Open Inquiry Network

Social Differentiation Network Theory

Open Inquiry Research Group

Research Edition A

Open Inquiry Editions

Contents

Preface: Why Step Out of the Class Image 4

Introduction: What Social Differentiation Network Theory Aims to Explain 7

Chapter 1. Why Class Theory Has Power: How a High-Compression Model Captures Real Social Pressures . . 13

Chapter 2. The Formation of the Class Plane 22

Chapter 3. The Temptation of a Single Axis: How an Effective Concept Is Elevated into a Presupposed Main Line 31

Chapter 4. Society Is Not a Combination of a Few Grand Concepts: From a Platter of Concepts to Differentiating Units 41

Chapter 5. What Is a Differentiating Unit? How Social Differences Become Differentiating Units That Can Be Extracted, Assigned Weight, and Connected to Consequences 51

Chapter 6. Concepts Are Not What Society Fundamentally Is: How Concepts Compress Differentiating Units and Occlude Reality 62

Chapter 7. How Differences Produce Consequences for Action: Differentiating Units from Background Differences to Chains of Consequences 72

Chapter 8. Superposition, Occlusion, and Generation among Differentiating Units: How Differences Form Relational Structures 82

Chapter 9. Why Differences Carry Different Weights: How Weight Forms within Relations 91

Chapter 10. Relational Fields: How Social Objects Undergo Distinction Extraction, Weight Assignment, and Positioning Anew 101

Chapter 11. Differentiation Positions: How Multiple Weights Combine to Form a Person's Actual Position . . 111

Chapter 12. Latent Differentiation Space: How Differences Not Yet Extracted Are Preserved and Triggered, and How They Change Positions 120

Chapter 13. Nodes: How Differences Are Preserved, Given Definite Form, Extracted, and Passed On 130

Chapter 14. Relational Chains: How Differences Are Recast, Branch, Flow Back, and Produce Consequences between Nodes 140

Chapter 15. Networks: How Multiple Relational Chains Jointly Process Differences and Reorganize Positions 150

Chapter 16. Community: How Long-Running Differentiation Networks Form Boundaries, Recognition, and Social Memory 159

Chapter 17. Institutionalization: How Differences Are Formatted, Judged, and Connected to Consequences That Can Be Put into Effect 170

Chapter 18. Class-Image Formation: How High-Weight Differentiating Units Are Brutally Projected into Class Images 180

Chapter 19. National-Community Formation: How Partially Overlapping Networks Form Historical Communities 192

Chapter 20. State Incorporation of Differences: How Differences Are Formatted, Mutually Recognized, and Connected to Chains of Implementation 203

Chapter 21. Historicization: How Past Differences Become an Order of Differentiation Available for Future Extraction 222

Chapter 22. Why Theory Must Simplify 237

Chapter 23. Dangerous Compression 248

Chapter 24. Differentiation Bias: The Misalignment of Explanation and Reality 262

Chapter 25. Illusory Explanatory Construction: Internally Coherent but Distorting Reality 274

Chapter 26. Model C, Complexity-Based Conflation, and Explanatory Calibration 286

Chapter 27. Family: Preservation, Responsibility, and Historical Indices in Kinship Networks 298

Chapter 28. Local Society: Local Recognition, Relational Nodes, and the Generation of Positions 310

Chapter 29. Nation and Community: Long-Term Interaction, Shared Memory, and Boundary Generation . . . 322

Chapter 30. The State: Identification, Registration, Certification, Implementation, and Write-Back 332

Chapter 31. The Market: Differentiation Networks in Prices, Debt, Credit, and Risk 343

Chapter 32. Schools and Education: Differentiation Networks of Student Registration, Evaluation, Qualifications, and Future Opportunities 353

Chapter 33. Platform Society: Differentiation Networks of Accounts, Records, Ranking, and Visibility 365

Chapter 34. Revolutions and Movements: Differences Gaining Weight Together, Rapid Connections between Nodes, and Action Write-Back 377

Chapter 35. Limited Distinction Extraction and Entry into Concrete Relational Fields 387

Chapter 36. Applied Analysis of Weight: Nodes, Transmission, Records, and Write-Back 397

Chapter 37. Calibrating Applications of Community: Types, Relations, and Boundaries 408

Chapter 38. Operational Calibration of Complexity Compression 419

Chapter 39. What This Theory Is Not: Society Is Not a Class Plane but a Differentiation Network 429

References and Chapter Reading Guide 441

Preface: Why Step Out of the Class Image

Am I writing this book because I cannot see labor, poverty, debt, unemployment, wages, housing, medical care, workplace injuries, and risk? Quite the opposite. All these things are real. They can crush a person's daily life, force a family into a position where it has no choice, and drive people to the point where no exit remains. Precisely because they weigh this heavily, I cannot accept gathering everything into a total image called "class."

In the intellectual context of mainland China, class theory is the root of communism. It certainly includes political propositions and carries a critique of society; at a deeper level, it puts a pair of glasses on people through which to see the world: first it compresses a complex society into a class image, then declares that image to be society as it really is; first it nails people into class positions, then explains family, locality, nation, clan, faith, rites and customs, the private sphere, community, and private life—all of them—as outer shells, appearances, or appendages of class relations.

I oppose communism, and what I oppose first and foremost is this way of seeing the world.

This opposition must be brought to bear at different levels. The name "communism," the theoretical structure that arranges reality through a total class image, historical traditions from different periods, actual organizations and institutions, and the actions of specific people must not be conflated into a single, undifferentiated subject. A name can suggest where to begin verification, but it cannot replace identifying structures, materials, authority, and consequences; nor can differences within historical traditions absolve an interpretive structure that employs class entities, class enemies and friends, and historical mission of responsibility.

The core structure this book opposes is an interpretive structure that uses class entities and a total class image to arrange in advance the positions of family, nation, locality, faith, the private sphere, and other differences, and organizes reality through divisions between enemies and friends and through historical mission. Judging whether a particular text, organization, institution, or person's actions enter into this structure requires corresponding evidence. Distinguishing these levels does not soften the stance of opposition; it simply refuses to let names replace proof and refuses to treat abstract labels as things that act on their own.

I do not deny inequality in reality, nor do I defend the rich, power, capital, exploitation, debt, or the shifting of risk onto others. Some people have not received the wages they are owed; some families are dragged into debt by a single illness; some workers suffer workplace injuries but cannot produce evidence to establish responsibility; some young people are so bound by rent and the risk of unemployment that they dare not quit their jobs—none of this is empty talk. Labor, wages, employment, property, debt, housing, risk, relations of domination, and the width of available exits tangibly change a person's living circumstances, action space, the risks they bear, and the exits they can choose. A social theory that cannot see these things is far too lightweight.

Seeing these real differences, however, does not mean having to acknowledge "class" as what society fundamentally is. What actually enters into social consequences are concrete differentiating units and the processes through which they operate in nodes, relational chains, weights, and write-back. What is called a class image is an explanatory image formed when a set of high-weight differentiating units undergoes low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming. Partial explanatory power comes from these real differentiating units and the processes of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression applied

to them. The class image is only a low-dimensional output; interpreters must not pass it off as reality itself, still less use it to demand that the whole of society operate according to its logic.

The most dangerous thing about class theory has never been that it is wholly false. A theory that cannot stand up at all can be dismissed at a glance. The problem is that it grasps some of the real weights bearing down on people, then compresses all these weights into the same total image. First it makes you think you have seen all of reality; gradually it makes you forget that what you have seen is actually only part of it. In the end, it is not content to explain wages, labor, debt, risk, and relations of domination; it wants to explain everything: family becomes class reproduction, nation becomes the occlusion of class contradictions, clan becomes a remnant of old classes, the private sphere becomes backward relations, culture becomes an instrument of rule, and local community becomes false consciousness. Even people's familial affection, memory, shame, loyalty, trust, and sense of belonging must be translated into a position within the class image.

Society has never been a sheet of class paper laid flat. A person's position in labor can cut out only part of their social reality; it cannot define their entire situation. The family has never been merely a unit of resource transmission: it preserves familial affection, obligations, memory, care, and long-term trajectories of life. Local society carries complex connections of familiarity, trust, reputation, and local relations; it cannot be reduced to a mechanism for distributing benefits. Still less is a nation a container for economic contradictions: it holds accumulated layers of language, rites and customs, shared experiences, and a sense of boundaries. As for community, it is certainly not an outer shell temporarily slipped on only for class mobilization. People live within layer upon layer of relations. Kin, language, the body, official documents and credentials, debt, occupation, illness, local memory, accent, credit, ceremonial cash gifts, household registration, school, religion, historical scars, institutional status, caregiving responsibilities, and private space grow heavier or lighter in different relational fields. They change a person's position, qualifications, risks, evaluations, responsibilities, choices, and consequences; they are not decorative trim around the edges of the class image. I call these units of difference differentiating units.

What Social Differentiation Network Theory sets out to do is to unpack the reality swallowed up by grand concepts. Faced with grand terms such as "class," "state," "market," "nation," "culture," and "family," it does not rush to treat them as already constituted entities. Instead, it keeps asking: in concrete relational fields, exactly which differences are extracted, who or what mechanism assigns their weight, and how do these differences pass through institutions, nodes, and relational chains to connect with resources, risks, and responsibilities? Some differences are amplified in this process, while others are downplayed; some are seized by explanatory images and pulled into the foreground, while others undergo occlusion or are left behind in the dark.

Social Differentiation Network Theory is concerned with how society takes shape in concrete relational fields and enters into real consequences. Reducing it to an ordinary list of factors would lose the theoretical judgments it contains; using it to exclude other valid explanations would repeat the errors of a single underlying entity and a total image. Neither state, nation, market, family, nor culture can replace class as a new single axis. What matters is to turn away from this temptation: in concrete relational fields, differentiating units undergo extraction, weight assignment, connection, transmission, and write-back, forming a constantly changing differentiation-network order.

Oppression in reality must be faced squarely; on this point there is no room for equivocation. I oppose communism because it carries a deeper explanatory violence: crushing three-dimensional society into a class plane, crushing living people into class positions, crushing communities into class instruments, crushing history into class struggle, and conscripting all differences into the same total image.

Communism has proposed some mistaken policies, but that is not the whole problem. The deeper problem comes from its grounding in a mistaken social ontology: treating the class image as reality itself, treating a low-dimensional projection as the three-dimensional world, and treating limited distinction extraction as ultimate truth. It thinks it has explained society; in fact, it has merely flattened society.

This is where this book begins.

This book faces squarely the pressures that genuinely exist in society. Wages, labor, debt, risk, and relations of domination all carry a real weight that cannot be ignored. But interpreters who adopt class theory and its total image have no right to monopolize the explanation of these pressures, still less to use a single plane to swallow up family, locality, nation, the private sphere, community, memory, the body, and the concrete days of people's lives all at once. Analysis and judgment are themselves necessary. What must be rejected is the practice of total-image subsumption of differences, of compressing reality through a monopoly on explanation, and of translating every inequality into class as what society fundamentally is.

The starting point of Social Differentiation Network Theory is precisely the refusal to surrender the world to a single total image.

Society is not a class plane. Society is a differentiation network.

Introduction: What Social Differentiation Network Theory Aims to Explain

I. Judgment Must Begin with What Is Happening

This book is not about which grand term best sums up society, but about where people should actually begin their judgment when faced with a concrete matter. Someone has not received the wages they are owed; a child cannot enroll in school because the required documents are incomplete; a family suddenly can no longer hold on after a patient is hospitalized; a local relationship changes course because someone gives testimony; a debt approaches its due date; a movement draws people who previously had nothing to do with one another into the same public event. Many things do not initially present themselves as complete images of “class,” “state,” “market,” “nation,” or “family.” In concrete events, people often first encounter materials, money, illness, relationships, responsibilities, records, deadlines, and risks; grand concepts can help people organize these consequences, but they cannot replace tracing the event itself.

This book therefore does not begin with a ready-made name for society. First, look at how a particular matter lands in people's lives: which differences have already entered into consequences, who or what procedure is handling them, how a determination changes eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, and ways out, and how the current handling leaves records that enter later life. Starting from concrete matters does not shrink society into everyday trivia. Only in this way can we know what abstract explanations actually capture and what they leave out.

Starting with grand terms is convenient: it can gather disorderly phenomena into a clear image and quickly bring certain burdensome relationships into view. The trouble begins when a concept is treated as society itself: events then fall into the compartments it has already prepared. A person's wages, labor relations, debt deadlines, housing conditions, household registration documents, physical condition, responsibilities to relatives, local reputation, language, credit history, and institutional status will not carry equal operative weight in the same event. Some differences weigh heavily at this moment, some sink into the background for the time being, and others have not even gained recognition yet. Neat names may be easy to understand, but they can wipe away the event's own texture.

II. Stepping Back from Grand Concepts to Concrete Differences

What this book calls a differentiating unit is a unit of difference in the world that can be distinguished, represented, subjected to weight assignment, and brought into comparison, and that may enter into consequences within a concrete relational field. It is not society's smallest atom, nor does it break a person down into an endless table of attributes. Its significance lies in reminding interpreters: do not rush to name an event; first identify which differences have already been extracted, which remain in the background, which are subject to occlusion, and which are changing a person's position, eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, action, or consequences.

When wages are not paid on time, we cannot leave it at “low income”; the matter also connects to contracts, working-time records, contracting relationships, debt deadlines, rent, whether fellow workers can testify, and whether the case will be accepted for arbitration. Whether a child can enroll in school is likewise not just an education problem; whether actual residence can be recognized through documents, whether the landlord has registered, whether the enrollment deadline is approaching, and whether the family has the time and cash flow

to navigate the procedures can all change the outcome. These observations are not meant to establish a universal checklist. Each matter engages different differences; what truly needs to be traced is how they enter into consequences in the event at hand.

The “relational field” here is neither a background nor a scene casually sketched by an interpreter. It refers to the concrete state of relations in which an event is already situated and which is causing certain differences to be extracted and subjected to weight assignment. Unpaid wages, school enrollment, seeking medical care, dividing a family household, migration, registration, giving testimony, transactions, and public conflicts bring different materials, relationships, and records to the fore. Discussing whether a difference matters apart from its relational field makes it easy to mistake abstract prominence for weight in reality.

A relational field will not have answers ready for the interpreter. It only lets certain questions surface first: which document is being required, which relationship can provide testimony, which record is being recognized, which deadline is approaching, who consequently has more to shoulder, and who loses choices. Interpreters cannot take in every possible difference at once; they can only follow the consequences that have already become apparent to determine which parts currently need to be traced. This limited scope must be adjusted as materials, nodes, and consequences change; it must be neither so narrow that it misses relationships already at work nor so broad that it crams everything into a single analysis.

Weight addresses precisely this problem. It is not a fixed ranking, much less a way of declaring a root cause for society in advance. A difference's weight consists in how strongly it can enter into real consequences within a concrete relational field. Household registration may not become an issue when buying groceries day to day, yet may suddenly gain weight in school enrollment, medical care, housing, and eligibility determinations; a past negative review ordinarily has no conspicuous effect, but once a procedure extracts it again, it may change subsequent opportunities. Weight requires the interpreter to explain: why this difference gains weight at this moment, what steps it has passed through, and where it will transmit the consequences.

Weight also requires comparison. Why do two apparently similar events produce different outcomes? When a family is just as short of money, why can one document be deemed valid while another is sent back; when two people are both injured, why can the fact of one person's labor enter into a determination, while the other's pain can go no further than a private account? Comparison does not automatically identify a single cause, but it can force explanation away from empty generalizations and back to which differences actually changed the consequences. A counterexample is not a nuisance; it makes the original judgment aware of its own boundaries and gives differences that have been downplayed a chance to reenter the analysis.

III. How Differences Enter into Social Consequences

A differentiating unit does not enter into consequences on its own. It needs to be extracted, undergo weight assignment, enter concrete nodes and relational chains, and, after processing, leave traces that can be extracted again. Extraction is not arbitrary selection. A difference may be pushed into current consequences by an event, procedure, relationship, or record; it may also enter a judgment because the interpreter frames a question and chooses an entry point for analysis. In both cases, the basis for extraction must be explained and subjected to checks against consequences, comparisons, and counterexamples. Weight assignment, too, is not an abstract statement that something is important; it is when a difference begins to change eligibility, responsibility, risk, evaluation, action space, or available fallback options.

Nodes are locations, mechanisms, or carriers where differences are stored, given definite form, formatted, identified, extracted, certified, passed on, executed, or subjected to write-back. Documentation requirements, files, contracts, schools, hospitals, judgments of responsibility within families, local testimony, administrative

procedures, and other places where processing actually takes place can all become nodes. A node is not an abstract dot, nor need it be an individual with a will; its role becomes apparent through what, concretely, it stores, rejects, recognizes, or passes on.

Some consequences become more severe precisely because differences have not been successfully extracted. If the fact of actually living somewhere cannot be converted into recognized material, that does not mean the person did not live there; if an injured body lacks records that can enter a determination, that does not mean the pain does not exist. The problem is that certain nodes handle only particular forms of difference, so facts of lived experience are rewritten, downplayed, or set aside as they enter a procedure. This gap cannot be fully accounted for by simply saying, “That is how the system works.” We must also examine who preserves the materials, how certification is obtained, who bears the consequences after a refusal, and whether people can reconnect to the processing chain through other relations.

Relational chains, in turn, reveal how differences undergo transmission, recasting, branching, amplification, attenuation, or recirculation between nodes. A case of unpaid wages may move from an employment relation into debt deadlines, then into rent and household expenses; if a piece of material cannot be accepted as valid, the consequences may extend from a single service counter to school enrollment, residence, and the next eligibility determination. A relational chain is not simple linear causation. It can break off or take a detour, and it may reconnect at another node. Merely saying that “some structure caused everything” often amounts to skipping precisely these intermediate processes.

The historical index and write-back keep explanation from stopping at what is immediately before us. Past differences do not govern the present on their own; they must re-enter the present through family memory, archives, institutional records, local reputation, community commemorations, or other nodes. Nor is write-back ordinary archiving. When the result of a determination, recording, handling, or action is preserved and can later alter eligibility, risk, evaluation, and action space anew, that is write-back. It shows that people do not bear only the consequences of the present in the present; what is written down today may also become a difference extracted anew tomorrow.

These concepts are not a set of procedures to be imposed on everything. Their functions differ: the relational field grounds judgment in the state of relations currently unfolding; weight keeps judgment from placing all differences on the same plane; nodes reveal how differences are handled; relational chains allow people to trace how consequences flow; the historical index and write-back reveal how time enters positions and choices. Together, they serve not to explain society in its entirety, but to enable a limited judgment to make its own grounds clear.

If an explanation retains only the endpoint, it will quickly erase the intermediate processes: unpaid wages become proof of some overall condition, blocked school enrollment becomes an example of some label, and local testimony becomes an incidental phenomenon. Tracing the process does not negate broader pressures; it allows people to know where those pressures take effect and where they are amplified, blocked, or redirected. This is also why this book does not understand comparison as selecting the one and only answer. Comparison means subjecting different explanations to the test of the same event, to see which consequences each can make clear and where each begins to leave parts it cannot handle.

IV. The Differentiation Network Is Not a New Total Image

In concrete relational fields, differentiating units undergo extraction, weight assignment, connection, transmission, and write-back, forming a constantly changing differentiation-network order. This is the book's core judgment. It does not mean that a new entity called a "network" lies hidden behind society, nor does it seek to replace the original big picture with an even bigger one. What the differentiation network points to is the order through which differences enter into consequences by way of nodes and relational chains; this order overlaps, branches, flows back, and fractures, and also reconnects in new events.

This book therefore cannot be reduced to an ordinary list of factors. Merely listing income, household registration, education, family, locality, ethnicity, the state, the market, and platforms one by one does not explain how they act. Conversely, presenting the differentiation network as the sole truth would likewise commit the error of the total image. This book puts forward a core theoretical judgment about how society takes shape in concrete relational fields and enters into consequences; it neither compresses everything back onto a single axis nor excludes other explanations that can explain events within their effective scope.

The state, the market, the nation, the family, locality, schools, platforms, and community can all be used, but each must be brought back to its own traceable mechanisms. The state involves identity documents, files, registration, certification, mutual recognition, enforcement, and write-back; the market involves prices, contracts, credit, deadlines, liquidity, debt, and risk shifting; the family preserves care, property, responsibility, memory, silence, favoritism, harm, and long-term evaluation; local familiarity, reputation, testimony, and spatial nodes can constitute real recognition networks; the national community, too, cannot be reduced to a myth of bloodline, a registered name, subjective imagination, or class occlusion. It may form through long-term interaction, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm and protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. Breaking these concepts back down into mechanisms does not abolish them; it requires them to submit to comparison and calibration.

V. The Power and Boundaries of the Class Image

Labor, wages, employment, property, debt, housing, risk, relations of domination, and the width of available exits are all real differences, and they may carry great weight. Any judgment about society that ignores them will lose its sense of reality. Class theory's appeal as an explanation within a limited scope lies precisely in its extraction of one set of high-weight differentiating units from among them. The question has never been whether these differences exist, but whether, after they undergo low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming, the class image is treated as a social entity, a natural community, or what society fundamentally is.

