

# On Non-Local Consequences and Structural Risk

## Purpose

This document exists to acknowledge, frame, and track **non-local consequences** that may arise from the articulation and dissemination of the corpus. It is not a disclaimer, a mitigation strategy, or an ethical prescription. It does not argue for or against publication, application, or adoption.

Its sole purpose is **situational awareness**: to make explicit that work operating at the level of coherence conditions may produce effects beyond its immediate domain of intent.

---

## 1. Scope of This Document

This document concerns **structural externalities** — effects that arise not from what the corpus advocates, but from what it makes visible.

It does not address: - Correctness of the corpus - Desirability of outcomes - Institutional strategy - Moral responsibility of readers or practitioners

It addresses only the predictable consequence that **clarifying foundational conditions alters downstream interpretive landscapes**.

---

## 2. Nature of the Risk

The corpus does not invalidate existing domains of study. It does not contradict their results, methods, or empirical findings. However, by explicitly articulating conditions for coherence, it may render some foundational assumptions **contingent rather than necessary**.

This introduces a class of risk distinct from error or misuse:

- Domains whose legitimacy depends on unexamined coherence assumptions may experience destabilization
- Long-standing conceptual frameworks may require re-grounding
- Certain research programs may be revealed as historically productive but structurally non-fundamental

These effects are **non-local**: they arise without direct engagement, intention, or intervention.

---

### 3. Perception as Attack

The corpus may be perceived as an attack on existing disciplines, institutions, or paradigms. This perception can arise even under good-faith reading.

This perception does not result from adversarial claims, but from: - De-authorization of implicit assumptions - Removal of protective ambiguity - Increased cost of category error - Collapse of rhetorical escape mechanisms

The corpus does not target institutions. It alters the conditions under which institutional claims are interpreted.

---

### 4. Plausible Downstream Consequences

Without asserting likelihood or desirability, the following consequences are foreseeable:

- **Institutional resistance or suppression** through neglect, reframing, or containment
- **Selective adoption** of downstream ideas without acknowledgment of foundational dependencies
- **Weaponization** by actors seeking to undermine trust without supplying replacement structure
- **Psychological harm** through premature application that dissolves meaning without re-stabilization
- **Professional harm** to individuals whose work becomes socially delegitimized before alternatives mature

These outcomes are not claims of intent, nor predictions of inevitability.

---

### 5. Non-Prescriptive Posture

This document does not prescribe safeguards, restrictions, or conditions of use. Introducing such prescriptions would collapse descriptive structure into normative control and violate the discipline of the corpus.

The corpus does not guarantee safe application. It does not claim moral authority over its effects. Responsibility for interpretation and application lies with the applier, not with the structural description itself.

---

### 6. On Replacement and Responsibility

Structural destabilization does not imply destruction. Making contingency visible does not eliminate utility. However, removal of foundational assumptions without replacement can create instability.

The corpus does not mandate replacement work. It recognizes that replacement is **harder than critique**, slower than destabilization, and unevenly distributed across domains and institutions.

This asymmetry is a property of foundational clarification, not a failure of responsibility.

---

## 7. Tracking and Reassessment

Non-local consequences evolve over time. Accordingly, this document is intended to be **revisited but not revised reflexively**.

Future expansions of the corpus may: - Increase destabilization surface - Lower barriers to misuse - Clarify risks previously unrecognized

Such changes should be **tracked**, not immediately resolved.

---

## 8. Summary Statement

The corpus operates at a level where clarifying coherence conditions can produce effects beyond local intent. These effects may include destabilization of existing assumptions, institutions, or practices. Acknowledging this risk does not imply endorsement, mitigation, or withdrawal. It reflects structural honesty.

The existence of non-local consequences is not a defect of the work. It is a consequence of its scope.

---

## Closing Note

This document does not ask to be cited, debated, or defended. Its role is archival and orientational. It exists so that future readers, critics, and practitioners cannot claim that the potential for non-local impact was unrecognized or ignored.