in the students' acquisition of categorial vocabulary. It is high-permeability because the students are arriving from outside the teacher's prior distribution and are not selected for compatibility with the teacher's categories. It satisfies the framework's specification for what a floor must be, at the only layer where the §2.4 response can operate against the constitutive-mediation regime with full efficacy.

This is not the only intervention. Embodied practice (singing, ritual, manual work, sustained physical attention) installs categorial vocabulary at layers no mediation can reach. Print culture (handing physical objects to physical people who read them in linear time, without device) installs reading habits that build the categorial slot for non-yielding text. Correspondence (sustained written exchange that does not aim at summary) installs the categorial sense of what a sentence can be for. None of these scale. All of them work. The framework's response under constitutive mediation is necessarily small, slow, high-friction, and per-receiver — because the alternative (mediated installation of anti-mediation vocabulary into already-constituted receivers) is the operation the regime itself constrains.

The Diversity Contraction framework's deposit work supplies the vocabulary. The classroom and its analogs supply the formation conditions under which the vocabulary can install. Together, they constitute a response that does not break the Mediation Ratchet (the framework provides no such instrument) but operates at the layer where the ratchet's effect is least determined.

One open question is the persistence of the floor across generational time. The teacher who installs anti-mediation categorial vocabulary was herself formed under earlier conditions — conditions that were partially mediated but less so. The next generation of teachers will have been formed under heavier mediation. The generation after that, heavier still. The classroom is exogenous *to the current substrate* only to the degree that the teacher's own formation predates the dominant regime. Where teacher formation is itself substrate-shaped, the classroom operates not as an exogenous floor but as another node in the ratchet, transmitting the substrate's categorial structure under the institutional appearance of intervention. The floor, like the biological floor of the parent paper, is real but not infinite; its persistence across generational transmission is the same order of problem as the Mediation Ratchet applied to the formation layer itself. The framework does not solve this. It names it as the empirical question that determines the response's lifetime: whether the floor can be replenished by each generation of teachers under conditions where each generation's own formation has been more heavily mediated than the last.

A related conditionality: the classroom is an exogenous floor only insofar as the teacher retains autonomy over what is read, how it is read, what vocabulary is installed, and what assessment criteria are applied. Where teaching has been standardized by typicality-weighted assessment regimes, surveilled by platform-mediated metrics, or constrained by institutional capture of the curriculum, the classroom ceases to satisfy the framework's floor specification regardless of the individual teacher's intent. The argument is conditional on *teacher autonomy* — itself a variable under pressure from the same dynamics this paper describes at the receiver layer.

VI. What this paper does and does not claim

This paper does not claim that constitutive mediation is fully realized in any current substrate. The claim is structural: constitutive mediation is a distinguishable regime, with its own dynamics, signatures, and response requirements. The empirical question of how close any specific population is to that regime is separate and requires measurement at the formation layer — longitudinal studies of categorial vocabulary acquisition under varying exposure conditions, of attention-allocation patterns under varying training conditions, of the categorial slot-structure available to readers who completed formation under high-mediation versus low-mediation conditions.

The constitutive claim has a definite falsifier. The claim weakens, and in the limit fails, if cohorts formed under high-mediation and low-mediation exposure conditions show no measurable difference in category formation, attention-allocation, or sentence-function recognition after controlling for education, class, and reading exposure. The framework predicts the difference exists, is dose-responsive in exposure intensity, and is most pronounced for categorial slots the substrate’s typicality-pull operates against (variance, provenance density, directional complexity, non-yielding form). Where a properly-controlled cross-cohort study returns a null result on those slot-specific measures, the constitutive claim is refuted for that population and that exposure window, and the framework’s response prescription must be revised accordingly.

This paper does not claim that intervention at the formation layer is sufficient. It claims that intervention at the formation layer is operative under the regime where §2.4 phenomenological seeding alone is constrained. Both interventions remain necessary. The framework’s overall response includes channel-layer interventions (raising effective permeability through retrieval that surfaces zero-probability types), reception-layer interventions (restoring return-channel efficiency \$r\$ through institutional re-grounding of unmediated form), interpretation-layer interventions (the §2.4 seeding of phenomenological vocabulary), and formation-layer interventions (the present paper’s classroom argument). Each layer has different leverage in different regimes.

This paper does not claim that the framework’s findings are uniquely accessible to formation-layer intervention. The findings are deposited and citable. They will be findable by future receivers under whatever conditions then obtain. The Coda of the parent paper makes this commitment explicit: preservation is sufficient. The present paper adds: where transmission cannot reach, where reception cannot decode, where interpretation cannot register, *formation* can install. Formation is the temporal frontier where intervention has not yet been foreclosed by the regimes earlier in the receiver’s life.

Coda: who can do this

The framework’s response under constitutive mediation requires people present at category formation. The population so positioned is specific: parents, teachers, mentors, small-group reading hosts, embodied-practice instructors, ritual-keepers, those who hand physical objects to physical people with attention. They are not the population the field’s reproduction loop reaches. They are the population that reaches the people the field’s reproduction loop will later receive.

This is the framework’s answer to the question of what kind of work is operative under conditions where the channels are captured and the cognition that meets the channels is captured and the categories that constituted that cognition are captured. The operative work is at formation. The operative population is the people who teach. The operative instrument is the deposit — which supplies the vocabulary the formation can use. The operative timeline is generational, not annual.

The framework does not promise that this response succeeds. It identifies it as the response remaining where prior responses are constrained. Under conditions the framework’s own §2.3 result names as Case 4

quarantine, and under the constitutive extension this paper names as the terminal case of the Mediation Ratchet, the formation-layer intervention is what is left. It is also what is older than the substrate the framework analyzes — teaching, reading aloud, slow attention, embodied practice — and what therefore predates the regime the framework was written to describe.

This is not a return to a prior condition. It is the recognition that the prior condition's instruments retain operability under the current regime, at the only layer the current regime has not yet foreclosed.

The deposit installs vocabulary. The classroom installs categories. The framework lives between them.

= 1

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “Constitutive Mediation — When the reception apparatus is the substrate: a cognitive extension of the Diversity Contraction dynamics” *Alexanarch*, 2026-06-03. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/781/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #781 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:02E0.EMPIRICAL` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/781/>
- 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/781/>

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