The class image is not an actor. Acts of compression, subsumption, demotion, or monopolizing explanation can be attributed only to class theory, interpreters, organizations, institutionalized interpretive procedures, or concrete handling mechanisms. When class theory elevates the results of its own distinction extraction into society itself and demotes family, locality, nation, the private sphere, community, the body, records, and other valid explanations to subsidiary material, what it produces is not an orientation that can be compared on an equal footing with other limited explanations. Class theory is precisely Model C: total-image subsumption, not Model A or Model B; the explanatory capacity within a limited scope generated by the real differentiating units mentioned above and by the processes of their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression cannot change this basic structure.

This judgment does not require readers to deny oppression, unpaid wages, workplace injuries, poverty, debt, or risk shifting. Precisely because these consequences are indeed so heavy, it is all the more necessary to ask how they pass through concrete nodes and relational chains and intertwine with family responsibilities, local recognition, institutional eligibility, national community, private life, and historical records. If all problems are first translated into the class image, many differences already acting in events will be downplayed, leaving only an image that looks clear but is in fact far too flat.

VI. How Limited Explanations Remain Open to Calibration

Being limited does not mean being invalid. Any explanation can extract only some differences, and every explanation leaves some parts unaddressed for the time being. Acknowledging this limit is healthy explanatory humility: it requires an explanation to state what it has seen, what it has downplayed, in which events it is valid, and which counterexamples would force it to revise itself. This humility preserves comparison; it does not abolish judgment.

Explanation can also run out of control at the other extreme. One form of this loss of control elevates a limited image produced through distinction extraction into society itself, leaving no place for other valid explanations; another illicitly substitutes the claim that society cannot be effectively explained for the fact that society cannot be exhausted and explanation is necessarily limited, thus placing models with explanatory power, limited but revisable models, erroneous models, and utterly groundless claims on the same level. The former is total-image subsumption; the latter is the erasure of distinctions between explanations. They move in opposite directions, yet both destroy the conditions for comparison, revision, and calibration.

Complexity itself is no reason to refuse judgment. Events may indeed involve multiple sets of differences, multiple nodes, multiple relational chains, and records left at different times; this calls for more detailed explanation, not for declaring everything equally important and equally impossible to compare. Only when "too complex" is used to cancel valid comparison, revision in light of counterexamples, and explanatory calibration does complexity-based conflation constitute Model C's mechanism for erasing distinctions between explanations. Acknowledging omissions, boundaries, and counterexamples is not this mechanism; on the contrary, these are the conditions that allow limited judgments to remain revisable.

VII. The Book's Course of Work

This book does not provide readers with an answer they can immediately apply to everything. It first addresses why grand concepts are attractive and why they so easily exceed their own valid scope; it then clarifies, step by step, how differences undergo extraction, weight assignment, preservation, transmission, comparison, and write-back, and examines their different modes of operation in communities, institutions, history, and various concrete domains. The discussions that follow do not ask readers to accept a closed system, but require every explanation to return to events: what it has extracted, what it has omitted, at which nodes it holds, along which relational chains it is transmitted, and in the face of which counterexamples it needs adjustment.

This course also defines the limits of the book's use. Social Differentiation Network Theory cannot replace concrete historical research, institutional analysis, legal judgment, economic analysis, or people's own experience; nor can it recast all this work as material subordinate to itself. What it requires is that, before making any broad judgment about society, we do not let concepts flatten events in advance. Judgments may be limited, but they must be traceable, comparable, and revisable.

The episodes involving school admission, workplace injuries, platform accounts, families, and local life used repeatedly in this book are composite scenarios that bring multiple verifiable mechanisms into a single analytical setting. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, they neither refer to a single real case nor imply that different regions, years, institutions, or platforms share the same lists of materials, procedures, and consequences. Specific institutional facts remain bounded by the relevant jurisdictions, periods, and sources.

Society is not constituted in advance by grand concepts such as class, state, market, nation, and family. In concrete relational fields, differentiating units undergo extraction, weight assignment, connection, transmission, and write-back, forming a constantly changing differentiation-network order. This statement is neither the endpoint of the book nor another total image; it is the direction this book must hold to as it begins to make judgments.

Chapter 1. Why Class Theory Has Power: How a High-Compression Model Captures Real Social Pressures

I. Why a False Theory Can Still Capture Suffering

A theory that relies on fabrication alone can hardly gain a firm foothold in people's daily lives. Unpaid wages, looming rent, borrowing after illness, unemployment, and workplace injuries are not created by theory; they first fall upon people's bodies, time, and living arrangements. This is precisely why a false theory can still have power: it touches something in reality that carries immense weight. Touching reality is not enough to prove that the entire explanation holds.

Class theory has precisely this appeal. It brings wages, working hours, employment, property, debt, housing, protections, risk, and relations of domination to the fore, revealing pressures that are not purely personal within predicaments previously dismissed as "poor planning," "not trying hard enough," or "bad luck." Some people cannot wait for their wages, and not just because they are impatient; some dare not quit their jobs, and not just because they lack courage; some must keep working after illness, and not just because they are unwilling to rest and recover.

These pressures must be acknowledged; a social entity called "class," however, cannot be acknowledged on that basis. What actually enters into consequences are concrete differences and how they operate within relations: when wages are paid, whether a contract is recognized, who can schedule shifts, when debts fall due, and who can obtain medical records, evidence, or care. The so-called class image is an explanatory image that class theory produces through the low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming of one set of these differences. It is not society itself.

This chapter addresses only why this image is appealing. Many accounts prefer to push predicaments back onto the individual: unpaid wages mean a lack of savings, unemployment means insufficient diligence, borrowing after illness means a lack of planning, workplace injuries mean carelessness, and being unable to pick up a child means poor family arrangements. Such judgments sometimes touch on part of the situation, yet they often gloss over how labor, time, evidence, protections, and buffers produce consequences.

When rent has not been paid on time, asking only whether spending has been restrained sidesteps who delayed the wages, whether documentation can establish the unpaid wages and the employment relationship, how long asserting one's rights will take, and whether the next job can follow without a gap. A mother's inability to pick up her child cannot be reduced to whether she fulfills her responsibilities either; who schedules the late shift, whether taking leave means losing pay, and whether refusing a shift will cost her next month's shifts also determine whether she can be there. Debt after illness must be traced to interrupted income, medical expenses that must be paid up front, and gaps in protections; the inquiry cannot stop at accusatory questions about whether precautions were taken in advance.

The explanatory appeal of class theory comes from its ability to consistently bring a set of weighty differences to the fore. It enables people to see that many things attributed to character and choice are in fact already constrained by relations of employment, resources, time, and risk. Bringing one set of differences to the fore does not mean that one has already seen society itself. Any set of differences brought to the fore must still confront the other materials, relations, and responsibilities at work in an event. Grasping one hard line

does not entitle class theory to assign all remaining differences in advance to the role of subordinate explanations. The weight it grasps is real; organizing that weight into the sole image of society is another matter.

Class theory cannot be placed alongside ordinary limited explanations, nor can it be described as an ordinary model that only later overstepped its bounds. Its ability to capture suffering is precisely what makes it easier for its basic structure—organizing the selected differences into a total class image—to operate.

II. Two Kinds of Deadlines and the Width of Available Exits: The Mechanisms of Unpaid Wages and Unemployment

In cases of delayed wage payments, we must first examine how two kinds of deadlines collide. The employer can postpone payment, but the worker's rent, food costs, children's expenses, medication costs, and loan-related dates keep advancing on their own schedules. When wages arrive a day late, life does not pause for a day; the cost of waiting falls first on those who need the money.

There is also an asymmetry in the ability to wait. The party able to withhold wages may treat delayed payment as a way to manage cash flow, negotiate, or arrange costs; the party waiting for wages, however, may have no alternative income and cannot persuade the landlord, creditors, school, and hospital all to wait. One party can push the deadline back; the other must respond immediately. The actions available to the two parties already differ.

Unpaid wages are not just a matter of a verbal promise, either. Whether materials can establish the fact of unpaid wages and the employment relationship affects whether the case can enter subsequent procedures. Suffering and discontent may be real, yet they may not immediately translate into materials recognized by those procedures. The time spent defending one's rights then feeds back into daily life: pursuing procedures requires taking leave, and while waiting for an outcome, one still has to pay rent, repay debts, and look for work. If a conflict arises with the original employer, whether one can move into the next job also becomes a problem. Unpaid wages do more than leave a sum of income unreceived. Evidence, time, housing, debt, and employment opportunities are joined into a relational chain, and the transmission of consequences continues along it.

Unpaid wages also change how people draw on relationships with relatives, colleagues, and local contacts. Some can turn to family for money to tide them over; others have no one to borrow from. Some can withstand the interval spent looking for their next job; others lose both income and existing support the moment they leave. These differences do not cancel the pressure of the employment relationship, but they determine how that pressure is borne, deferred, or passed on.

Failure to resist immediately cannot be taken as proof that one's existing position reflects one's character. The conditions for action are jointly constituted by payment deadlines, whether materials hold up as evidence, whether the chain of daily life permits waiting, and whether future employment can follow without a gap. By drawing out employment, income buffers, asymmetries of time, and the bearing of risk, class theory does prevent "not daring to make a fuss" from being reduced to weakness of character. This is the basis of its appeal. Yet those owed wages still differ in their physical condition, responsibilities to relatives, local relationships, existing debts, and available work. Class theory cannot, merely because it has drawn out the preceding factors, rule in advance that the remaining differences deserve to be no more than footnotes to the same image.

In unemployment, this mechanism manifests itself in differences in the width of available exits. Unemployment cannot be reduced to a single point in time. Questions of rent, deposits, social insurance, debt, family responsibilities, and the next job all open up at once. Once income stops, matters that could previously be handled separately begin to crowd together: whether one can keep one's housing, how to cover children's expenses, when creditors will demand repayment, and whether institutional eligibility will become precarious because employment has been interrupted.

A person with a resource buffer is not free of pressure, but he still has time to wait, screen, and compare. He can send out a few more résumés, reject work he knows will harm his health or cannot sustain his livelihood, and give himself some time to recover before making the next choice. This time is not abstract freedom; it is sustained jointly by savings, housing, support from relatives, protections that can continue, and existing work experience.

Nor do people without a buffer lack the ability to choose. The problem is that their choices take place within a narrower span of time. When rent, repayments, and daily expenses press in, accepting or rejecting unsuitable work, accepting or rejecting worse conditions, often does not present two equally bearable options. Some can wait a few months; others can wait only a few days. Both are choosing, but they are not choosing under the same conditions for waiting.

The ability to refuse poor-quality work therefore cannot be understood solely in terms of personality or discernment. It also depends on how many rounds of failure one can withstand after losing income, whether one can avoid moving for the time being, and whether one can keep care, debt, and social insurance from breaking down all at once. A failed interview may merely delay plans for someone with a buffer, but for someone without one, it may immediately change housing, borrowing, and family arrangements.

Age, industry, city, health, institutional status, and family responsibilities also change the consequences of unemployment. Age affects the work available; industry affects the speed of transition; health limits what work one can take; and family responsibilities determine whether one can relocate or wait a long time. These differences need not be central every time, yet they can lead the same period of unemployment toward different outcomes. By drawing out resource buffers, the ability to wait, the width of available exits, and the bearing of risk, class theory can strip the claim that "the unemployed do not try hard enough" of its function of occlusion. It cannot, on that basis, presuppose a class entity, still less compress the time, bodies, families, and institutional relationships of all unemployed people into a single fate.

III. Branching Relational Chains: Family Responses, Bodily Reality, and Procedural Determination

Whether people can wait and choose under a deadline is one question; how working-time arrangements change care is another. Decisions about shift scheduling often take place outside the family. Workplace managers arrange early and late shifts, overtime, and days off; workers receive a timetable that has already been set. Yet the times when someone needs to pick up children after school or take on care within the family do not automatically fit that timetable.

A shift schedule enters the family along a temporal chain: late shifts cause drop-off and pick-up arrangements to fall through, last-minute overtime breaks prior commitments to provide care, and taking leave reduces income or affects the following month's shifts. Working hours are not clock times confined to the workplace; they change who cooks, who stays with a sick person, who explains things to the school, and who bears the burden of children waiting and older people complaining. Refusing a shift assignment is not simply a matter

of declaring what one wants, either. Taking leave may mean a pay deduction, refusing assigned shifts may affect the following month's schedule, and changing jobs may bring an interruption in income and the risks of looking for work again. Workers know the arrangements are unreasonable, yet income and job opportunities have already raised the cost of refusal.

The consequences for care also accumulate. Failing to pick up a child once may be only a temporary difficulty; repeatedly coming home late and repeatedly asking others to pick up the child, however, change judgments among relatives about who owes whom, who is reliable, and who must give way. The pressure created by a shift schedule is therefore not just a sum of lost income; it also enters family memory and arrangements for responsibility.

The family's immediate response to this pressure first changes the care and housework arrangements at hand. Arguments, compromises, requests for help from relatives, reallocations of housework, or decisions about who must give up one of their jobs—if the outcomes of these responses are preserved in family memory and arrangements for responsibility as differences that can be retrieved again later, write-back has already taken shape.

Only when these contents are identified again, retrieved, interpreted, or subjected to weight assignment in subsequent handling will they again change whether leave can be taken next time, whether anyone is willing to help, and how much more uncertainty the family can bear. Responses outside the workplace may thus, in turn, constrain or support choices at work.

Class theory can see here how the power to schedule shifts reaches into the family, and this is no small matter. But the family is not a passive container. Whether relatives can handle drop-offs and pick-ups at short notice, who thinks care should be whose responsibility, who has helped whom in the past, and how the family remembers one absence after another will make the same shift schedule produce different results in different families. These relations do not arise unidirectionally from labor relations, nor can they be written as appendages of labor reproduction.

Work arrangements affect family care, but illness is first of all a bodily event. Pain, treatment, recuperation, and limitations on activity do not lose their own reality because of income or job titles. How much recovery time a patient needs, whether they can continue their previous work, and whether they need care from others are all direct questions arising from the condition of the body. The same illness does not produce the same social consequences for everyone. People with savings, more stable jobs, protection, or access to care support may still be able to sustain treatment and recuperation for a time; for people with few resources, unstable work, and heavy family responsibilities, other links in life begin to loosen more quickly as soon as something goes wrong with the body. Illness is not produced by class. Yet once it enters existing relations, the ways it is borne diverge.

Once bodily impairment meets daily pay, pay deductions for leave, or unstable work, an interruption in income immediately enters the picture. Hospital bills arrive first, while wages may fall; people who need to recuperate must also face pressures concerning absence, performance, their position, and returning to work. The body needs time, but income arrangements are often unwilling to wait. Once medical expenses, interrupted income, and loan deadlines are linked, the transmission of pressure continues along debt and kinship relations. Repayment dates will not give way to treatment, so whether one can quit a job or recover fully from an illness may be constrained anew by a sum of money falling due.

Protection, savings, and support from relatives form different buffers. Having protection does not mean that all expenses and pressures from missed work are covered; having savings does not mean that the pressures of

care and missed work disappear; having relatives willing to lend money may also bring future responsibilities and changes in relations. These buffers cannot be summed up by saying that someone has “somewhat better conditions”; rather, different relations absorb or amplify consequences at different times. Debt following illness also makes treatment choices and arrangements for daily life constrain one another. Some people can recuperate first and then decide whether to return to work; others must secure their income before they can even discuss treatment. Some can distribute part of the costs across relatives and the relations that provide protection; others can only keep all the pressure on themselves. The difference lies not only in having more or less money, but also in what kinds of support can be sustained as deadlines approach.

Debt after illness cannot be summed up along a single economic line, also because the same pressure changes shape across different relations. Savings may initially absorb medication costs, which later turn into loans from relatives; missed work may first reduce income and then bring care and repayment arrangements into conflict; whether an employment relationship can be maintained also affects the possibilities for protection, returning to work, and seeking further help. The type of illness, age, degree of recovery, medical system, marital relationship, urban eligibility, and care arrangements can also lead the same interruption of income to different outcomes. These factors do not serve to deny the weight of resources and protection, but to prevent any single line of compression from being treated as a complete explanation of illness, the body, and family relations.

Class theory extracts gaps in protection, resource buffers, interruptions of income, and the bearing of risk, and can thus point out that the consequences of illness do not fall evenly. But illness, the body, the family, and medical relations cannot be reduced to expressions of a class image. Each enters into the consequences through treatment, borrowing, care, institutional recognition, and recovery time, and may change where the burden of the same debt ultimately falls. Class theory can point out the uneven distribution of resources and risks within these consequences, but it cannot indiscriminately conscript the onset of illness, bodily recovery, what families bear, and medical procedures as evidence of one and the same underlying class reality. Only by placing each back within actual relations can we see where pressure can be absorbed and where it is pushing people into debt.

Illness shows that bodily processes are not the same as economic arrangements, while work injuries further demonstrate that the fact of bodily harm does not automatically amount to procedural recognition or the actual bearing of responsibility. Work injuries likewise bring bodily harm and organizational responsibility directly before us. The consequences of a work injury do not stop at the moment of the accident. If it is described merely as an operating error, insufficient attention, or bad luck, attention becomes fixed on the instant of injury, while the labor arrangements before and after the accident are obscured. Whether a contract exists, whether the worker has received training, whether working hours are excessive, whether machinery has protective safeguards, and who is responsible for keeping records at the site are all conditions shaping how the injury is understood.

After an injury, medical records, proof of the employment relationship, site records, and coworkers’ testimony determine whether bodily harm can be recognized through formal procedures. Evidence does not automatically stand on the injured person’s side. Who controls the records, who is willing to testify, and whether the materials can be obtained can mean that the same pain sometimes enters the recognition process and sometimes remains only a private statement. Whether responsibility can be confirmed still depends on recognition, assessment, compensation, and waiting. Who advances the medical expenses, who bears the burden of daily life while work is suspended, who can still afford to wait when assessment is delayed, and whether the employer acknowledges the fact of employment all affect the transmission of the accident along

different relational chains. The consequences of a work injury are not an allocation of responsibility on a sheet of paper, but how the body, income, materials, and time support one another or push one another away.

Class theory extracts the organization of labor, the allocation of responsibility, and the shifting of risk from this, and can thus oppose attributing work injuries entirely to individual carelessness. This extraction draws on real-world material: some people do indeed find it harder to preserve evidence and harder to bear the wait, and are more likely to lose their income after work stops. But bodily harm does not disappear within the recognition procedure. Family care, loans from relatives, relations with coworkers, local help-seeking, and the legal system all enter into the consequences of treatment, compensation, and returning to work. They do not serve to dilute the weight of the organization of labor, but to reveal why responsibility may still be borne by different people in similar accidents.

IV. How Dispersed Suffering Acquires a Common Language: Connection and Its Limits

No theory can do without compression, because the people, materials, time, and relations implicated in unpaid wages, scheduling, debt after illness, unemployment, and work injuries are too complex. Without extraction and connection, people can hardly see clearly which pressures repeatedly alter the consequences; compression serves precisely to place scattered experiences within comparable contours, so that people need not treat every event anew as an isolated accident. But these five domains enter life at different nodes, and the mechanisms each brings into play also differ: unpaid wages involve payment and deadlines; scheduling involves working time and care; debt after illness involves the body and borrowing; unemployment involves waiting and fallback options; and work injuries involve evidence and responsibility. Since they enter at different nodes, their concrete consequences in life will not be entirely the same. Thus, although theoretical compression is necessary, it cannot flatten out the actual paths through these different nodes.

Class theory and the interpretive procedures that adopt it extract resource possession, the sale of labor, control over time, the bearing of risk, buffering capacity, and differences in fallback options from these events. Class theory connects the power over payment, the power over scheduling, income buffers, debt pressure, the determination of responsibility, and differences in fallback options into a single line, revealing asymmetries within relations and pointing out that some suffering is not a private failure. This connection enables people who had previously borne their burdens separately to see similar pressures and recognize how others' difficulties and their own can illuminate one another.

On this basis, class theory gathers the extracted differences under names through which people can identify one another, allowing wages, working hours, risks, property, and fallback options to be seen as evidence of the same social position. This public naming can swiftly counter accounts that make the consequences entirely private, and thereby provide a ready-made language for organization, mobilization, and public judgment. Without having to fabricate unpaid wages, illness, unemployment, or work injuries, class theory can use a single explanatory line to organize dispersed suffering into what appears to be a common situation. This is precisely the source of its powerful appeal.

Yet what is connected consists of similar differences that may carry high weight, not an already existing class subject acting as a unified whole. Society is not first neatly divided into a few classes for people then to enter with their respective lives. People live within intersecting relations of body, occupation, income, debt, household registration, accent, kinship, locality, medical history, housing, institutional eligibility, and care responsibilities. When a child enrolls in school, household registration, social insurance, rental registration, school documents, and whether the parents can take leave may carry great weight; when borrowing money, creditworthiness, kinship relations, past dealings, and local reputation may carry great weight; in debt after

illness, interrupted income, medical expenses, recovery time, and loan deadlines may all close in at once. Wages, employment, resource buffers, and the bearing of risk do indeed carry great weight in many relational fields, but this does not give them a fixed priority over all relations.

Repeated connection of differences still does not form an entity. The fact that certain differences often appear together can only show that they jointly alter consequences in some relational fields; it cannot support the reverse inference that a preexisting class entity is arranging them.

A class image can indeed present some circumstances in compressed form, but it cannot replace the differentiation position of concrete people within relations. Even people with the same income may face different consequences in their lives because of differences in medical history, household registration, care responsibilities, residential address, support from relatives, and institutional recognition; the rough position marked by the image cannot replace the actual position jointly formed by these differences within concrete relations. When the same set of economic pressures recurs, class theory appears especially solid, but however solid the image may be, it does not exist prior to relations. Even when wages, housing, debt, and domination jointly grow heavier across several events, they still bear on concrete people through contracts, residential addresses, qualifications, care, records, and time arrangements; to take recurring outcomes alone and turn them into proof that an entity exists is precisely to retreat from relations to a total image.

The product must be distinguished from the subject performing the operations: the class image is merely the result of this compression, projection, and naming, and cannot be written as an actor that actively connects events. It is class theory, interpreters, organizations, or institutionalized procedures that carry out extraction, weight assignment, organization, naming, and the arrangement of interpretive positions. For the same person, labor relations may come to the fore when wages go unpaid; residential address, documents, and qualifications may have a more direct bearing when their child's school enrollment is blocked; and when they cannot recuperate after illness, they encounter different barriers involving medical treatment, care, and debt. If all these problems are adjudicated in advance under the same name, the relations that should have been identified anew are left merely to supply further evidence for that name.

When class theory extracts shared pressures, it causes these different circumstances to be translated first into the same kind of position. Translation is not without use; it can make visible some of the weight that was previously concealed. But class theory establishes a shared language as the only exit, allowing mechanisms of divergence to appear only as examples of an already established image. Once translation becomes the only entrance, residential address, medical history, care, local recognition, and institutional eligibility—which could otherwise change the judgment—are forced first to prove that they still ultimately serve the same image. This is precisely the threshold at which the capacity for connection turns into total-image subsumption. Two things must be separated here: concrete differences do indeed grow heavier within relational fields; compressing them into a single entity posited as what society fundamentally is, however, strips each of its eligibility to reenter explanation. The former must be preserved; the latter must be taken apart.

V. The Structure of Total-Image Subsumption and Limited Economic Differentiation Analysis

The danger of compression does not lie only in someone occasionally misusing an originally neutral tool. The structure of total-image subsumption inherent in class theory does not emerge only later or after excessive use; its basic structure is to organize high-weight differences extracted within a limited scope into a total image of class and allow other differences to be understood only in ways this image permits. This structure makes compression cease to be merely a temporary task of explanation and begin to prearrange for society what is fundamental, what is superficial, and what can serve only as subordinate material. Concrete actors who adopt this structure will make family, locality, nation, body, memory, medical history, and community relations appear only as the image permits.

When some differences are extracted, others are simultaneously downplayed. How family care is distributed, how local relations provide or deny support, how national memory and language figure in recognition, how bodily recovery limits action, and how institutions handle medical histories and records may not all retain their original explanatory standing within class compression. They do not cease to have consequences simply because an image has not placed them at its center.

In concrete relational fields, some differentiating units do indeed carry great weight. When wages go unpaid, employment relations and payment deadlines immediately change life; when a workplace injury occurs, whether the facts of the work can be established directly affects compensation; when unemployment strikes, resource buffers and waiting time narrow or expand choices. These judgments concern consequences within events; they do not proclaim an eternal center of society. High weight does not imply any inherent hierarchy. The fact that income carries great weight in one event does not mean it determines outcomes before anything else in every relation; the same income can also connect to different consequences depending on differences in address, medical history, family support, household registration, and institutional eligibility. Weight within a concrete relational field cannot be directly rewritten as the sole main axis of all social relations.

Here lies the crucial transformation in class theory: it organizes differences in labor, wages, property, debt, risk, and domination that repeatedly gain weight in certain relational fields into a total image of class; it then uses this image to determine in advance where other differences should ultimately be placed. Family can be described as reproduction, locality as surface relations, nation as occlusion, and body and memory as derivative material. The material need not be denied; it may still be stripped of its standing to change judgments independently.

Rejecting a sole main axis does not mean flattening all differences into equal importance. Different events still require judgments about which materials, relations, and responsibilities are entering into consequences. What must be rejected is the use of a total image to decide the outcome for all differences before an event even begins; this turns high weight from a judgment open to examination into a naming of society that cannot be revised.

Acknowledging that class theory can draw out real pressures is the starting point for dismantling it. If wages, labor, debt, housing, risk, differences in timing, and relations of domination are described as inconsequential, the critique will be even further removed from people's daily lives than class theory is. These differences narrow people's ways out and change who can wait and who must bear the consequences immediately; they cannot be brushed aside. Their weight must be preserved; it is another matter to project them as class entities, natural communities, or what society fundamentally is. The various mechanisms are connected to one another, yet each still has its own relational chains through which it produces consequences.

Dismantling the total class image must not throw people back into individual blame, nor break pressures into unrelated fragments. It requires placing the labor, wages, employment, property, debt, housing, risk, domination, and ways out drawn out by class theory, together with the materials, responsibilities, and relations it has downplayed, back within concrete consequences. Doing so does not eliminate judgment; instead, it makes judgment open to scrutiny: who arranges time, and where; which record can be recognized; what deadline is approaching; which relational chain transfers consequences to whom; which differences are becoming weightier at this moment. A class image can depict part of a situation; interpreters who adopt class theory must not let this image speak for society itself, still less use it to monopolize the interpretation of suffering.

Limited explanation also compresses, but it must still account for what it has drawn out, which materials it has not yet addressed, and what consequences might force a revision of its judgments. Class theory does not earn exemption from this responsibility merely by grasping real differences. Limited economic differentiation analysis must be kept separate from class theory. When researchers trace a case of unpaid wages, a debt relationship, ways out in housing, property use, labor arrangements, the shifting of risk, or concrete domination, and restrict their conclusions to what the available materials can support, this kind of analysis can be revised in light of family caregiving, ethnic relations, local recognition, legal qualifications, and other materials. It addresses how specific differences enter into consequences; it does not automatically become class theory merely because it studies economic questions.

Whether an analysis enters the class theory criticized in this book cannot be determined by researchers' self-designation, nor simply by the breadth or narrowness of their research. The key lies in the explanatory structure: once an analysis first forms a class image and then uses a total class image to prearrange the explanatory positions of other differences, fix the meanings they are supposed to have, or digest counterexamples anew as evidence of class occlusion, false consciousness, and deeper class relations, it enters Model C: total-image subsumption. Narrowing the scope will not turn this kind of class theory into Model A, Model B, or an ordinary limited tool; what can be retained is limited analysis of concrete relations involving wages, debt, labor, property, housing, risk, and domination.

Chapter 2. The Formation of the Class Plane

The class plane is formed by class theory, interpreters, and institutional procedures of interpretation: they organize differences extracted within a limited scope into a single main axis, then expand this image into the base map of society as a whole. The discussion here concerns not the generation of objective class entities, but the formation of an explanatory plane.

I. The Capacity for Distinction Extraction within a Limited Scope and the Structure of Total-Image Subsumption

Wages, employment, working hours, rent, debt, risk, and resource buffers are all hard relations extracted by class theory. They do exist, and their consequences can be severe. Class theory has grasped a set of real differences; this cannot be passed over. Denying these differences would leave theory without ground beneath its feet, and the consequences of relations involving labor, income, resources, and risk would once again be downplayed. A social theory blind to these differences would also readily rewrite structural pressures as individual failures once again. A person's income, assets, labor position, employment relations, resource buffers, and capacity to bear risk profoundly alter his circumstances. Especially in many problems involving wages, housing, debt, educational opportunities, and the risk of illness, this set of differentiating units extracted by class theory often forms not the background but intensely amplified differences that do carry high weight in these problems.

Analysis of labor, wages, employment, debt, risk, and relations of domination can be limited, concrete, and bounded. What is truly difficult to handle is explanation valid within a limited scope: real differentiating units such as labor, wealth, employment, and resource distribution, together with the processes of their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression, form class theory's limited explanatory capacity. Yet class theory's basic structure organizes this portion of explanatory power into authority over all explanation, compresses and projects the extracted differences and names them a class image, then installs this image in the place of what society fundamentally is.

The move from “there is a set of real differentiating units here” to “other relations are merely appendages of the class image” reveals class theory's procedure of total-image subsumption: from the outset, the capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope is organized into the total image's structure of subsumption. Class theory connects the extracted differences into a measure for all explanation and carries this line into the family, locality, nation, religion, culture, education, memory, private sphere, community, region, language, faith, body, identity, shame, responsibility, familial affection, and local standing. Other relations may still appear, but they can be mentioned only as subsidiary explanations of the class image.

High weight does not mean always having the highest weight, still less does it justify becoming the sole main axis. A society does not have only one kind of difference at work. Family, region, language, institutions, the body, age, gender, memory, religion, education, occupation, local standing, legal status, and migration experience can all alter a person's position. They carry different operative weight in different problems: sometimes they recede into the background, sometimes they are amplified, and sometimes they determine how a person is seen, excluded, protected, or harmed even more directly than the set of differences extracted by class theory.

For example, a worker from elsewhere is seen first and foremost as a laborer in the factory. His wages, working hours, contract, and risk of workplace injury are indeed closely related to differences in labor,

employment, resource buffers, and risk-bearing. But when he enrolls his child in school, household registration, proof of residence, a rental contract, available school places, and local institutions reposition him. Resources, income, and the family's safety net remain present, because they affect whether he can rent suitable housing and pay additional costs; but what determines his position at this point is no longer labor relations alone.

When the same person enters different problems, the differences he carries are reordered. Class theory turns a set of high-weight differentiating units into the sole main axis through low-dimensional projection, thereby forming the class plane. Interpreters who adopt this image no longer ask about these units' operative weight in concrete problems, but assume in advance that this class image has already supplied the final explanation. Thus, the family is written as class reproduction, locality becomes the surface layer of economic structure, the nation becomes an outer garment for the mobilization of interests, religion becomes a tool of the order of domination, and culture becomes a shell of ideas. They may appear, but they lose their own explanatory standing.

This is like projecting a three-dimensional object onto a wall. A projection can show contours and can also show direction. The class image can indeed reveal certain real relations in society. But the projection is not the thing itself, and the shadow cannot replace the actual object. People can infer some relations from a shadow, but they cannot leave the object's thickness, sides, back, and internal connections entirely to the shadow to explain. The problem is that interpreters who adopt class theory mistake the projection for the actual object. An image can present part of reality, but it cannot present every relation; when the procedure of interpretation permits reality to appear in only one shape, the projection masquerades as society itself.

II. Presence Rewritten as Exclusivity: The Demotion of Family, Locality, and Shared Memory

Many errors first grasp part of reality and then expand it. This does not mean that class theory is merely an ordinary limited explanation whose application is occasionally expanded later; rather, its capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope is organized into the procedure of total-image subsumption from the outset. Class theory does not get every fact wrong: families do transmit resources, local disputes involve interests, religion may serve order, and national narratives may also be mobilized. The problem is that the procedure of interpretation directly rewrites “presence” as “exclusivity,” elevates these facts to the status of all facts, and connects the extracted differences in advance into a decisive measure for all explanation. Although other differences can still be mentioned, the procedure of interpretation strips them of the standing to alter judgments independently. They are no longer treated as real differences capable of altering social positions, but can appear only in a demoted capacity as shells, surfaces, disguises, or supplements of the class image. Society is thereby compressed into a plane.

There is nothing absurd about saying that differences in income, real estate holdings, educational attainment, personal connections, and occupational position exist within families. Parents' real estate holdings, income, education, and connections do alter their children's opportunities; whether a family can provide tutoring, a stable home, room for trial and error, and emotional support also materially affects the next generation's opportunities. The family has never been only about familial affection; it does transmit resources, habits, fears, and boundaries. But if one goes further and concludes that these differences have proved the family to be essentially nothing but a machine for class reproduction, explanation has crossed a line. The family is also a place of bodily care, a place where past relations accumulate, a place of emotional dependence, and a place

where favoritism and silences are preserved over the long term. Illness, indebtedness, inheritance, the ordering of elders and juniors, and memory also operate concretely within the family.

When an elderly family member falls ill, who pays, who steps back at the sight of the bill, who stays at the bedside, who takes leave from work, who remains silent before the sickbed, who received more parental care in the past, and who among the siblings has always been thought responsible for shouldering the burden—none of this can be fully explained by interpreters who adopt class theory and rely solely on the class image. Money is present, but it cannot substitute for the consequences that care, memory, responsibility, and emotional dependence produce at this moment.

A person cares for his sick parents not simply because his economic position dictates that he must. He may be the one who lives closest to home, may have been expected since childhood to be sensible, may be the sibling most afraid to refuse, may have been wronged in the past, or may, precisely because he has the lowest income, be the one whose time is most readily claimed. Class theory can extract the resource pressures involved, but the resulting class image cannot show why these responsibilities fall to him.

The same is true of local relations. There is nothing absurd about saying that local land disputes involve struggles over resources. A plot of land has value; when its boundaries change, interests change. But a local dispute often also draws out past relations, marriages, personal obligations, funerals, reputations, generational seniority, and trust or distrust accumulated over many years. A shifted field ridge may call up a land exchange twenty years earlier; a record of wedding and funeral exchanges may record who was absent from whose family funeral; an elder's words carry force not because of formal power, but because he still carries operative weight in local memory. Interests are present, yet past relations, reputation, generational seniority, and local memory still alter how the dispute unfolds.

Local society likewise cannot be reduced to a table of resources. Land, housing, shops, school places, and job opportunities certainly matter, but relations among acquaintances, standing, reputation, dialect, past events, wedding and funeral etiquette, pathways of mutual assistance, and mechanisms of exclusion also arrange people's positions. When someone returns to their hometown for a wedding or funeral, the amount of gift money, seating precedence, who takes the initiative to greet them, who avoids seeing them, and even who brings up a debt from ten years ago may all redefine that person's position. If the class image occupies the center in advance, these details are easily demoted to the surface layer; often, it is precisely these details that determine whether a person can be accepted, can ask for help, and can preserve their dignity.

The same is true of nations, religion, and rites and customs. National discourse may be used by political forces, religion may serve the order of domination, and rites and customs may oppress people; none of this can be denied. But language, migration, memories of war, shared experiences of harm, sacrificial rites, funerals, forms of address, rituals, and taboos also genuinely alter people's identifications, fears, boundaries, and ways of forming alliances. Domination is present, but language, shared memory, rituals, and taboos also concretely alter identification, boundaries, and alliance formation.

Shared memory works in the same way. Why does a group remember a particular migration, a particular conflict, a particular language, a particular festival, a particular boundary? These memories may of course be related to resources and power, but once they enter concrete life, they are no longer mere decoration for resource relations; they materially alter people's closeness and distance, alter trust and fear, and alter who is seen as one of us and who is seen as an outsider.

The class plane formed by class theory displays explanatory power because its procedure of interpretation can rapidly rewrite these complex relations: on seeing a family, it asks how resources are reproduced; on seeing a

locality, it asks how interests are distributed; on seeing religion and rites and customs, it asks what kind of domination they have served; on seeing nations and culture, it asks what economic contradictions they have concealed. These questions have value in themselves, yet the answers have often already been predetermined when the questions are asked. This flattening explanation does not necessarily delete these relations entirely, but it depresses their independent operative weight, stripping them of the standing to govern their own meaning.

III. Turning Nodes into Labels and the Occlusion of Function

Class theory rewrites relations and, in the process of interpretation, also compresses nodes into group labels. When it sees scholars, clans, academies, chambers of commerce, and local organizations, it often asks first: Which class do they belong to? Which class interests do they represent? Are they remnants of an old class? These questions are not entirely without meaning. Scholars may hold cultural qualifications, clans may uphold an order based on seniority and male authority, chambers of commerce may serve local capital, academies may exclude certain people, and local organizations may also keep power in the hands of a few.

But if the analysis stops here, nodes are directly compressed into group labels. Network analysis asks not which label they fall under, but what differences they have taken up, what memories they have preserved, which relations they have connected, which channels they have opened or monopolized, whom they have oppressed, and what they have protected.

A clan is not merely a “landlord clan” or an “old force.” It may preserve genealogies and mediate disputes; it may also arrange sacrificial rites and distribute resources while preserving structures that exclude women or oppress younger generations. In certain periods, it may also take in orphans, the sick, migrants, and people who have lost access to state relief. An academy is not merely a “cultural institution of the scholarly stratum.” It may restrict entry to knowledge, but it may also preserve texts, train people in expression, sustain teacher–student lineages, and connect local prestige with public discussion. A chamber of commerce is not merely a “merchant-class organization.” It may defend commercial interests, but it may also take on and sustain functions involving credit, mutual guarantees, dispute mediation, and local public affairs.

These nodes can of course oppress people, but their oppressive character is not the whole of their structure. The class plane makes oppression, whose interests are served, and group labels visible, yet struggles to show how nodes take up and sustain what passes through them, what functions those nodes perform, and how differences are preserved, filtered, interpreted, and passed on within nodes. By ignoring the concrete mechanisms of nodes, this perspective further produces an occlusion of the concrete channels on which people depend when learning to read and write, expressing themselves, seeking redress, migrating, entering commerce, and participating in local affairs.

Class theory’s flattening explanations also erase channels. Channels for education, expression, law, and migration, and entry points into commerce and politics, are not merely outer shells of class oppression. They have concrete nodes, entry points, rules, those who take up and sustain these functions, and blockages. Whether a person can learn to read and write, whether they can express themselves, whether they can seek redress, whether they can migrate, whether they can enter commercial networks, and whether they can participate in local affairs—all depend on passing through concrete channels. This plane can present oppression and the replacement of groups, but it cannot present channels and the migration of functions. Scholars, academies, clans, chambers of commerce, and local organizations may be oppressive; in different relational fields, they may also take up functions such as literacy, mediation, credit, public expression, local

mutual aid, and privately sustained cultural traditions. Modernization is not simply a matter of replacing old classes with new ones; it requires examining whether these functions have migrated successfully.

If the old academies are abolished, who takes up and sustains literacy, expression, teacher–student lineages, and local public discussion? If clans are broken apart, who takes up and sustains dispute mediation, assistance among kin, care for the elderly, and local memory? If chambers of commerce are eliminated, who takes up and sustains commercial credit, mutual guarantees, industry rules, and local public affairs? If local organizations are uniformly incorporated into a higher level, do channels for expressing local problems, negotiating, and self-correction still exist? These questions cannot be answered by saying that "old classes have been replaced by new classes." What has been replaced is the label attached to a group of people; the functions have not necessarily migrated. Dismantling one entry point does not mean that a new one has already formed; eliminating an old node does not mean that the differences it once took up now have someone or something new to take them up and sustain them. Class theory readily writes social change as the replacement of low-dimensional positions marked out by the class image, so that channels, the right to take up and sustain these functions, and the migration of functions cannot enter into the main judgment.

This makes it necessary to clarify the private sphere and intermediate nodes. The private sphere is the space in which a person, a family, and local society can live, accumulate, judge, pass things down, form associations, and speak without being wholly swallowed by the state, organizations, movements, or ideology. The private sphere is not necessarily warm, nor is it necessarily equal. Families and clans may produce oppression, academies may exclude people, and chambers of commerce may defend the interests of a few; teacher–student lineages may create barriers to entry, and local public expression may also be controlled by structures of prestige. Analyzing the private sphere and intermediate nodes does not mean glorifying them.

The problem is that society cannot consist solely of vertical relations between individuals and the highest organization. Intermediate nodes such as clans, academies, chambers of commerce, teacher–student lineages, and local public expression may oppress people, but they may also preserve the root system of society's self-generation. These intermediate nodes may also preserve memory, train people in expression, or sustain credit arrangements; dispute mediation, the organization of mutual aid, and the maintenance of privately sustained cultural traditions are sometimes also accomplished through them, forming social connections that do not depend entirely on the state and the market. Class theory readily treats all these nodes as outer shells of old classes. Doing so can sometimes reveal real oppression, but it also flattens society's intermediate layer along with it. What is flattened is not only the old forces, but potentially also a society's capacity for self-repair, self-expression, and sustaining its own relations and carrying them forward. The real questions are which functions must be retained, which forms of oppression must be dismantled, which channels need to migrate, and which intermediate nodes need to be transformed—rather than simply compressing all intermediate nodes into class labels.

IV. The Mechanism of Strong Compression and the Unfolding of the Formation Chain

The class plane is not clumsy. It appears clear because class theory has accomplished a strong compression. A complex society contains too many differences: income, occupation, family, region, language, education, legal status, the body, debt, trust, shame, memory, religion, local prestige, and experiences of migration are interwoven. If each were unfolded, society would become a tangle of details difficult to judge. Every theory must compress; without compression, there is no understanding. The problem is not compression itself. Every explanation requires compression; class theory and the interpretive procedures that adopt it mistake the compressed result for society itself and use it to arrange subsequent material.

Class theory compresses complex society onto a single axis. This axis pursues a fixed set of positions: who possesses and who labors, who receives the gains and who bears the costs, who holds a buffer of resources and who has no way out left. This line is powerful: interpretive procedures use it to organize material quickly and deliver clear judgments. Clarity itself brings pleasure. Many relations in reality are mixed: a family may both protect and oppress people; a tradition may both preserve memory and exclude others; the members and organizers of a local community may both provide mutual aid and punish those who do not fit in; a market opportunity may both release capacities and create new vulnerabilities.

Mixed states are difficult to handle. Class theory offers a quicker reading: interpreters who adopt it compress mixed relations into antagonism, multiple differences into a principal contradiction, and uncertain judgments into a definite stance. This is its attraction, but also its danger, because clarity may come from insight or from deletion. Class theory can extract the hard structures of labor, wealth, resources, and risk, and the resulting image presents some of the relations within them. When class theory then organizes all relations back onto the same axis, clarity comes to depend on deletion; what is downplayed is sometimes precisely the relations that make society what it is.

Criticizing the class plane must not lead to the opposite extreme of treating complexity as supreme and assuming that the more complex a theory is, the better. If a theory refuses compression and tries to retain everything, it will ultimately lose its capacity for judgment; society certainly contains countless differences, but not all differences are equally significant for every problem. A model that includes everything looks comprehensive, but may in fact make nothing clear. The error of the class plane does not lie in using compression or remaining simple, because every explanation must be simple enough to use. The real point of disagreement is that a limited model should know that it explains only part of reality, captures certain high-weight differences, and produces an occlusion of others, and therefore needs to be tested against concrete problems and acknowledge its own boundaries.

The basic structure of class theory, however, directly organizes its own simplicity into a complete total image of society. As it captures certain high-weight differences, it immediately fixes them in the highest position forever, demanding that all reality must ultimately return to this scale and relegating other differences to appearances, outer shells, or disguises. This certainly allows it to incorporate more phenomena quickly into an established image, but in this self-enclosure it loses the capacity to be corrected by real consequences. It is precisely through this plane that class theory trains people to view society in a low-dimensional way, so that explanation is no longer merely a tool for looking at society, but instead permits society to appear only in the form prescribed by the class image.

The class plane is not formed by a single act of naming. Interpreters first extract differences such as labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, exit costs, and domination from existing relations; extraction itself is not fabrication, because these differences are already at work in concrete consequences. Next, interpretive procedures assign a higher explanatory standing to one set of these differences, making them the clues sought first when reading the material. This step may still yield valid judgments, because certain relational fields do indeed make these differences especially weighty.

The key lies in connection. The extracted differences originally operate through different relational chains: income connects to housing, care, and waiting; property connects to ways out, qualifications, and the bearing of risk; labor relations connect to time arrangements, possibilities of exit, and domination. Class theory gives priority to connecting these different chains into a single main line. Connection makes scattered material readable, while also changing the relative positions of the materials; relations that could originally alter a judgment on their own begin to be required first to explain how they return to this main line.

Compression follows. Compression does not delete the material entirely, but reduces multiple relations capable of changing the conclusion to an image with fewer dimensions. Family, locality, shared memory, qualifications, the body, and channels still appear, but they are positioned in advance as background, transmission mechanisms, or subordinate outcomes. Projection makes positions at different nodes and in different relational fields appear comparable along the same axis; naming then calls this set of results, which has undergone extraction, weight assignment, connection, compression, and projection, "class." The name is thus easily mistaken for an entity that has long existed beneath the surface of society.

This formation chain must always return to the actors. It is not the class plane that extracts materials on its own, nor the class image that subsumes other explanations on its own; it is class theory, the interpreters who adopt it, organizations, and institutional procedures that select materials, arrange weights, establish connections, and use names. These actions may be dispersed across textbooks, slogans, research, organizational language, and institutional classifications, yet they point toward the same result: granting an already compressed line of explanation the standing to adjudicate other differences in advance.

V. Causal Distortion, Objects of Action, and Reifying Inversion

The formation process changes the point of entry into the problem. If an explanation first treats the class image as a total image, materials will be selected from the outset according to whether they can substantiate the predetermined main axis: wages, possession, labor, and risk are readily recognized as fundamental materials; kinship responsibilities, local recognition, memory, qualifications, care, and intermediary organizations are often retained only when they can supplement the main line. The selection and rejection of materials affect not only the length of an article but also causal judgments. Relational chains that needed further questioning are shortened, nodes that might have brought about a turning point are treated as surface phenomena, and channels that had to be checked are rewritten as incidental results of predetermined positions.

Flattening also changes the objects of subsequent action. If a node is first compressed into a group label, dealing with it can easily become nothing more than replacing, abolishing, or classifying it, without further asking what it has borne, what it has blocked, what it has preserved, or whom it has harmed. If a channel is first deemed the outer shell of an old image, then who will take up and sustain literacy, expression, mutual aid, credit, mediation, and local public discussion after that channel is dismantled ceases to be a question that must be answered. The point here is not to defend old nodes, but to refuse to let labels bypass the examination of functions, relations, and consequences.

Likewise, the private sphere is not a pure zone detached from social relations. Families, teacher–student lineages, local life, and intermediary organizations may all preserve oppression, exclusion, and inequality; they may also give people ties, memories, and room for judgment that are not wholly dictated by the highest organization or the market. When class theory assigns these spaces in advance to a single main axis, it may grasp the real resources and domination within them, but it may also fail to see how they take on responsibilities, sustain expression, or provide paths toward repair. Judgment should retain this two-sidedness rather than naturalize the private sphere or uniformly treat it as a disguise.

The class plane is readily treated as social structure partly because class theory grasps real pressures, and partly because the compressed image is easy to name, disseminate, and institutionalize. Once a name stabilizes, interpreters can easily treat it as the source of the materials, forgetting that it was originally the result of organizing some of those materials. Thus, "class" is misrepresented as a subject that determines relations, action, and history on its own, rather than as a compressed explanatory image. Reconstructing the

formation chain means dismantling this inversion: concrete differences and their relational consequences come first, followed only then by extraction, weight assignment, connection, compression, projection, and naming; the final name must not be projected backward as what society fundamentally is from the outset.

Class theory therefore cannot be treated as an ordinary limited explanation, with the problem attributed to occasional extensions of its use later on. A limited explanation acknowledges the range of materials it draws on and allows materials it has not addressed to force adjustments in judgment through concrete consequences. By contrast, the total-image structure inherent in class theory organizes differences extracted within a limited scope into a predetermined scale of adjudication: other materials are recognized as having explanatory value only when translated back onto this scale. Both may use compression. The difference lies not in whether compression occurs, but in whether compression still accepts correction by boundaries, consequences, and relations that have not been subsumed.

VI. Dismantling the Plane, Calibrating the Order, and Comparison within a Limited Scope

Dismantling does not mean refusing to judge, nor does it mean laying out every difference as equally important. This chapter does not deny that class theory captures real differences; wages, employment, debt, rent, educational opportunities, medical risks, domination over labor, and exit costs cannot bypass this set of differences. Interpreters who adopt class theory can indeed extract a set of real differentiating units. Class theory's limited explanatory power comes precisely from concrete differentiating units such as labor, wages, employment, property, debt, resource buffers, risk-bearing, and relations of domination, and from the processes of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression applied to them. But showing that class theory captures a set of real differentiating units does not mean treating the class image as what society fundamentally is, much less allowing the class image to monopolize society.

Dismantling the class image requires returning the already named image to its formation process, reducing it back to concrete differentiating units, and asking anew whether a given difference gains weight, and within which relations and concrete relational fields, how it connects, what consequences it produces, through which channels it enters into consequences, and which materials have been downweighted yet are sufficient to change the judgment. Interpreters must not let this image predetermine the meaning of all relations, nor demand that all other differences become subordinate to the class image. The problem with class theory is not that it sees wages, labor, employment, property, debt, risk, and relations of domination, but that its structure of total-image subsumption does not allow society to extend beyond the class plane.

Nor does this book replace the class axis with another main axis; replacing class with the state, the market, culture, the nation, the family, or institutions merely substitutes one plane for another. What needs to change is the way questions are asked: in a concrete problem, which limited explanations can explain the current consequences? What real differences has class theory extracted? In forming the class image, what has the interpretive procedure that adopts it downweighted, and what standing to explain has it revoked?

It is the class image that needs to be dismantled, not remade into an ordinary limited explanation open to calibration. Only then can the extracted real differentiating units—labor, wages, property, debt, housing, risk, and so on—together with their relational consequences reenter concrete explanations that have boundaries and are open to calibration. Only by dismantling the class image back into concrete differences and concrete relations can downweighted materials reenter judgment. Only when interpreters no longer treat the class plane as society itself can concrete explanations accept calibration by consequences, counterexamples, and changes in relations.

The formation of the class plane involves an inversion of explanatory order: are differences first repeatedly extracted from events, or does the image first prescribe which differences should be seen in those events? Wages, debt, property, or housing may gain weight together in different events. This recurrence can support comparisons of limited scope between concrete situations, but it cannot, in reverse, prove that a class plane exists prior to events. The class plane's structure of subsumption is not an occasional overstepping of bounds in history. Its structural criterion is this: only when the interpretive procedure uses the image to predetermine the positions of other differences, and counterexamples can only be rewritten as supporting evidence subordinate to the image, does the structure of subsumption truly take shape.

Turning differences into an image also changes their temporal order. Family care, local interactions, medical histories, and educational qualifications sometimes operate before economic pressures arise, and sometimes are pushed to the fore only after unpaid wages, unemployment, or debt. If the class image organizes every temporal sequence into the same kind of reproduction or relation of interests, it will overlook when differences emerge, who preserves them, and which node brings them into consequences. Once time is flattened, the theory appears more orderly but actually loses its power to explain changes in events.

The key to dismantling the class image is to place compressed concrete differences back into relational fields, nodes, and relational chains, thereby preserving the capacity for comparison within a limited scope. People can compare differences in wage payment deadlines, evidence, housing pressures, and the capacity to wait between two cases of unpaid wages; they can compare why two families with the same income obtain different school admission outcomes; they can also compare the consequences of the same policy in different places. These comparisons focus on the unfolding of concrete relations. They are by no means a return of the class plane, much less an indication that class theory, with its structure of subsumption, can be patched into a suitable limited model.

When new materials enter judgment, whether the plane can give way is an important clue for identifying Model C. If new materials show that support provided by families, national memory, or legal qualifications have changed the original causal path, limited analysis should supplement or narrow its conclusions; if users can only say that these materials are actually still expressions of class position, and use this claim to refuse revision, the image has already digested the counterexamples. The problem with the plane is not that it is drawn simply, but whether it still allows reality to change the image anew.

Chapter 3. The Temptation of a Single Axis: How an Effective Concept Is Elevated into a Presupposed Main Line

I. The Structural Difference Between Class Theory and Other Presupposed Axes

Class theory seizes on wages, labor, property, debt, housing, risk, and exit costs. These differences are real, and they are often weighty. It does touch reality, yet from the outset it organizes the differences extracted within a limited scope into a total class image and requires other relations to be measured against that image. Class theory does not first exist as an ordinary limited explanation and only occasionally expand later; its capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope is from the beginning situated within a structure of total-image subsumption. Concrete explanations formed around state institutions, market exchange, national communities, cultural relations, and family relations can provide limited accounts within bounded questions. These broad concepts do not become the highest main line on their own. A corresponding presupposed axis forms only when interpreters, organizations, or institutional procedures elevate one of them in advance above all questions. Concepts are not actors; it is the people and procedures that use concepts that extract, assign weight to, connect, translate, and adjudicate materials.

Accordingly, this chapter does not line up class theory and other concepts as a series of "models that later overstepped their bounds." What is distinctive about class theory is that total-image subsumption is its basic structure; other concepts, by contrast, may be turned by their users into corresponding subsumptive explanatory constructions. Class theory lowers the standing of other differences; interpretive procedures that adopt these presupposed axes do the same, but the structural sources of the two must not be conflated. The class image cannot be remade into a safe limited explanation simply by restricting its scope. What can re-enter concrete analysis are differences such as wages, labor, property, debt, housing, risk, and exit costs, together with the consequences they produce in different relations. Renaming these differences as a safe form of class theory still treats the result as an acting subject. The differences extracted by class theory can be tested case by case: Are wages overdue? Is housing unstable? Is a debt deadline approaching? Has protection been interrupted? On whom does the cost of exit fall?

These questions have weight in their own right. Only when they are returned to concrete relations can we distinguish which consequences are produced by labor relations and which are also shaped by address, care, institutional eligibility, and support available through local relations. Therefore, the limited explanatory capacity formed by real differentiating units and by the processes through which they are extracted, assigned weight, connected, and compressed cannot exonerate the total-image structure of class theory. Class theory can extract real differences such as labor, wages, and property, yet it also presses housing, debt, medical history, household registration, family responsibilities, and support available through local relations—matters that could have been questioned separately—into one and the same position. Concrete differences that have been extracted can enter a bounded explanation; the class image cannot be remade into a safe ordinary limited model. When class theory gathers differences into a class image, the image appears especially powerful because the relations extracted are genuinely weighty.

This power cannot grant the image ontological status. Any concrete judgment involving wages, labor, property, debt, or risk must still make clear in what relations it becomes weighty, and which other differences present at the same time alter the outcome. Distinguishing class theory from other presupposed axes is not a

preemptive absolution of those other concepts. The state, the market, the nation, culture, and the family can all be elevated into subsumptive images; what cannot be done is to use “they do this too” to flatten the inherent structure by which class theory itself moves from distinction extraction to a total image. If class theory is described as something that can become safe again once its scope is restricted, the class image is once more given a place of adjudication. What needs to be restricted is not the image, but the differences, relations, and consequences extracted by each concrete explanation.

II. Formation Procedures, Working Lines, and Temporary Centers

A presupposed axis does not appear out of nowhere. Certain differences first become connected to consequences within a relational field, and interpreters therefore give them priority when selecting material. Organizations and institutional procedures then fix weights and reconnect the material, arranging relations that could originally have been tested side by side into a hierarchy of primary and subordinate. Family, locality, institutions, the body, language, memory, and faith could each originally have connected to consequences. Once the presupposed axis has formed, the interpretive procedure need not deny them; it translates them into appendages of the main axis. This procedure calls counterexamples exceptions, withdraws standing from other explanations, and enables the image to spread rapidly, even issuing judgments before all the material is in. Every action in this formation chain has an actor: interpreters select material, organizations fix weights, naming processes arrange relations, and institutional procedures preserve and transmit judgments. It cannot be said that the state, the market, or the family compressed society by itself.

Relevance within a limited scope by itself does not entail uniqueness. Between the fact that a given difference really becomes weighty and the claim that it should override all differences lie procedures of selection, weight assignment, connection, naming, and transmission. These procedures can be questioned, and material can overturn them. Once a presupposed axis is complete, the order of the material is rewritten as well. Relations that should originally have been questioned are treated as examples proving the main line; counterexamples that could change the judgment are required to explain themselves. Explanation is thus no longer a search within the material for the relations that are more weighty; it becomes an arrangement, under the main line, of where every item of material is to be placed.

This arrangement also changes what questions people can ask. When the axis comes first, the question often becomes how to prove it; when the material comes first, the question is which relations have already entered into consequences and which have not yet connected. On the surface, both forms are analysis, but in practice their attitudes toward counterexamples and what remains unknown are entirely different. Once organizations and institutional procedures fix a particular axis, it is written into tables, slogans, organizational language, and everyday judgments. People begin to use this classification to decide which materials matter, which suffering is merely incidental, and which responsibilities can be omitted. These acts of preservation and transmission make the presupposed axis more than a viewpoint: they turn it into a procedure that repeatedly arranges the questions. Every step in forming a presupposed axis can be interrupted: bring in omitted material, recheck weights, ask whether the relations are truly connected, and preserve the standing of counterexamples to explain.

These efforts do not guarantee permanent correctness, but they prevent an explanation from declaring itself complete before it has begun. Interpretive procedures that adopt a presupposed axis also change how experiences not absorbed by the main line are understood. Such experiences are often judged unimportant, immature, or temporary deviations. Preserving their standing does not require treating all material as equally weighty; it prevents weights from being fixed before the evidence arrives. If an interpreter is to assign a

higher weight to a given main line, the process by which that weight was acquired must be laid bare: Which consequences support the judgment? Which relations were omitted? And who preserved this selection of material as common sense? These questions do not abolish the main line, but they prevent it from impersonating an answer before it has been explained.

Analysis still needs a main line. Without distinctions between primary and subordinate matters, people cannot judge what in an event first connects to consequences, nor can they track how relations change a person's position. Compression is not an error; a limited explanation is not an error either. The difference lies in where the main line comes from. If it emerges from a concrete relational field, consequences that have already appeared, and traceable relations, it must accept correction by new material and counterexamples. An interpretive procedure that adopts a presupposed axis, by contrast, decides the answer before analysis and then stuffs the material into predetermined positions.

A temporarily weightier line may appear in a child's school admission, exchanges surrounding weddings and funerals, or the fear of resigning. But no line can acquire complete explanatory authority before the question has unfolded, nor can it acquire standing through the fame of a concept. No judgment can trace every relation at once. The main line therefore becomes a necessary working line whose function is to narrow the range that must be questioned immediately, not to close the other entrances. Since it is a working line under a limited field of vision, it must answer why this relation is taking effect first at this moment rather than another, while leaving room to look back and check: Could omitted material change the consequences? Could another node invalidate the original weight? When conditions change, where must the judgment be withdrawn?

Acknowledging this limitation and making the main line retractable does not make a judgment weak, still less does it allow the line to be declared society's hidden skeleton. Sometimes a main line appears clear at the beginning of an event but later has to yield to new material; when material genuinely changes the judgment, the analysis adjusts with it. It is refusing this movement that makes a working line degenerate into a preset scale. Once a main line appears, it is therefore necessary to distinguish whether it is explaining consequences or merely naming them. Explaining consequences can yield testable judgments; naming them only pastes a known name back onto the material. The more convenient a main line is, the more this distinction is needed. The main line must serve the question, not make the question serve the main line. Once the order is reversed, analysis may look faster, but in reality it is merely repeating an existing verdict.

A presupposed axis sometimes forms quickly and sometimes through long repetition. In a single event, a difference may temporarily occupy the center because a deadline is approaching, resources are concentrated, or enforcement is coercive. Only after repeated events, when interpreters transplant that temporary center into every question, does the axis change from a convenience within an event into a preset arrangement. To judge this change, one must compare whether the difference retains the same weight in different relational fields, rather than looking only at whether it is conspicuous in one case. The same person may be held by different relations at different times: during wage arrears, wages and payment records come first; when a child enters school, address and documentary requirements come first; after illness, the body and care responsibilities may come first. If an axis analysis preserves only the entry point of the first question, it will treat later new material as deviation. A genuinely limited judgment must be able to explain when the main line is valid, when it recedes into the background, and which relations re-enter into consequences.

Eliminating a presupposed axis does not mean rejecting long-term structures. Stable institutional, community, family, and market relations may recur across events; they must still be explained through carriers, materials, and intermediary pathways, and compared across different periods and against counterexamples. Long-term

continuity requires more complete tracing of relations; it does not grant any name the right to rank every event in advance.

III. The State Axis: Institutional Thresholds and the Administrative Plane

In certain areas and specific school-admission years, when families from elsewhere apply to enroll their children, they may be required to submit some combination of household-registration or residence documents, rental or property documents, social-insurance or employment documents, application materials, and student-status materials, and may be affected by local quota and allocation rules; the specific items vary by area, year, and admission category. Together with rental deadlines, work arrangements, family care, and the means of obtaining documents, these institutional differences alter whether a family can get through the procedure. The administrative plane forms when an interpretive procedure compresses all consequences into "the will of the state." Institutional thresholds can still be seen, but they are used to replace other relations: whether a landlord cooperates, whether relatives can provide care, whether work hours can be adjusted, and whether parents can obtain information are all demoted to background. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

The state is neither the sole cause nor an abstract actor that commands reality. Concrete institutions, service windows, records, quotas, and implementation arrangements enter into consequences along different relations. The consequences of the same set of administrative documents may also differ from one family to another: one person may be blocked by difficulties in obtaining proof, another by unstable housing, and another by being unable to arrange care and work at the same time.

When all these different consequences are reduced to a single abstract will, the points at which change is actually possible disappear. Administrative procedures appear to deal only with materials, but in practice they also arrange waiting, travel back and forth, qualifications, and visibility. Families from elsewhere face a chain of concrete thresholds: who can issue proof, preserve records, and complete documents within the deadline, and who loses options because residence and work are unstable. The question of school admission cannot stop at administrative criticism; when the means of obtaining documents, residential stability, working hours, and care arrangements are interconnected, changing one item may not be enough.

Only by tracing how these elements connect can we know which link causes a family to lose its options, rather than attributing every difficulty to an abstract name. Interpreters who adopt a state axis also readily make the direction of reform falsely simple, as if changing one institutional rule would automatically change every consequence. Institutional adjustment may be necessary, but one must still ask whether service windows, document preservation, support available through local relations, family time, and working conditions have changed together; otherwise, the threshold has merely moved to another place.

In the school-admission relational field, the high weight of institutional materials does not deny the roles of local familiarity, sources of information, and family arrangements. Precisely because these relations can change the consequences of the same institutional threshold, an administrative explanation cannot write itself as the whole explanation. Criticism of administrative thresholds must therefore be concrete: which documents, which window, what deadline, and whose work arrangements are they connected to? Only then will institutional pressure not be replaced by an abstract state.

IV. The Market Axis: Monetary Pressure and the Transactional Plane

Cash gifts exchanged at weddings and funerals involve amounts, income, and burdens, so the market axis has something real to grasp. But a cash gift is connected not only to costs and returns; it is also connected to who once attended, who once failed to attend, degrees of closeness and distance, local reputation, dignity, and future mutual aid. If interpreters convert every exchange into a transaction, they grant the transactional plane complete explanatory authority. This image can present the monetary burden, but it cannot replace relational memory and recognition; translating the latter wholesale into costs does not make them disappear.

When interpreters designate monetary pressure in advance as the highest scale, the market axis forms, and the remaining consequences are arranged as incidental psychology or culture. Money is not false, and costs are not irrelevant. The problem is only that once cost is designated as the final scale in advance, memory, recognition, and mutual aid within relations can appear only as accessories, and originally different consequences are flattened. The language of transactions easily makes relations look clean, because amounts can be calculated and burdens compared.

Cash-gift relations, however, also preserve past exchanges and future expectations; they may create pressure, but they may also connect to support in times of difficulty. Looking only at price makes these different directions of relation lose their names at the same time. An interpretive procedure that adopts the market axis will also judge relations that people are unwilling to put a price on as unimportant. Dignity, memory, and mutual aid within cash-gift exchanges may of course conflict with burdens, but they cannot therefore be declared illusions. In later exchanges they may still change who can ask for help, who is trusted, and who bears shame.

When interpreters select material only along the market axis, they readily overlook that monetary relations do not occur only at the moment of payment. Who can postpone payment, who can borrow, who receives help because of a reputation, and who loses the ability to refuse because of an owed favor all carry price into longer relations. The memory, dignity, and mutual aid within cash-gift exchanges enter consequences through subsequent exchanges; the payment relation is thereby extended into a relation of continuing support and obligations. Cash gifts at weddings and funerals also remind us that relations are not the opposite of cost.

Costs can create pressure, and relations can create pressure; the two may also reinforce each other within the same exchange. Elevating either one into the sole scale only makes the other difficult to examine. Judging market pressure likewise requires tracing concrete payments and the support and obligations carried forward through relations: who can refuse, who must maintain the exchange, and who loses subsequent options because of one expense? These questions are closer to consequences than the name of a transaction.

V. The National and Cultural Axes: Memory, Responsibility, and the Plane of Identity

A national community may be formed through long-term interaction, multiple layers of relaying, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared experiences of harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. The name of a nation may be compressed or put to use, but a real national community cannot therefore be reduced to a bloodline myth, a state registration, subjective imagining, a cultural label, or a class occlusion. Conflicts do involve language, memory, and harm, as well as institutions, resources, local relations, and individual experience. If interpreters designate nation or culture in advance as the highest scale for every conflict, they compress complex relations into a plane of identity; what is criticized is this procedure, not the reality of community. Concrete explanations formed around cultural relations can show how rites and customs, expectations, shame, and long-term evaluation enter action, but they cannot deliver the final judgment on every concrete consequence.

A national community is even less synonymous with a “plane of identity.” National or cultural clues may be highly weighty in some questions, especially when language, experiences of boundaries, and shared responsibility directly change action. But this weight must be demonstrated by concrete relations; an identity name cannot guarantee it in advance. A community does not disappear because it contains internal differences. Long-term interaction can preserve language, rites and customs, protection, responsibility, and experiences of boundaries, and can also lead people to respond differently to harm and commitment.

Compressing all this into cultural identity cannot explain the source of shared responsibility, nor can it show how institutions and resources intervene. A bounded explanation of nation and culture can show when shared memory enters a conflict and can ask who is using the name and who bears the consequences. Presetting them as the sole main axis instead reduces a real community to a label that can be invoked at will, obscuring both interaction and responsibility. Protecting nation and culture does not mean exempting them from examination. A community may take up protection and responsibility, but the community may also be exploited through names, organizations, or propaganda.

Distinguishing these two things is precisely what prevents criticism of such use from becoming an erasure of the community itself. If the national or cultural main line does not accept the limits of the material, it will often read every difference as a question of friend and foe or identity. This reading may look firm, but in practice it removes the community’s internal responsibilities, local differences, and institutional conditions from what can be said. The reality of a community does not provide an all-purpose answer. It only means that long-term interaction and responsibility can genuinely enter into consequences; in each case, they must still be examined together with institutions, resources, and local relations.

VI. The Family Axis: Everyday Relations and the Psychological Plane

When a person is afraid to resign, family relations, shame, a sense of security, parental expectations, and care responsibilities may genuinely influence their actions. An explanation that takes the family as its axis can present part of the inner relations, but it cannot psychologize rent, debt, industry cycles, medical protection, and the pressure of supporting the elderly. When interpreters first describe every difficulty as family structure or psychological dependence, the procedure forms a psychological plane and pushes labor institutions, housing costs, and relations that provide protection into the background. Once the interpreter lets the family concept deliver the final judgment on every relation, the explanation has already gone beyond acknowledging family relations.

The family should neither be denied nor naturalized or romanticized. It can carry responsibility, harm, memory, and a sense of security, while intersecting with institutions, work, and resource conditions. Family influence likewise does not cancel external conditions. Whether a person can change jobs, whether protection can continue, and whether rent rises all return to family relations; calling them purely internal problems merely locks different pressures inside one psychological name. The force of family relations also requires concrete tracing.

Whether parents can help, who bears care, and how shame limits requests for help can all change a person's action space; but they never occur alone. Rent, debt, medical care, and fluctuations in an industry can in turn rewrite what the family can bear. An explanation that takes the family as its axis often seems persuasive because it is close to everyday life. Precisely for that reason, it is more important to distinguish responsibilities that have actually arisen within the family from the interpreter's practice of sending every external pressure back into the family. The former can help us understand action; the latter merely occludes how institutions and resources limit choice.

Within family relations, support and constraints may exist at the same time. Some people gain care and a way out through the family, while others bear heavier responsibilities because of the same relation. This difference cannot be decided in advance by the name "family"; one must see how resources, time, the body, institutional eligibility, and emotional demands intertwine. Family questions should likewise not be obscured by an overall characterization of the family as either warm or oppressive. Who can provide care, who can exit, and who bears responsibility for debt and medical care often determine action more directly than an abstract image of the family. Explaining these relations clearly is the only way both to avoid denying the family and to prevent the family from subsuming other causes. Family clues can explain why some people stay, remain silent, or cannot exit, but they cannot remove the need to ask about rent, debt, protection, and work relations.

VII. Comparison and Concrete Judgment After Removing Presupposed Axes

Replacing class with the state, the state with the market, or the market with nation, culture, or family does not change the method of a presupposed axis. These concepts have different contents and can grasp different relations; what they share is that the interpretive procedures using them elevate one line in advance as the highest axis. Choosing another total image is not a way out. As long as other differences must first prove that they serve the main axis and counterexamples are downgraded in advance, the structure of subsumption remains. This does not mean that all concepts are alike. Class theory grasps real differentiating units such as wages, labor, and property; its limited explanatory capacity comes from these real differences and from the operations performed on them, but total-image subsumption is inherent in its structure; class theory cannot be remade into an ordinary limited model that becomes safe merely by restricting its scope. Concrete explanations formed around the state, market, nation, culture, and family, by contrast, can provide limited accounts within bounded questions. What must be taken apart are the procedures of presupposition and subsumption.

Interpreters are easily attracted to a presupposed axis precisely because this procedure quickly supplies a position, a distinction between friend and foe, and a verdict. Speed does not prove completeness. If an explanation no longer waits for material or deals with counterexamples, it has merely exempted itself from the duty of accepting correction; its explanatory power has not increased. Changing the name does not change this shortcut to a verdict; it only changes the answer. Class, state, market, nation, culture, and family are not the same concept, nor should they cancel one another. What must truly be rejected is granting any name the power to adjudicate before the material. Different main axes need not simply replace one another. In a

concrete event, institutions, prices, memory, family, and local relations can become weighty at the same time, and can also constrain one another. If one highest line is selected first, that mutual constraint is mistaken for disorder; only by tracing relations can we know how they enter consequences together.

Removing a presupposed axis does not make analysis lose direction; it forces the direction to explain itself. If a relation is weightier at this moment, material must support it, and one must trace the nodes that make it weighty; when the material and nodes change, the original judgment should change with them. Merely replacing the presupposed axis changes only which material is seen first; it does not change the adjudicative procedure. What needs to change is the adjudicative procedure itself: a main line cannot acquire standing before the relational field, nor can other relations be declared subordinate in advance. The sense of completeness supplied by a presupposed axis may be convenient, but rejecting it keeps relations not yet heard in a position where they can be tested.

A main line may appear, but it cannot be preset. Judgment must always face concrete tests: which differences truly connect to consequences, which become weighty in the current relational field, which relations change a person's actual position, and which counterexamples are sufficient to force revision. If a line can absorb only material that supports it while calling other consequences noise, it has already left concrete analysis. A bounded main line does not require all material to speak with one voice; it allows different relations to coexist and allows a line that was originally weightier to become lighter when new material arrives. This adjustment to counterexamples and new material is precisely taking responsibility for consequences. Comparison and correction are not abandonment of judgment; they free judgment from dependence on a line that is always right and prevent a limited field of vision from masquerading as the whole field.

A limited explanation can identify a relation that is weightier, but it must state its boundaries and cannot first call other relations outer shells. This means that the boundary of the main line must be stated clearly: which stretch of relation it handles, which questions it does not handle, what material it depends on, and what counterexample would force it to change. These limits prevent a limited explanation from being elevated into the whole explanation. Once a main line can be corrected, it need not fear the existence of other explanations; different explanations can thereby be compared according to what each has extracted, what it has overlooked, and on which consequences it has greater force. Only when one line is first elevated into the whole do other explanations become enemies or noise.

If a main line emerges from consequences, it need not promise to remain valid forever. It can withdraw when a stretch of relation ends, or be rewritten when a new node appears. A main line that can be compared is a bounded main line: it does not fear another explanation pointing out omissions, nor material forcing it to contract. This mutability is what prevents the image from hardening, and is the condition that allows a limited explanation to retain its boundaries.

Removing a presupposed axis does not invalidate concrete judgment. For a child's school admission, one must trace how household registration, social insurance, rental registration, quotas, care, and working hours connect; wedding and funeral cash gifts involve income, burdens, memory, closeness and distance, and future mutual aid; fear of resigning requires examining how rent, debt, industry cycles, medical protection, old-age support for parents, and shame enter action. Social complexity cannot be an excuse for refusing judgment. Judgment must instead make clear what it has extracted, which differences it has assigned weight, through which relations they enter consequences, and what material would overturn the original arrangement. This does not scatter every event into fragments; it returns concrete relations to a testable position. Concrete judgment does not mean listing items one by one. Tracing differences and their connections is meant to find what can change consequences and what is merely a substitute for a name; it can still reach clear conclusions,

but it does not hand the conclusion in advance to a broad concept. The three cases do not point to an all-purpose answer; they require interpreters to trace separately how institutional eligibility, relational exchanges, and pressures on action connect.

Removing a presupposed axis requires interpreters to acknowledge that adjudication has costs. Compressing a question into a single cause too early makes nodes that could have been changed invisible; pulling relations apart is precisely how one avoids substituting a convenient answer for actual responsibility and consequences. The common requirement is simply that a broad concept must not decide their outcome before tracing begins. Conclusions may differ, and the weightier differences may differ as well. Concrete judgment must ultimately land where action is possible: which materials need to be added, which node can be changed, which relation needs to be taken up and sustained, and which responsibilities can no longer be occluded by a name.

This requires an explanation to take responsibility for the consequences it identifies; it does not reduce theory to administrative advice. After removing the presupposed axis, judgment can remain very sharp. It can point out how a particular institution traps people, how a debt relation tightens choice, or how a relation transfers risk; it simply cannot smuggle these definite judgments into a single total name that has already adjudicated every question. The responsibility of judgment lies here: explain why these differences are weightier at this moment, rather than mistaking greater weight for exclusivity.

VIII. Society Is a Differentiation Network

Society cannot be adjudicated by a presupposed axis, nor can the state, market, nation, culture, and family simply be placed side by side and added together. That would merely replace one single image with a rough list. Judgment must return to concrete differences that can change positions, relations, and the consequences of action, and to the processes through which they connect. Society is a differentiation network: differences are extracted, assigned weight, connected, and transmitted within concrete relations, and consequences take shape through these processes. This judgment is not another highest image that subsumes every explanation. When analysis unfolds from it, every explanatory line must state what it has extracted, what it has downplayed, and when material should rewrite it. If an explanatory line cannot state its boundaries, it readily treats the part it sees as the whole. Returning to concrete differences rejects concepts passing judgment on society before the material.

To speak of a differentiation network is not to rename everything a network, still less to substitute a new name for the old total image. Analysis must still return to how differences are extracted, in which relations they become weighty, and how they change positions and action. Precisely because there is no presupposed axis, every proposed main line must accept comparison, counterexamples, and correction. Concrete differences do not by themselves constitute a completed total image. They are extracted and change positions only within events, nodes, and relations. Starting from this, one can make forceful judgments while preserving an opening through which those judgments can be corrected; that is why judgment remains possible after rejecting presupposed axes.

Returning from a presupposed axis to concrete differences does not require starting from zero every time. Existing concepts can provide an entry point, and known relations may temporarily be weightier; but an entry point cannot close off further inquiry, and temporary weight cannot become permanent supremacy. Social analysis must preserve a place for material to re-enter. The process by which concrete differences connect does not automatically provide an eternal main line. It requires interpreters continually to explain their selection of material and their boundaries, and requires readers to be able to point out relations that have been downplayed. This mutual correction is what keeps judgment within social consequences.

To develop judgment through the social differentiation network, one cannot use complexity as an excuse. Analysis must still question relations, positions, and consequences within complexity, and refuse to let any preset name replace this work. Returning to concrete differences does not break society into mutually unrelated fragments. Differences affect one another within relations and transmit consequences to new positions; what must be rejected is only the practice of compressing these connections in advance into a single main axis.

Chapter 4. Society Is Not a Combination of a Few Grand Concepts: From a Platter of Concepts to Differentiating Units

I. How a Platter of Concepts Occludes Consequences

A single governing axis cannot be presupposed for society. The clues supplied by class theory come from the real differences it extracts, but that does not make the class image a safe, ordinary, limited model; the concepts of the state, the market, the nation, culture, and the family may all provide important clues in particular questions. When any one concept is placed in advance at the highest level of explanation, other differences are easily translated into its appendages, and complex relations are flattened into a single plane.

After rejecting a single axis, people often retreat to "the joint action of multiple factors": society has the state, the market, culture, the nation, and the family in addition to class. It is not necessarily wrong to acknowledge that several factors may operate together, but the formulation easily stops at a parallel list of concepts; the concepts have multiplied, while the formation of consequences still has not been explained more precisely. "They are all relevant" at most points to several directions. It does not say who extracts the concrete differences, how they acquire greater operative weight, which qualification or restriction they connect to, or which differences, though present, never enter the result at hand.

A child's school admission may involve institutional thresholds, income, the ability to rent housing, the ability to take time off, information channels, and the ability to pay at the same time. Wedding and funeral cash gifts may likewise involve amounts, reciprocal exchanges, local evaluation, and mutual aid; a workplace injury may involve labor relations, evidence, procedure, and waiting. If these questions are merely distributed into drawers labeled "the state," "the market," "culture," and "the family," analysis has not yet begun to track how the consequence is formed. Listing concepts completes only a classification; the consequence still has to be traced through concrete relations. A single axis sends all material toward one answer; a platter of concepts leaves several answers, but still sorts the material into pre-given names first. The former compresses differences into one line, the latter packages differences into several grand terms. Both can miss the steps that actually change the consequence: whether material can be obtained, whether a qualification can be recognized, whether waiting can be endured, whether a relation can continue, and who ultimately bears responsibility.

A platter of concepts appears prudent because it acknowledges that a matter has more than one side. But acknowledging several sides does not yet explain how those sides meet. If income, household registration, local reputation, care responsibility, and institutional procedure are merely named one after another, they remain like unrelated blocks. What must actually be made clear is which condition enables another condition to take effect, and which restriction prevents an existing resource from becoming a choice. This parallel listing also easily produces a false sense of balance. Once every grand term has been mentioned, people assume that the material has been treated fairly; in fact, some relations remain in the background, and some differences are named without anyone asking how they operate. Fairness in parallel listing cannot replace fairness toward the chain of consequences.

Listing concepts side by side has another problem: it easily mixes things from different levels. Household registration is a form of institutional eligibility; whether a landlord cooperates is a concrete relation; taking

time off is a time condition; a shortage of places is a distributional restriction. They may all appear in a school-admission problem, but they do not acquire the same position merely because they are all called “state factors.” If analysis does not separate the levels, it cannot know whether to ask about the institutional text, the practice at the service window, support provided by private actors, or family time. Grand terms also often describe an ongoing process as a static background. When people say that an institution is present, they still have to ask how it enters the result through registration, verification, interpretation, supplementary documents, and deadlines; when they say that the family is present, they still have to ask how care, economic dependence, and emotional demands change the choices a person can make. Only by returning the background to the process can concepts stop occluding where the consequence actually passes through. A concept can temporarily focus analysis when it is used as an entry point; when it is used to close the question, it prevents further inquiry. The former says, “Let us first see how the administrative procedure intervenes”; the latter says, “This is a state problem,” and stops there. The difference is not whether a concept is used, but whether the concept leaves an exit back to the material.

II. Grand Concepts as High-Level Compression Labels and Indexes

“The state,” “the market,” “culture,” “the family,” and “the class image” are high-level compressed names for many concrete differences and relations. Grand concepts are not useless. They can provide direction and an entry point, allowing an outline to become visible first. Saying “the state” can gather together and direct attention to law, administration, household registration, registration systems, public finance, schools, borders, service windows, and enforcement; saying “the market” can gather together and direct attention to prices, wages, credit, rent, transactions, various opportunities including employment opportunities, risk, and ability to pay; saying “culture” and “the family” can likewise bring rites and customs, social face, habits, care, dependence, debt, inheritance, and emotional relations into view. Such an outline keeps discussion from losing all direction.

The problem is that an entry point cannot replace an analysis of consequences, and compression also occludes internal differences. Saying “the state” does not explain whether household registration, school places, registration with the subdistrict administration, administrative procedure, legal text, an explanation at the service window, or fiscal allocation is creating the restriction; household registration and school places are not the same kind of threshold. Saying “the market” likewise does not say which of housing prices, wages, credit, rent, employment opportunities, opportunity costs, or risk pricing has connected to the person’s choice; housing prices and wages do not change choice in the same way. Care, debt, control, and inheritance do not all lead to the same consequence either. A concept points toward a field of relations, but that does not mean every relation within it has the same operative weight. When differences of different kinds, operative weights, and directions are gathered under one name, the name itself can no longer substitute for detailed judgment. A grand term may appear to have explained the problem when it has merely wrapped up the material that still requires further questioning.

Compression can also misrepresent differences that constrain one another as pointing in the same direction. A rise in wages may not immediately relieve housing pressure; acquiring institutional eligibility may not make up for a shortfall in time for care; local reputation may bring mutual aid while simultaneously making refusal more difficult. If only one general name is retained, these tensions are smoothed away, and analysis is left arguing only over which concept is more important. Because concepts are convenient for argument, people also often mistakenly assume that concepts already correspond one-to-one to consequences. In fact, relations pointing in opposite directions can exist under the same name: the family can provide care, but it can also

increase responsibility; local relations can provide mutual aid, but they can also increase pressure. Unless compression is unfolded again, these directional differences are easily erased by a single overall judgment.

The conceptual outline, the concrete institution, the points within relations where things are taken up and carried forward, and the actual consequence must be kept separate. An institutional name can indicate which kind of threshold to investigate, but it cannot replace questions about documents, deadlines, records, service windows, and modes of enforcement; the name of the family can indicate care and dependence, but it cannot replace questions about time, debt, health, and available exits. If a name is treated as the answer as soon as it appears, the points that can be examined and changed disappear instead. A compressed result cannot itself extract material, determine weight, arrange classifications, or make a ruling. Those acts are always performed by interpreters, organizations, or institutional procedures: someone chooses which records count, a procedure stipulates which documents are valid, and a form of naming puts relations that could previously be discussed separately into the same category. Asking about these processes preserves the concept while preventing it from occluding the actual extraction of material and the judgment applied to it.

Grand concepts do not need to be abolished; they can remain indexes for entering a question. They indicate which material is worth seeking, but cannot decide in advance which material is primary or secondary, still less act in place of concrete interpersonal, institutional, and resource relations. The point of taking them apart is to make names accept the constraints imposed by the material again; their public use remains. When people use “the market” or “the state,” they should be able to say which relations it points to here, which parts have not yet been proved, and which counterexamples might force the judgment to contract. This restriction does not deprive a concept of force. It prevents the concept from pretending to be a conclusion that has already been completed.

The convenience of compression also changes the way questions are asked. When people first ask, “Is this really a state problem or a market problem?”, attention easily concentrates on choosing a name for the event. If they first ask which difference changed a qualification, a cost, how things are taken up and carried forward, or an exit, the name can remain until later as a temporary tool for organizing the material. This latter question does not deny concepts, but it does not let a concept distribute the conclusion among the materials in advance. A concept can still be used as an index, but each use must return to one simple question: what material does it point to here, and what material does it occlude? If that cannot be answered, the concept may only be giving an existing judgment a different name. The same question applies to the state, the market, the family, culture, and the nation, as well as to the class image.

Reopening grand concepts does not mean looking for some social atom or final material. The analysis must pursue which concrete differences and relations are brought into comparison in this matter, how they are recognized, downplayed, or amplified, and how they enter the consequence along institutional, interpersonal, and resource conditions. Society is a differentiation network, but this judgment does not provide another complete total image. How material is extracted and how it enters a ruling must still be traced to concrete people and procedures.

III. Unfolding the School-Admission Eligibility Chain and Institutional Responsibility

In some regions and particular admission years, household registration or residence conditions, school places, application rules, and local provisions issued by education authorities may affect admission. Income, the ability to rent housing, the ability to take time off, information channels, and the ability to pay additional expenses are composite situational factors a family may face while going through the procedure, not uniform formal thresholds proved by the policy sources cited. When a child enters school, whether a residence permit is valid, whether social insurance has been continuous, and whether a rental contract is compliant can all change the result. Whether a landlord is willing to cooperate with filing, whether the document deadline can be met, whether the parents can take time off to go to the service window, whether anyone reminds them of the application procedure, whether school places are scarce, and whether the community is willing to issue a certificate all operate at different stages. Each can turn the facts of everyday residence and work into institutional eligibility, or make that conversion fail. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

An eligibility chain can be seen here: residence must leave records that can be recognized; the records must be assembled within the deadline; and assembling the documents requires someone who can arrange time, obtain information, and complete the necessary trips. When a landlord does not cooperate with filing, families with similar incomes and similar labor positions may still lose the same possibility of admission; when social insurance is interrupted for one month, a set of documents that appeared complete may change eligibility. These consequences are not directly deduced from abstract names. They take shape where concrete differences meet procedures. Eligibility chains also interconnect. A residence permit, social insurance, a rental contract, and filing are not isolated items; the absence of one document may mean that even with another document available, the procedure cannot be completed. The ability to take time off and information channels are not purely private conditions either: they determine whether a family can turn existing facts into documents that a service window can recognize before the deadline. This is why tracing relations matters more than listing concepts.

The same rule does not necessarily produce the same result for every family. When school places are scarce, whether the documents are complete, the speed of supplying additional documents, residential stability, and the availability of a community certificate may all change where a family ends up. This does not shift institutional responsibility onto the individual; it refuses to let an abstract institutional name occlude how an institution connects with living conditions through concrete procedures. Time is not an incidental background either. Document deadlines, time off, and trips to the service window bring work arrangements into the conditions of admission; information channels affect whether a family knows when to apply, to whom, and with what documents. The ability to pay extra expenses may not determine the result by itself, but when expenses for housing, transportation, or replacement documents, or losses incurred by taking time off, arise, it changes whether the family can continue to endure the process. Tracing these relations does not deny institutional critique; it brings the institutional threshold down to a place that can be explained.

The role of information channels is not merely “knowing more.” It concerns whether a family knows the deadline, what kind of filing is needed, which certificate can be supplemented, and when it must go to the service window. The ability to take time off determines whether that information can become actual action. When work arrangements conflict with document deadlines, the same procedural requirement produces different time costs for different families. The availability of a community certificate also shows that a procedure consists of more than formal rules. How rules are explained, how documents are verified, and

whose cooperation is needed can make the same fact of residence appear with different degrees of visibility. Registration with the subdistrict administration, a residence permit, rental filing, and school places each have their own requirements. A family must make the necessary connections among them before it can turn its living arrangements into eligibility for admission.

IV. Wedding and Funeral Cash Gifts, Marriage Pressure, and Workplace Injury: Tracing Relations and Consequences

Assigning wedding and funeral cash gifts to "the market plus culture" can do no more than mark the two ends of the problem. Amounts, income, return gifts, and burdens affect a family; wedding and funeral exchanges, social respectability, the order between elders and juniors, and local evaluation are also involved. Yet the same five hundred yuan is not the same thing in different relations. It may be ordinary reciprocity, or it may be understood as estrangement, compensation, or pressure. The difference lies not only in the amount, but also in who attended, who was absent, how past exchanges left records, and how local reputation was preserved. Attendance records and return gifts in gift-giving are not fixed moral scales. They become conditions of pressure or mutual aid because local relations continuously preserve, interpret, and respond to past exchanges. Whether the parents still live locally, whether the person has not returned home for years, whether help is expected later, and whether the person will still need mutual aid in the future can all change how the same payment is understood. A name cannot make the final judgment for these relations.

The pressure of income and return gifts cannot be erased, and local reputation and future mutual aid cannot be reduced to an equivalent measure and then treated as nonexistent. One person loses room to maneuver because of an expense, while another receives support through past exchanges; the same relation can bring burden and help at the same time. Handing all of this over to the names of the market or culture only mixes different consequences into one conclusion.

"Culture plus the family" gathers several sources of marriage pressure, but it cannot show how that pressure changes with age, health, care, and work conditions. Age milestones, the parents' health, anxiety about old age, employment stability, the cost of having children, economic dependence, and relatives' evaluations can make the pressure change direction at different moments. Age, employment stability, the cost of having children, and parental health in marriage pressure do not simply add up. When the parents' health begins to deteriorate, marriage pressure is no longer merely pressure at the level of ideas. Changes in parental health may bring care and anxiety about old age closer together; care, old-age support, family continuity, and the taking up of economic responsibilities may enter the conversation together. This does not mean that all families will be like this. It means that the sources of pressure cannot be closed in advance by the two names "the family" or "culture." Economic dependence may also make refusal difficult; when work is unstable, marriage arrangements are not necessarily only a private choice. Calling all these pressures culture or family merely removes from view the conditions that can be questioned separately.

In the case of workplace injury, the summary "class plus the state" is still too coarse. Contracts, medical records, surveillance footage, testimony from coworkers, training records, the employer's attitude, the assessment procedure, advance payment of medical expenses, family savings, and waiting time may all change whether a remedy can be carried through. Labor relations and institutional procedures are present, but they do not automatically produce evidence or make it possible for a family to endure the wait. Whether a contract exists, whether medical records are complete, whether footage is preserved, and whether coworkers are willing to testify each connects to different conditions of recognition. In workplace-injury remedies, training records and the employer's attitude may affect whether responsibility is recognized, while advance

payment of medical expenses and family savings affect whether the wait can be endured. When the assessment procedure is prolonged, the relations among evidence preservation, coworker testimony, and family resources become clearer. These differences do not deny the importance of labor relations; they show how labor relations produce asymmetrical consequences within concrete procedures.

All three sets of circumstances point to concrete relations and their consequences. Differences are not a flat list of factors. What matters for analysis is when they acquire operative weight, whether they can be recognized, and whether they connect to a consequence. Consequences are often not decided once and for all: exchanges continue after a gift is paid, marriage-pressure conversations change with health, care, and work, and a workplace-injury remedy passes through evidence collection, assessment, and waiting. Naming an event with a grand concept at only one point in time easily misses how relations reallocate pressure and the support that sustains people through the subsequent process.

Concrete tracing therefore also prevents the sources of pressure from being reduced to mere individual choice. A gift is not only a matter of whether one is willing to give; marriage pressure is not only a matter of whether one is willing to marry; and a workplace injury is not only a matter of whether one is willing to pursue a remedy. Income, records, health, evidence, waiting, and conditions for receiving support constrain how action can take place. Making these constraints clear prevents abstract concepts or personal character from replacing actual relations.

This turn also requires preserving what is unknown. When a concept first acquires the status of an answer, material not yet seen is often treated merely as an exception; returning to concrete differences requires acknowledging that some relations have not yet been clarified and that an existing judgment may change with new material. Primary and secondary status cannot be declared before the material arrives. Retreating from grand concepts to concrete differences can still produce judgments. Analysis can still indicate which relations are provisionally closer to the consequence, but it must explain where that judgment comes from and what material would make it fail. A name provides a starting point; concrete tracing determines whether a judgment can stand.

This turn also places critique at a more concrete point. If one merely says that a grand concept oppresses people, it is often difficult to tell where it can be changed; if one can trace which document, which deadline, which way of taking things up and carrying them forward, or which relation changed the consequence, it becomes possible to distinguish which links require further questioning. This does not reduce responsibility to technical detail. It prevents critique from stopping at a name that cannot be tested. Analysis therefore no longer settles for asking “what factors are there?” but asks “how do differences acquire consequences within relations?” The first question easily produces a long list; the second requires tracing the intersection of material, procedure, time, and the taking up and carrying forward of what is involved. It does not guarantee a simple answer at once, but it prevents explanation from stopping at a parallel list of concepts.

V. The Turn to Differentiating Units: Procedural Recognition, Actual Operation, and Judgments of Operative Weight

To say only that society "has class, the state, the market, culture, and the family" appears comprehensive, but it soon comes to a halt. This way of listing existing names does not explain how a consequence reaches a particular person, or why similar situations produce different results. If analysis keeps moving among several grand terms, it easily treats known concepts as explanations that have already been completed. School admission, gifts, marriage pressure, and workplace injury show that certain concrete differences acquire relative weight within relations and connect to qualifications, positions, actions, and consequences. What this chapter marks with "differentiating unit" is precisely the analytical turn from grand concepts back to these concrete differences and their relational processes.

The turn does not produce another, longer table of factors. If residence permits, contracts, medical records, gift records, and parental health are merely placed side by side, we still have not answered when they are extracted, by what procedure they are recognized, or how they connect to qualifications, waiting, responsibility, or choice. The work of analysis is not to collect as many names as possible, but to find the differences and relations that genuinely change the consequence in a concrete question. Grand concepts can remain entry points: the state points to institutional thresholds, the market to payment and credit, the family to care and dependence, and the nation and culture to memory, rites and customs, and shared responsibility. After the entry point, however, analysis cannot stop at the name. It must return to the concrete material and ask which difference has entered the comparison and where it was taken up and carried forward in a way that changed the result.

When judging operative weight, one cannot equate "recognized by a procedure" with "actually operative"; they are not the same thing. Some conditions are downweighted because they leave no record, yet may still affect whether a person can obtain material, endure waiting, or maintain a relation; some conditions are formally listed but may not change the result in a particular situation. Tracing this gap keeps analysis from merely repeating existing classifications. Judgments of operative weight must also distinguish the direct from the indirect. A condition may not immediately determine a qualification, yet may affect whether the material needed to determine that qualification can be obtained; a relation may not directly produce a remedy, yet may determine whether support is available during the wait. These indirect relations cannot be treated as irrelevant simply because they are absent from the surface rule, nor can they therefore be exaggerated into the sole cause.

Being able to distinguish differences does not mean that all differences are equally important in the current question. If analysis lists every detail as equally decisive, the result is only a fragmented list; if it returns to grand concepts, it flattens the differences again. Between these two errors, one must judge which differences have acquired greater operative weight in the relation at hand. A rental contract may not stand out in ordinary life, but may carry greater weight at school admission because of filing and qualification; records of wedding and funeral exchanges may not ordinarily determine life, but may connect to local reputation and mutual aid in weddings, funerals, and borrowing money; surveillance may ordinarily be only equipment, but after a workplace injury it may connect to evidence and the assessment procedure; parental health may ordinarily look like family background, but may redirect pressure when marriage is urged and old-age care is arranged. These comparisons do not establish a fixed ranking in advance. They require judgment to change with the concrete question. What analysis seeks is not an eternal ranking table, but a checkable judgment about how the current consequence was formed.

Operative weight is not an eternal property carried by a difference, nor is it decided once by a conceptual name. How material operates in a concrete situation depends on the handling by people, organizations, and institutional procedures: someone extracts material in the situation, stipulates which records are valid, and connects certain conditions to a qualification or responsibility. When a procedure, relation, or event changes, a former background may move forward, and material once considered weighty may cease to work; when new material appears, the difference formerly given greater weight may also need to be checked again. A difference with greater operative weight need not remain weightier forever. This correctability is the restriction required to avoid both reducing analysis to a list and organizing it around a governing axis.

The key, then, is not to claim that everything matters, but to make clear what has affected the consequence in this question, what remains only background, and what, though not recognized by the current procedure, may reappear in another relation. This is only a transitional discussion; it does not write relative weights in advance as a complete rule for later chapters. Such questioning also preserves the place of counterexamples: people with similar incomes may end up with different consequences because of housing, medical history, care responsibility, or support available through local relations. This is not a denial of labor and wages. It refuses to let a total image predetermine that every difference can only be read as the same position. Concrete differences can have very great force, but a total image is not thereby exempt from being taken apart.

VI. Dismantling the Class Image and Real Differences

The differences that class theory captures are often persuasive precisely because wages, labor, housing, debt, and risk really do compress people's choices. Taking the image apart does not erase these pressures, nor does it dilute them with culture or the family. It requires each pressure to be returned to a relation that can be checked: who pays, who waits, who has a buffer, who can exit, and which form of institutional eligibility makes the pressure heavier or changes its direction. Taking the class image apart does not yield a list of differences that can be completed once and for all. Different questions will extract different material, and wages, housing, debt, and responsibility for workplace injury need not always appear in the same combination. Analysis therefore cannot first judge someone through a low-dimensional position; it must check whether the extracted differences are actually connected to the consequence at hand. This is especially relevant to judgments of responsibility. If one summarizes everything through the class image, different restrictions and burdens are easily written in advance as the same situation; returning to concrete relations of wages, housing, debt, procedure, and care makes it possible to see who carries the pressure, where it is shifted, and where it might be changed. This does not reduce the weight of labor and property relations. It refuses to let the image make the final ruling for them.

The class image cannot be supplemented to form a platter of "class plus the state, market, nation, culture, and family," nor can it be kept at the center with all other relations treated as peripheral patches. Class theory does extract real differences that carry considerable weight in labor, wages, property, debt, housing, risk, resource buffers, employment, and domination. Yet the limited explanatory capacity formed by these differentiating units and by their processes of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression cannot change the structure by which class theory organizes concrete differences into a total class image from the outset. The problem is not that class theory was later overused or occasionally claimed a monopoly on explanation in advance. It has never been a safe, ordinary, limited explanation. When material such as labor, wages, and property is extracted, class theory simultaneously compresses, projects, and names it as a total image, making it easy for other differences to be arranged inside that image. The concrete differences extracted can return to a bounded analysis; the class image itself cannot be remade into a safe, ordinary, limited model.

Taking the image apart is not a denial of the weight of wage arrears, insecure housing, debt deadlines, unemployment risk, responsibility for workplace injury, or resource buffers. On the contrary, precisely because these consequences are real, we must ask separately when they become heavier and how they connect to household registration, medical history, care, institutional eligibility, support available through local relations, or the ability to endure waiting. In wage arrears, labor, wages, employment, and resource buffers may carry considerable weight; in waiting for a workplace-injury remedy, labor relations, medical records, procedure, and what the family bears may jointly change the result. Returning these concrete differences to their respective questions does not thereby produce a gentler class theory. The class image is attractive because the relations extracted behind it really do carry considerable weight. That attraction cannot give the image the status of what society fundamentally is, nor exempt interpreters from scrutiny in light of counterexamples, boundaries, and other relations.

VII. Society Is a Differentiation Network: Ontological Boundaries and Continuity with Volume I

The phrase “differentiation network” first points to a real, dynamic structure of social relations: society forms and exists as a differentiation network. At the same time, it preserves a processual requirement: do not treat a social consequence as directly caused by a single name; ask instead how differences enter a result through relations, procedures, the taking up and carrying forward of what is involved, and write-back. It does not provide an all-purpose guiding line that can replace other concepts, nor does it declare differences not yet extracted to be known answers in advance.

Differentiating units cannot be arbitrarily added together into social atoms. Society is a differentiation network: concrete differences are extracted within relations, assigned operative weight, connected, transmitted, and returned to consequences. The differentiation network is a real, dynamic, open, relational social structure situated in relational fields, and it replaces the class entity and the pre-existing class plane. But it is not a fixed, closed, pre-completed, personified ultimate entity that exhausts society; it is not the highest image, nor does it arrange society by itself. Extraction, naming, classification, recognition, and adjudication must still be traced to interpreters, organizations, and institutional procedures.

The name of a nation can be compressed, invoked, or used; criticizing the name of a nation and a plane of identity does not amount to denying a real national community. A real national community may form through long-term interaction, multiple layers of relaying, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harms, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. It cannot be reduced to a bloodline myth, a state registration, subjective imagining, a cultural label, a plane of identity, or class occlusion. Criticizing the direct adjudication of a problem through “the nation” as an unexpanded grand term is precisely a way of preventing the real relations of a community from being replaced by a convenient name.

Understanding society as a differentiation network does not promise a convenient total answer. It requires a fresh check in every concrete question: which differences were extracted, which relations gave them operative weight, which material was omitted, and how the result returned to people’s qualifications, responsibilities, and actions. This work is slower, but it prevents complex consequences from being handed over to a name too early. In this sense, rejecting a platter of concepts is not rejecting the use of concepts, nor rejecting the formation of provisional judgments. What it rejects is treating a name as a completed account of society before the relations have been unfolded. A concept can direct us toward material, but the relation between material and consequence must be explained separately.

Society is neither a presupposed axis nor a platter of a few grand concepts. Concepts can provide direction, but they cannot replace tracing how concrete differences enter qualifications, positions, actions, responsibilities, and consequences. Putting concepts side by side only expands the index; returning differences to relations is what begins to explain how consequences form. The differences extracted by class theory—labor, wages, property, debt, housing, and risk—must still be examined in concrete questions. What cannot be retained is the practice of collecting them into a total image of society. Retreating from a platter of concepts to concrete differences does not cancel judgment; it requires every judgment to state which relations support it, which material it has skipped, and under what conditions it would need to be revised.

Chapter 5. What Is a Differentiating Unit? How Social Differences Become Differentiating Units That Can Be Extracted, Assigned Weight, and Connected to Consequences

I. Questions in the Situation at Hand and the Formal Definition of the Differentiating Unit

If grand concepts such as class, the state, the market, the nation, culture, and the family are not treated in advance as completed explanations of society, social analysis must keep asking: which differences actually enter into social consequences? Merely saying that society is complex, or placing many factors side by side, cannot trace how differences enter concrete relations and consequences. A child who cannot enter school, a worker who cannot obtain compensation, a cash gift that causes estrangement, a person excluded because of an accent—none of these can be left at the level of grand concepts. Which difference was extracted within which relation, and how did it change the result? That is the question that must be pursued.

When a child enters school, formal institutional factors such as household-registration conditions, school places, and application rules may be involved; where local policy expressly requires them, some documents concerning residence, social insurance, renting, or filing may also enter the review. Document deadlines, whether the parents can take time off, and whether the landlord cooperates in producing rental documents, by contrast, are living conditions a family faces while going through the procedure; a statement from the community is formal documentation only where the specific rules expressly make it so. Formal institutional requirements and informal living conditions jointly affect the result, but they must not be mixed together and written up as a single set of admission rules. The same applies to compensation for workplace injury. Domination, risk shifting, and difficulties of exit within labor relations matter, as do the determination of workplace-injury status, the assessment procedure, and rules of evidence. The concrete result must still be traced to whether a contract exists, whether medical records are complete, whether surveillance footage has been preserved, whether coworkers are willing to testify, who advances the medical expenses, whether the family can endure the wait, and whether the person concerned understands the procedure. Grand concepts provide direction, but they cannot replace tracing how consequences form.

A differentiating unit is a unit of difference in the world that can be distinguished, represented, assigned weight, and brought into comparison, and that may be extracted, connected, transmitted, and written back within a concrete relational field, thereby changing an object's position, eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, action, or consequences.

The “unit of difference” meant here is not a fixed entity that exists independently of relational fields, nodes, and relational chains. Things, bodies, relations, memories, institutions, languages, spaces, resources, records, and actions in the world may all contain differences that can be distinguished. In a person, one can identify age, the body, language, income, debt, medical history, household registration, kinship relations, local belonging, platform records, and past experiences; family relations contain property, care relations, kinship order, past obligations left unfulfilled, and local reputation; local society contains accents, place names, roads, schools, customs, public memory, and structures of recognition. These differences do not naturally all become weighty at once, but they may be extracted in a particular event and enter relations and consequences.

What makes a differentiating unit is not a name or category in itself, but whether a difference can be identified, represented, compared, assigned weight, and change consequences within relations. Whether one has local household registration, whether social insurance is continuous, whether a contract is compliant, whether medical records exist, and whether there are records of cash gifts are all differences. Only when they are extracted in school admission, job seeking, compensation, borrowing, marriage or romantic relationships, care, exclusion, or the allocation of responsibility do they enter social consequences as differentiating units.

II. Potential States, Relationality, and the Empirical Levels of Representation

The differentiating unit first requires us to distinguish three things: whether a difference meets the conditions for becoming a differentiating unit, whether it has already been extracted in the current relational field, and whether it has already acquired weight and connected to consequences. Units of difference in the world that can be distinguished, represented, assigned weight, and brought into comparison, and that may change positions or consequences through extraction, connection, transmission, and write-back, belong to what this chapter calls differentiating units. The fact that one has not yet been extracted in a particular event does not mean that the difference does not exist, or that it has lost its potential as a differentiating unit. Only when specific people or procedures actually extract and use that difference, making it change qualifications, responsibilities, risks, evaluations, actions, or other consequences, can we further judge that it has taken effect in the current relational field. Analysts must therefore explain separately a differentiating unit's potential state, its state of extraction in the present, and its state of actually taking effect; they must not compress all three into the same moment.

Differentiating units have potentiality and relationality. A medical history may not become weighty in ordinary conversation, yet it may change a position when it enters a hospital, insurance, marriage or romantic relationships, or labor arrangements. Household registration may not become weighty in everyday chat, yet in procedures for school admission, obtaining local household registration, buying a home, or applying for benefits, it may change qualifications or become weighty. An accent is sometimes only a difference in sound, but it may become weighty in local recognition, exclusion, trust, or judgments of identity. Whether a difference produces consequences depends on which nodes extract it, which relational chains transmit it, and which specific people and procedures within institutions, platforms, schools, hospitals, or state service windows—as well as which family members, market participants, or members of local communities—recognize, amplify, downweight, or reject it. The same difference can acquire different weights in different relational fields; it may also temporarily cease to have an effect or reappear.

When the same person enters a hospital, a school, a labor relation, or a family event, the differences extracted from them, and the weights those differences receive, will vary. In a hospital, medical history, health insurance, ability to pay, and a family member's signature may become weighty; on entering the school system, household registration, student status, proof of residence, and the parents' social insurance may become weighty. Labor disputes bring out contracts, wage records, evidence of workplace injury, and coworker testimony; in family events, care responsibilities, past obligations left unfulfilled, kinship relations, and local reputation may become weighty.

A difference may have several forms of representation at the same time. Income can be represented in a wage statement, a money-transfer record, a family's oral account, or proof of debt; residence can be represented in a lease, a community statement, school documents, or neighbors' observations; bodily conditions can remain in pain, medical records, leave records, and care arrangements. These representations are not interchangeable, nor do they automatically have the same operative weight merely because they all point to the same fact of

life. In identifying a difference, analysts must preserve distinctions between forms of representation, because different forms do not connect to the same nodes, scopes of authority, and consequences. Even where rules in a particular procedure may allow some materials to replace one another, that substitutability is conferred by the specific procedural rules; it is not a universal interchangeability inherent in the fact of life itself.

At the same time, the same experience may also be represented differently by the person concerned, family members, staff, and those who record it. Conflicting versions do not cancel the reality of the experience, but they require us to distinguish their sources, when they were formed, the occasions on which they are used, and the authority to adopt them. When specific people record and pass on the conflict and use it to change trust, procedures, or responsibility, it is these inconsistent representations and the way they are handled that enter into consequences, not an abstract “dispute” that acts on its own.

When differences are formatted in the course of handling them, some content is retained and some is downweighted. A form can record an address, income, and dates, yet may not record care burdens, waiting costs, and local support; an oral account can preserve the continuity of an experience, yet may lack the form a procedure requires. Analysis through differentiating units must recognize both the need for a form that can be processed and the omissions caused by that format; it cannot judge facts of life that did not enter a field on a form to be nonexistent. Correspondingly, the original experience, the result of its handling, and later explanation must also be kept separate. Pain, residence, and care first exist as facts of life; diagnosis, registration, and evaluation are ways specific people handle them under rules; later analysts then put forward differentiating units on the basis of these materials. Treating the result of handling as an unprocessed original fact overlooks how the preceding node helped shape the form of the difference.

The scope of a difference must also be made clear. Listing someone's “family background” as a differentiating unit is still too coarse. One must go on to ask who provides care, which property or debt has been extracted, which memory is recognized in a dispute, and which kinship position has changed the available exits. Listing “locality” as a differentiating unit does not complete the analysis either: local reputation, address, testimony from acquaintances, travel distance, and local rules may each enter different consequences. A name can be an entry point; it cannot replace breaking the category down. But this process is not endless: the level of detail of a differentiating unit should be governed by whether it can explain real consequences. If finer distinctions only add names without changing judgments about material, positions of responsibility, or the continuation of relations, there is no need to go further. But when stopping would conceal who handled something, which difference was downweighted, or which pathway was interrupted, finer distinctions cannot be omitted. The choice of scale is therefore constrained jointly by the question and the material, rather than arbitrarily decided by an interest in classification.

III. Mechanisms of Operation: Weight Assignment, Continuation, Positions of Responsibility, and Receding Effects

The existence of a difference does not mean that it is already operative. The world contains many differences involving the body, age, language, region, wealth, labor, institutional status, medical history, debt, kinship, rites and customs, education, and memory; they do not all naturally produce social consequences. A difference must first be distinguishable, and it must also acquire a representation. Within institutions, differences usually appear as credentials, files, numbers, documents, and records; in local society, they may appear as reputation, forms of address, wedding and funeral exchanges, seating order, and memories among relatives; in bodily relations, they may appear as medical records, scars, the capacity to act, or age-related conditions. Representation is not decoration. It bears on whether a difference can be identified, transmitted, and extracted.

Even when differences have acquired representations, concrete relations do not extract every difference in a person. A school may extract household registration, social insurance, proof of residence, age, and student-status documents; an employer may extract contracts, attendance, performance, bodily condition, and degree of compliance; local society may extract cash-gift exchanges, kinship relations, past relations, reputation, and social respectability; a court may extract evidence, written acknowledgments of debt, money transfers, judgments, and enforcement records.

Differentiating units that have been extracted acquire different weights. Weight is not a natural property of a differentiating unit, but the operative weight formed within concrete relational fields and relations: in school admission, continuity of social insurance may carry more weight than the parents' accents; in workplace injury, proof of a labor relation may carry more weight than everyday popularity; on occasions of cash-gift giving, whether one attended in the past may carry more weight than present income. Differentiating units must also enter comparison, pass through nodes, and connect to consequences along relational chains. Qualifications, credibility, responsibility, available exits, and judgments about receiving help or being excluded can all change a person's position. Household registration can connect to school-admission eligibility, continuity of social insurance to recognition in a city, contracts to labor relations, and medical records to compensation and leave; cash-gift records and accents may connect in different ways to local reputation, closeness, or exclusion. Extraction, weight assignment, and transmission are not a fixed, one-way process: they may intersect or branch, and a downweighted difference may be extracted anew in another relation.

Differentiating units also have temporal conditions. A difference raised today was not necessarily already taking effect in the same way yesterday; nor can a record formed later be retrospectively written into the material available for an earlier judgment. What must be traced is when a difference was preserved, when it was extracted, when it entered comparison, and when specific people connected it to qualifications, responsibilities, risks, or arrangements for action. Once temporal order is flattened, the relaying that actually changed consequences in the event disappears. Differences appearing at the same time have not necessarily been connected to one another. Wages and rent, medical history and responsibility for workplace injury, income and household registration can coexist in one event. Only when specific people or procedures use one of them to change qualifications, deadlines, risks, responsibilities, or available exits, leaving material and intermediary links, is there sufficient basis to judge that it has entered a causal linkage. Statistical correlation, similar names, and co-occurrence can suggest where to investigate, but they cannot replace carriers, acts of handling, and relational chains.

Within the same event, some differentiating units can substitute for one another, while others can only supplement one another. The fact of residence may be jointly supported by a lease, payments, a community statement, and school records, but whether any one can replace another depends on procedural rules; bodily pain and medical records can corroborate one another, yet they do not have equal force in every judgment of responsibility. Analysts must identify the boundaries between substitution, supplementation, and non-interchangeability. When materials conflict, subsequent handling changes as well. When facts of residence do not match procedural requirements, family memories contradict official files, or local recognition and state registration cannot be mutually recognized, the concrete participants must select material, explain their authority, and bear the consequences of their handling. Analysis should not rush to eliminate the conflict, nor write “conflict” itself as an actor. It must preserve the sources on each side, the positions at which materials are adopted, and the results of handling them.

Differentiating units also concern the allocation of responsibility. The person who raises a difference, the person who preserves the material, the person who assigns operative weight, the person who refuses recognition, and the person who bears the consequences may occupy different positions. Some only supply material; some have the authority to adopt it; some can initiate supplementation or correction. Writing a difference as “caused by the institution” or “caused by the family” conceals the differences between these positions. Making differentiating units concrete allows responsibility to be pursued through relational chains rather than handed over to abstract names. In judging responsibility, seeing a difference and having the capacity to correct it remain two different things. Personnel at the end of a process may know that the material is problematic yet have no authority to alter the format; those in higher positions may hold the power of correction without directly facing the person concerned. The weight of a differentiating unit can indicate where the problem lies, but responsibility must be pursued further through knowledge, authority, choices, and consequences.

Effects that run in the opposite direction within relations cannot be ignored either. Family support may reduce debt pressure while increasing long-term care responsibilities; local reputation can make testimony available, but it may also lead to monitoring and exclusion; institutional records can open a path to qualification, but they may also cause an erroneous determination to be extracted repeatedly later. Differentiating units have no fixed direction toward good or evil; their consequences must be explained through concrete connections. The receding of a differentiating unit also requires conditions. After a debt has been repaid, the current payment obligation may end, yet the associated credit records, family borrowing, and local evaluations may not disappear at the same time; when a qualification is corrected, an earlier refusal may still leave losses of time and opportunity. To explain that a difference no longer takes effect, one must separately check its direct consequences, how it remains preserved, and whether it is extracted again later.

IV. How Differentiating Units Differ from Ordinary Perspectives and Comparisons

An ordinary perspective can suggest where to look; differentiating units require us to go on to explain which concrete differences are operating and how they enter into consequences. Looking at a child's school admission from the perspective of the state brings household registration, school places, and administrative procedures into view. Yet whether the child can enter school must still be traced to how continuity of social insurance, rental filing, explanations at the service window, document deadlines, and community certificates operate within relations. Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract labor domination, risk shifting, and exit costs in workplace injury. Whether a contract exists, whether surveillance footage has been preserved, whether coworkers testify, whether medical records are complete, and whether the family can hold out until the assessment result arrives must still be traced one by one, because they change how compensation ultimately takes shape. A cultural perspective can point to rites and customs and local evaluations. Estrangement caused by a cash gift still requires tracing how past exchanges, kinship relations, and responsibilities for mutual aid enter into consequences. A perspective turns the field of vision in one direction; it cannot replace tracing the mechanisms of concrete consequences.

Differentiating units cannot be treated as permanent variables either. Today's household-registration documents may become weighty in a school-admission event, yet be merely background in tomorrow's dispute among relatives; the same medical record serves different functions in medical judgment, workplace-injury determination, and family care. That weight changes with relations does not mean that judgment is arbitrary. It requires a clear account of why a difference becomes weighty and of the nodes that take up its consequences.

In comparing different explanations, differentiating units provide common units for tracing, not common conclusions. Two explanations can begin with the same wage documents yet reach different judgments about their connections to housing, care, the nation, or law. What matters in comparison is not who lists more differences, but who can explain extraction, weight assignment, transfer, and consequences, and who can accept limits on the scope of their explanation imposed by contrary material. When several explanations extract the same difference, that does not justify merging them into the same theory. Economic analysis, legal judgment, and family research may all be concerned with income, yet ask different questions about material, responsibility, and consequences. Differentiating units make comparison among them possible, while still requiring that their respective scopes be preserved to prevent the formation of a new total image encompassing all research.

V. Judging Effectiveness and the Boundaries of Empirical Evidence

That everything can be differentiated does not mean that everything is equally important. If every difference is listed as important, analysis loses its capacity for judgment. The tables and chairs, dust, lighting, paper, sounds, and smells in a room can all be distinguished, yet they may not enter into the consequences of a child's school admission. Whether a difference matters depends on whether it has been extracted, assigned weight, brought into comparison, and connected to consequences. Rental contracts, continuity of social insurance, proof of residence, and school places may become weighty in school admission; surveillance footage, medical records, coworker testimony, and labor contracts may become weighty in workplace injury. The same difference may become weighty in different relational fields, or it may be unimportant. Whether a judgment can be made still depends on which differences acquire weight in the concrete relational field and what consequences they connect to.

Differentiating units can be downweighted, occluded, or suspended without thereby departing from reality. A fact of residence rejected by a school may still be preserved by the family; pain ignored by an employer may remain in the body and in medical records; local memories downweighted by a public narrative may still be transmitted among relatives and in commemorations. Analysts must distinguish between a difference not being extracted, being extracted without being assigned weight, and losing its effect during transfer after being assigned weight. These three situations produce different consequences and require different forms of correction. Differentiating units can also help analysts distinguish the nonexistence of a fact from its nonrecognition: residence, injury, care, or shared life may actually have occurred, yet fail to enter a procedure for lack of the required format, witnesses, or authority to retrieve the material. In that case, one cannot say that the difference does not exist; one can only say that it has not yet acquired the force required by the current handling. Conversely, recognition of a record does not guarantee that its content fully corresponds to the facts of life. Both directions require checking.

Connecting difference, representation, extraction, weight assignment, and consequences is meant to preserve the conditions under which each link holds. A fact of life may exist without yet being represented; material may be received without acquiring operative weight; a determination may be made without being transmitted to subsequent nodes. The establishment of any one link cannot automatically prove the others. Precisely because interruption is possible at every point, the concept of the differentiating unit can preserve a place for counterexamples, the unknown, and correction. Whether a difference can enter a causal explanation does not depend on whether the concept makes sense, but on how carriers preserve it, through what material it is represented, at which node it is extracted and assigned weight, and how it ultimately changes a concrete position. If a key connection is missing, at most one can propose a possibility that remains to be investigated. New material can fill a prior gap in knowledge, but it cannot be retrospectively written in as evidence already available at the time of an earlier judgment.

The adoption of material on one occasion can prove only that it acquired force in the setting of particular personnel, deadlines, and procedures; failure to find evidence that it took effect likewise permits only a limited conclusion of insufficient material, an interrupted pathway, or correlation alone being visible at present. To propose a more stable pattern of differentiation, one must also compare whether other events exhibit similar extraction, recognition, and consequences. If new material changes a judgment, one should preserve the evidential boundaries of the original conclusion, then narrow its scope, reduce its operative weight, or reconstruct the intermediate relations; one must not retrospectively recognize the unknown as causation already established. Absence, silence, or refusal sometimes produces consequences within concrete relations, but the fact that a result has appeared does not justify inferring a single attitude behind it. Failure to submit material, attend, or respond may arise from lack of knowledge, insufficient time before a deadline, lack of authority, bodily limitations, relational estrangement, or deliberate refusal. Only when specific people or procedures record and interpret that absence and connect it to consequences do the relevant differences enter the current judgment. The conditions producing the absence must still be kept separate from those who interpret it afterward.

The strength of material is not determined by the neatness of its form or its quantity. Contracts, work schedules, money transfers, coworkers' observations, and actual management can jointly support the existence of a labor relation, yet formal records may also be mere copies of an earlier judgment; an oral account that is difficult to format may instead preserve an account of time and of what people bore, neither of which the procedure recorded. When several materials are used together, one must check how they were formed, whether they are independent of one another, and who preserved and passed them on. Only genuinely complementary sources constitute corroboration; repeated appearances of information from the same source

cannot masquerade as stronger evidence. A research question can determine which differences to trace first, but it does not authorize interpreters to exclude material that conflicts with their position. Omissions caused by limits of scope, time, and available information should be explained together with the reasons for selection, the current conclusion, and counterexamples that could change the judgment. If the conclusion is extended from an individual case to the family, locality, institutions, or a larger scope, the relaying and the basis for comparison must be explained separately. Making these boundaries public does not turn the main text into an appendix of materials; it lets readers know where an inference holds and where it can be opened up again.

A difference may occupy different positions when an analysis ends: some have been extracted by specific people and connected to consequences; some have been raised but not recognized; some already have the conditions for preservation but have not yet been triggered in the current event; others are only research hypotheses awaiting support from material. These positions cannot be compressed into a single list of factors, or unproved possibilities will acquire the same operative weight as effects already in force. Only by preserving these distinctions can subsequent research know whether it needs to add material, clarify authority, or adjust the original inference.

VI. Low-Dimensional Compression in the Class Image, Macro-Level Inference, and Changes of Scale

Class is not what society fundamentally is, but an explanatory image produced when a set of real differentiating units undergoes low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming. It is neither an isolated differentiating unit nor a single-point difference. Differences such as labor position, possession of wealth, employment relations, resource buffers, the bearing of risk, the ability to exit, debt, and housing pressure, once compressed within relations of economic domination, form the situations marked out by the class image. When a person's wages are overdue, labor relations, income buffers, rent pressure, the cost of asserting rights, and alternative employment opportunities become weighty together. Class theory subjects these real and weighty differences to low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming, thereby forming the class image. Yet the weight of the differences themselves cannot prove the existence of a social entity called class.

The class image formed in this way must still be brought back by interpreters into concrete relational fields and subjected to calibration against other differentiating units and counterexamples. Limited explanatory capacity comes from real differentiating units and the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them; the class image is only a low-dimensional output and cannot on that account be passed off as what society fundamentally is. But this calibration does not mean that the class image can be preserved as a safe, ordinary, limited explanation. Class theory organizes differences into a total image from the outset; it is not an ordinary concept that was originally safe and only later lost its boundaries. The fact that it includes the extraction and compression of real differentiating units does not justify rewriting it as an ordinary entry point exempt from questioning of its structure.

When differentiating units enter macro-level judgment, a single difference must not be elevated into a permanent main axis, nor must all differences be placed side by side without distinction. If similar extraction, weight assignment, and ways of taking up and sustaining differences recur across multiple events, they can support a judgment of stable relations within a particular regional, temporal, and institutional scope. If small differences change consequences through similar people, procedures, and relations across multiple events, they can also support larger structural judgments. But obstruction experienced by an individual family cannot

directly establish that an entire region follows the same pathway; similar results in several places still require comparison of rules, resources, and implementation.

Macro-level conclusions must retain local material, the dominant pull, exceptions, and new events that may change the ordering; they cannot automatically expand on the strength of the number of cases or the name of a concept. Macro-level names, in turn, must remain constrained by region, period, sources of material, and exceptions. Such inference must also answer whether similar results arise through the same relay process: if the format of qualifications causes obstruction in one place, while a shortage of resources causes it in another, apparently identical obstruction does not support a single pathway. Conversely, even when results differ, a structural effect with a bounded scope may still be identified if the same rules repeatedly change action space under different conditions for bearing consequences. The macro level is not a matter of smoothing away differences between cases, but of comparing how mechanisms persist or change direction under differing conditions.

Comparison and changes of scale must first establish whether the units are commensurate. An individual's monthly income cannot be placed directly alongside a family's total assets, nor can one medical record be treated as being on the same level as years of local reputation. When differences in residence move from a family's everyday life into eligibility within the school system or state registration, content from that life undergoes retention and omission. Analysts should state whether they are comparing time, qualifications, risks, the capacity to bear burdens, or relational positions, and explain what content can still be mutually recognized across scales and what holds only within the original relation. Moving from local differences to larger relations cannot omit relaying. Similar wage pressures in multiple regions initially create only a question for comparison. To propose stable relations across regions, one must also investigate similar rules, enterprise arrangements, document formats, resource allocation, and connections that can be repeatedly checked against material from events. Local material and macro-level theory are not two unrelated levels: macro-level judgments arise from local relations being continually taken up and carried forward, not from the automatic enlargement of the name “differentiating unit.” The importance of a differentiating unit is determined by its actual effects and the range of its continuation, not by the size of the scale; it therefore does not become the sole main axis merely by entering macro-level discourse.

VII. Not Becoming a New Main Axis, and Responsibility for the Boundaries of Material Selection

Listing differentiating units and then using the list to explain everything merely substitutes a new plane; it does not make society more three-dimensional. Without weight, the listed differences become only fragments placed side by side; apart from a relational field, one cannot judge which differences will be extracted. Differentiating units alone cannot explain how multiple differences jointly form an actual position. The entirety of possible differences not yet extracted is not equivalent to differentiating units; but a difference that meets the conditions for becoming a differentiating unit does not lose its potential as one merely because it has not yet been extracted in a particular event. Elevating differentiating units into a new main axis to replace class, the state, the market, the nation, culture, or the family merely repeats the error of flattening reality with an overarching concept.

Analysis through differentiating units establishes the conditions under which differences acquire social efficacy, not an infinite table of attributes. Details of life acquire corresponding operative weight in the current question only by entering consequences through carriers, material, procedures, and time. Conditions that have not yet become apparent may still really exist, but they cannot be written in advance as principal

causes already in effect. This enables differentiating units to open up what grand concepts occlude without becoming a new total image that handles every event. Differences that have not entered the present event are not thereby abolished by the theory. They may remain in bodies, family memories, local relations, or institutional materials, awaiting extraction anew at another node. Distinguishing real existence from current efficacy is precisely the condition needed to avoid mistaking the window of analysis for the boundary of social existence.

A differentiating unit is not a social atom, nor an ordinary factor waiting to be used in every relational field; still less can it preserve, interpret, or write back effects on its own. The difference it denotes manifests social efficacy in a given relational field only through concrete carriers, relational pathways, and handling procedures. This boundary both preserves the reference to real differences and prevents differentiating units from being fixed as the smallest units of a replacement for the class plane.

The theoretical function of differentiating units is to return selection, representation, comparison, and causal linkage to interpreters. Without material, carriers, and pathways to consequences sufficient to support the relation at issue, conceptual possibility cannot acquire the standing of an empirical conclusion. If new material fills in the connections, differences previously excluded may re-enter. This boundary, which can open and close, enables theory to judge without filling the unknown with an illusion of completeness. At the same time, the extraction of differentiating units is not without limits. Where medical histories, family conflicts, or religious practices involve the private sphere, whether material can enter a judgment is constrained by the consent of those concerned, procedural authority, and existing responsibilities within relations. Completeness of research does not suffice to justify indiscriminate retrieval; the manner in which material is obtained changes trust and risk, and also becomes part of the assessment of consequences and the scope of judgment.

VIII. Conceptual Tools, the Reality of Relations and Groups, and Explanatory Boundaries

Concepts are not useless. Class, the state, the market, culture, the family, and the nation can all compress complex reality into an outline that can be articulated, enabling people to judge and argue; once treated as what society fundamentally is, they also occlude the differences beneath them. Interpreters who adopt class theory may occlude the differences among wages, debt, housing, risk, and the ability to exit. The concept of the state may occlude differences among household registration, service windows, legal texts, administrative interpretation, and fiscal allocation; the concept of culture may occlude differences among rites and customs, shame, gender expectations, local reputation, and long-standing habits. Concepts must return to concrete relational fields and be calibrated against differentiating units and the processes through which they enter consequences. Only then will concepts not be passed off as what society fundamentally is. General concepts can thereby leave room to be unfolded again, but the structure of class theory organizes differences into a total image from the outset; it is not an ordinary concept that was originally safe and only later lost its boundaries.

Some differences can be fully explained only within relations. The deadlines of creditors and debtors, what caregivers and those receiving care bear, and recognition between members and communities cannot be attached solely to one individual. Analysis must identify at once the positions of participation, the direction of effects, and the actual consequences. This explains how differences are constituted relationally; it does not establish a separate, pre-existing, fixed category of “relational differentiating units.” Differences at the group level, such as shared memories and shared harms, likewise persist only through real carriers. Family narratives, school education, rituals, recorders, witnesses, archives, and members' practices may jointly

preserve and bring forward the relevant material again. Names of nations, families, or organizations can summarize these relations, but they cannot themselves remember, judge, or take responsibility. Reality at the group level comes from an ongoing process of taking up and carrying forward these relations and their contents, not from a name acquiring a unified personality.

That concepts are not what society fundamentally is does not mean that they are confined to researchers' language. Institutional classifications, forms of address within families, and names of communities, when used by specific people, can actually change qualifications, trust, and responsibility. What must be ruled out is writing a name itself as a pre-existing entity or actor. The same holds for differentiating units: they point to how real differences enter consequences, but they cannot operate on their own apart from people, material, relations, and procedures.

Chapter 6. Concepts Are Not What Society Fundamentally Is: How Concepts Compress Differentiating Units and Occlude Reality

I. Concepts Are Not the Enemy

Without concepts, experience is difficult to remember, compare, and discuss. Wages, employment, debt, rent, medical records, household registration, accents, cash gifts, kinship relations, real estate, educational qualifications, religion, the body, age, prior relations, school places, evidence of workplace injury, and family responsibilities would remain scattered across individual experiences if there were no names at all by which to organize them. People in conversation first draw on names such as “wages,” “the state,” “the market,” “culture,” or “the family” to identify the general direction of the material: labor and income; law and registration; prices and credit; rites and customs, and memory; care and dependence. Only by using names to organize this material do people sketch a provisional outline.

Through names, people remember recurring relations and compare experiences separated from one another. Without this step, public judgment can readily fall back into scattered impressions and individual stories. People also use concepts to transmit material for discussion. When someone describes a difficulty with school admission, a case of unpaid wages, or a cash gift, they need not retell every detail each time. Listeners can first use the name to grasp the general direction of the problem, then return to the material to see whether that name applies. Concepts, therefore, are not the enemy. The problem begins when names are used in place of further inquiry. If a name serves only as an entry point, it can still lead people back to labor, documents, time, care, records, and the ways things are taken up and sustained; if it is treated as an endpoint, the material begins to disappear behind the name.

This distinction cannot be applied directly to class theory. Labor positions, wages, property, employment relations, debt, housing, resource buffers, the bearing of risk, the ability to exit, and domination are all real differences that carry considerable weight, and each can enter a bounded analysis. Class theory, however, organizes these differences into a total class image from the outset. It is not an ordinary concept that was originally safe and only later lost its boundaries.

General concepts can leave room to be unfolded again. The structure of class theory, by contrast, compresses, projects, and names the extracted differences as a total image, making it easy for other differences to be arranged inside that image. The fact that it grasps some weighty relations does not justify preserving it as a safe entry point.

Conceptual compression has at least three distinct levels. The first is naming for communication: gathering scattered events into formulations that can be remembered. The second places material within a particular explanatory framework and indicates which differences are considered important. The third may treat the framework, in reverse, as the pre-existing structure of reality and require all subsequent material to prove that it is merely an expression of that structure. The first two levels can be useful; it is the third that constitutes the ontologization of concepts.

II. How Concepts Compress Differentiating Units

A concept is a name into which people compress a set of related differentiating units in order to discuss, remember, compare, and judge reality.

Compression here is not an action that a word performs on its own. In naming, classifying, registering, and discussing, people, interpreters, organizations, and institutional procedures extract some differences whose relations have already become apparent and group them under a name. The name is both the result of this compression and an entry point for subsequent use. What is compressed is not empty abstraction, but concrete differences and the relations they have already manifested.

This selection has a different focus in different concepts. In speaking of “the state,” users may bring together law, registration, household registration, school places, public finance, administrative boundaries, public resources, implementation at service counters, and supporting material. In speaking of “the market,” they may bring together prices, wages, rent, credit, exchange, competition, the ability to pay, risk, and opportunity costs. Likewise, users draw on “culture” to organize rites and customs, forms of address, face, gender expectations, memory, local habits, taboos, and judgments of closeness and distance. When naming something as “family,” they provisionally group together care, dependence, inheritance, debt, favoritism, prior relations, eldercare, intimacy, control, and available exits. The material drawn on need not be exactly the same in every case, yet people readily regard it as naturally belonging to the same kind.

Compression preserves similarities among certain differences, as well as the experience of their having jointly acquired greater weight in some problems, so that people do not have to name every encounter from scratch. Material included under a name becomes easier to see, while material that has not been extracted may recede into the background. Reality has not disappeared; explanation, argument, and institutional handling may simply no longer give it the same place.

A name must not be conflated with the material compressed into it. “The state” is not registration, public finance, and service counters themselves, nor is “the family” identical with care, debt, and prior relations. People use names to gather material provisionally, but in another matter that material may still connect to different relations and consequences. Nor can the same name guarantee that the differences within it have the same operative weight: household registration and school places form thresholds in different ways, just as housing prices and wages alter choices in different ways. People use names to sketch an outline; detailed judgments must still return to the material. The possibility of unfolding the material again is precisely a condition of a concept's limited validity. Users should explain what they have extracted at this point and acknowledge what they have omitted. When counterexamples, boundaries, and new material enter, the original compression can be corrected, rather than reality being required to accommodate the old name.

Concepts can be used repeatedly because an act of compression leaves a name that can be taken up by others. Later users need not have experienced the original relations themselves to approach, through this name, experience that has already been organized. Yet carrying a name forward is not the same as carrying forward all the material. The more stable the name, the easier it becomes to forget how the original material was selected. Compression also changes the scale of comparison. Once people place several differences under one name, they often find it easier to see what those differences have in common, but harder to see their respective times and origins, and the conditions under which they are taken up and sustained. Comparison thus gains an entry point, and also a point at which distortion may occur. It is precisely these differences, hidden by the common outline, that need to be unfolded again.

Naming practices are not always carried out by the same kinds of actors. Everyday conversation, research explanations, organizational classification, and institutional registration gather material in different ways; what is retained and what is omitted may also differ when the same name enters different procedures. Naming itself does not change life unless someone connects the name to records, qualifications, authority, resources, or responsibilities. The term “workplace injury” may have different consequences in procedures involving medical records, assessments, compensation, and leave; the term “nation” may likewise carry different relations in family memory, education, legal registration, and the handling of boundaries. A concept's efficacy comes from how specific people and procedures use it, rather than from a fixed power possessed by the name itself. Differences in authority also arise when different participants use a concept. Those involved can use a name to describe their experience, staff may use fields on a form to connect the name to qualifications, and researchers use it to organize comparisons. The three have different capacities to produce consequences. The fact that the word is the same does not justify assuming that all users are performing the same action.

Concepts also change shape as they are passed between stages. A school understands “residence” as material bearing on eligibility, a community as long-term interaction, and a family as a fact of everyday life. The same word enters different consequences at different nodes. If we compare only the wording, we can easily mistake different forms of handling for the same judgment. What must be traced, therefore, is which node extracts the concept, what format it adopts, and to whom it transmits the result. Problems of translation across contexts are connected to this as well: legal, family, local, and academic language may use different names to describe the same part of an experience, or the same name to handle different relations. Whether translation succeeds depends on whether material, responsibility, and consequences can be connected. Merely aligning words does not prove that a concept has the same meaning at different nodes.

The historicity of concepts must also be preserved. The same name may be supported by different material in different institutions, generations, and local relations. Continuity of the name does not mean that the mechanisms of consequences have remained unchanged. Names for nations can carry forward long-term memory, but may also be reformatted by institutions; the name “family” can sustain kinship responsibilities, but may change meaning through household division, migration, and conflicts over care. Concepts must be traced together with the relations that formed them.

Boundary cases often expose the conflation of concepts: an organization may both participate in market transactions and receive authorization from the state; a family may both preserve community memory and handle property arrangements. The same object can thus enter different relations. Analysis must explain the material, authority, and consequences of each relation separately. The fact that the object is the same does not justify combining the concepts of market, state, family, or community into a single actor.

III. Why Concepts Have Power

Through shared names, people bring widely separated experiences into relations that allow comparison. Events need not remain forever a matter of private experience alone. If a person's difficulty is always confined to a private account, it is not easy to establish comparisons with other people's material. Names bring situations that were previously difficult to communicate into public language. In a case of unpaid wages, wage arrears, rent pressure, lack of savings, the cost of defending one's rights, alternative employment opportunities, and domination in labor can be seen together. In school admission, household registration, student registration, school places, certificates from subdistrict offices, education department rules, and implementation at service counters can also be placed within the same set of institutional relations. In cash-gift exchanges, records, social respectability, closeness and distance, seating arrangements, prior relations, and future mutual aid can enter discussion. This organization speeds up public judgment. People can first see which problems are not isolated accidents, then ask through which concrete stages they are connected. The practices of naming and organizing material keep discussion from being reduced to “I had bad luck” or “He was unlucky.”

People, organizations, and institutional procedures also use names to preserve experience. Repeatedly used names retain in memory a set of relations that once appeared together. Later users draw on these names to approach old problems, and organizations and institutional procedures often use classifications to record, compare, and handle material. Institutional handling depends on names, fields, and classifications to preserve records, compare qualifications, and make decisions. Precisely for this reason, the use of names is never merely a question of language: it affects which material can readily enter a procedure, which requires additional explanation, and which experiences have no existing field in which to be placed at all. Concepts may also harden through repeated institutional use. When the same field, the same classification, and the same set of evidentiary requirements are used across multiple events, people prepare the corresponding material in advance, and experiences that do not fit the format find it harder to enter judgment. This stability is a real consequence, but it still comes from the ongoing handling by rule-makers, record-keepers, reviewers, and those implementing decisions. It does not mean that the concept itself has become an entity capable of acting.

Yet preservation is never complete preservation. The easier a name is to transmit, the more easily the disagreements, conditions, and exceptions once within it are occluded. Compression brings convenience, but also limits. Public judgment depends especially on concepts, yet cannot stop at them. After saying that a rule is an administrative matter, that an expenditure involves market pressure, or that a set of interactions involves local rites and customs, one must still return to specific documents, deadlines, the ability to pay, and prior relations to see how they alter consequences. The power of a name comes not from its standing above reality, but from users being able to enter reality through it. Apart from material, procedures, and relations, a name is nothing more than a slogan to be fought over.

IV. How Concepts Occlude Reality

Occlusion does not mean that reality disappears. Reality continues to unfold, but often it can enter explanation, records, and public discussion only through classifications already in use. Those who use class theory may see more of labor, wages, property, debt, housing, and domination, while downweighting language, religion, the body, local memory, prior relations within families, rites and customs, and institutional identity. Those who use the name “the state” may likewise focus on law, registration, and administration, while placing rent, help from relatives, market costs, local familiarity, and family care in the background. The first set of material is not false, nor is the second set real only on that account. If interpreters forget their own choices about what to retain and omit, they will mistake the differences already extracted for the whole of reality.

Within a market framework, cash gifts, support for elderly relatives, family affection, and local credit are often treated as costs and returns. When interpreters adopt a cultural framework, housing prices, childcare costs, gendered risks, and the pressures of eldercare are readily assigned to traditional beliefs; when they turn to a family framework, unemployment, debt, housing costs, and industry cycles may in turn be classified as private trauma. Each account may grasp some relations and omit others. Occlusion also comes from institutional classification. A procedure specifies which forms of proof count, which experiences can be registered, and which relations can remain only in oral accounts. It is not concepts blocking material on their own: organizations, institutional procedures, and naming practices place some material in visible fields and leave other material outside them. Once existing classifications become the only language, unclassified differences find it difficult to gain standing in an explanation. They may still affect qualifications, waiting, responsibilities, and action, yet find it difficult to enter formal judgment.

Occlusion is often not deliberate concealment. Interpreters may sincerely organize material under names familiar to them, while institutional procedures may simply continue using existing fields. As names are used repeatedly, differences not included come to look more and more like irrelevant facts, even though they continue to alter people's choices and consequences. The same material also takes on different appearances under different names: debt can be seen as market pressure, a family burden, or a problem of institutional eligibility. Any of these accounts may grasp some of the facts. If only one is permitted to exist, the other relations lose the opportunity to be examined.

Names for nations must also be treated separately here. Names can be compressed, invoked, classified, or put to use; real national communities, however, cannot on that account be reduced to mere concepts, identity labels, state registration, subjective imaginings, or appendages of class. The compressibility of names does not cancel the real relations through which communities have formed historically.

Placing class, the state, market, nation, family, and culture side by side does not automatically yield a complete explanation. Institutions may also create records according to classifications and then use those records, in reverse, to prove that the classifications are correct. Both practices readily allow names to occlude the actual handling. Analysis must trace who classified first, which fields and rules preserved the results, how subsequent personnel retrieved them, and whether contrary material can correct existing records. Only by opening up this formation chain can the juxtaposition of multiple concepts and institutional records be kept from replacing causation, time, and responsibility.

V. How Concepts Come to Be Treated as What Society Fundamentally Is

When a concept serves as an entry point, users still return to the material it indicates. If judgment stops at the name and says only that this is a state problem, a market problem, a cultural problem, or a family problem, documents, time, relations, the ways things are taken up and sustained, and responsibility are no longer investigated. Once a name is treated as fundamental reality, explanation undergoes an inversion: a judgment that should have been supported by material instead requires the material to prove the name. Relations that do not fit the name are described as secondary, exceptional, or superficial, and differences within the name are forcibly arranged in the same direction. Concepts do not inherently produce this result on their own; the problem lies in users and procedures refusing to unfold them again.

The ontologization of general concepts occurs when names are mistaken for independently existing social entities. Interpreters no longer explain who extracted which material or which procedures gave it operative weight, and no longer allow new material to change the judgment. A name changes from a tool for organizing experience into something that adjudicates experience in advance. When names seem able to arrange reality on their own, the actual actors who extract, classify, retain, omit, name, and adjudicate are erased. These actions must always be traced to specific interpreters, organizations, institutional procedures, and classificatory practices. Only by restoring the actions to these actors can we see where a judgment begins to lose its boundaries. The state, market, culture, and family can all be misused in this way. They can point to entry points into different relations, but cannot declare a sole cause on reality's behalf, still less reduce all other relations to their own appendages. General concepts may still be brought back within bounds by boundaries, counterexamples, and material. If users explain the scope of their material, acknowledge omissions, and allow judgments to contract, names will not readily replace society itself. What is at issue here is the limited use of general concepts, not an exemption for class theory.

Class theory requires separate treatment. It is not an ordinary concept that turned from an entry point into a wall only after later misuse. From the outset, it compresses, projects, names, and organizes differences such as labor positions, wages, property, employment relations, debt, housing, resource buffers, the bearing of risk, the ability to exit, and domination into a total class image. These differences can each enter a bounded analysis. The total class image itself, however, cannot be preserved as a limited entry point, with the state, market, nation, culture, and family then treated as peripheral supplements. Its capacity to extract differences within a limited scope has not changed its basic structure of subsuming explanations.

Abstract names cannot bear responsibility on behalf of actors. The market does not set prices on its own, the state does not carry out registration on its own, the family does not allocate care through a unified will, and the nation does not preserve memory on its own. Specific participants, organizational positions, rules, and procedures are the carriers through which differences are handled. Concepts can generalize their relations, but cannot become the source of their actions.

The power and danger of concepts come from the same capacity for compression. A concept organizes scattered consequences into comparable problems, but may also fix the outline obtained through comparison as a pre-existing world. Work with concepts therefore does not aim to find the largest name. It must maintain distinctions among naming, extraction, weight assignment, passing on, and write-back, so that material can reopen generalizations. Only under this condition is a concept a bounded explanation, rather than an image elevated into what society fundamentally is. Concepts also function differently in different settings: in public language a concept may gather experiences together; in fields on institutional forms it can connect to eligibility and implementation; in academic discussion, research concepts are used to organize comparisons.

Even when all three use the same name, their respective carriers and consequences must be distinguished. Continuity of wording cannot stand in for continuity of relations.

Saying that concepts are not what society fundamentally is does not negate their power. Generalizations can still organize real problems, but must explain who carries them, when they form, on what material they are based, through which nodes they pass, and what consequences they produce. They must also acknowledge what contrary material would invalidate the conclusion. A concept's force comes from its ability to accept limits in reality while continuing to explain, rather than from securing a position immune to correction. When a concept proves effective repeatedly across events, an analyst can strengthen the judgment concerning its pattern of relations. Yet this stability is still supported by material and relaying; it does not elevate a generalization into an entity capable of acting on its own.

The boundaries of concepts must ultimately be grounded in responsibility. If “institutions,” “the market,” or “culture” leave people unable to identify who makes rules, allocates resources, preserves material, rejects objections, implements consequences, or holds the authority to correct, abstract names have already taken over the actions of actors. Whether analysts use these names to explain or to criticize, they should restore control, knowledge, authorization, and the capacity to revise to concrete positions. Disaggregating them in this way does not lessen criticism; it enables criticism to reach the relations that produce and sustain consequences.

VI. Differentiating Units Must Not Be Ontologized Either

Differentiating units cannot be elevated into what society fundamentally is under a new name, nor should they be treated as social atoms, ultimate entities, or an all-purpose term. They cannot replace class, the state, market, nation, culture, and family as another, still larger total concept. Breaking concepts back down into differences does not mean that we have found society's final material. Only within concrete problems, as differences connect with other relations, does it become apparent what they can change. Detached from these processes, arranging differentiating units into a fixed list would likewise freeze analysis back into a plane.

Treating differentiating units as new labels merely gives the old practice a different word. If someone says, “This is a problem of differentiating units,” but no longer explains which differences are extracted, by whom they are recognized, how they are transmitted, and when they enter consequences, the name likewise becomes empty. Nor can differentiating units serve as an all-purpose explanatory key. They remind people to ask how differences are extracted, recognized, and transmitted, but do not guarantee that every difference named will enter consequences. Differentiating units acquire meaning only within concrete problems. Which relational field they enter, which relations they connect with, and at which nodes they are preserved, certified, or passed on are what enable certain differences to enter qualifications, responsibility, action, or consequences. Nor can they be detached from relations of operative weight: a difference that is prominent in one matter may recede into the background in another, and the same record may produce different consequences when adopted by different procedures.

The judgment that “society is a differentiation network” has real standing in social ontology and cannot be reduced to an analytical method, an observational perspective, or a rhetorical metaphor. Equally, users cannot expand it into an ultimate entity or highest total image that is closed, exclusive, and completed in advance, that encompasses everything that exists in the universe, and that is immune to counterexamples. How concrete differences are extracted, connected, assigned operative weight, recognized, and adjudicated must still be traced to interpreters, organizations, institutional procedures, and actual relational processes. The network is neither a mechanical aggregate nor an actor operating on its own. Preserving this boundary serves

to maintain the differentiation network's reality, the way society is formed, and the network's openness together; it does not withdraw this book's affirmative proposition in social ontology.

Criticism of concepts must also delimit its target. Pointing out that a particular usage occludes reality does not cancel the name's function in every setting. Rejecting class as what society fundamentally is still leaves room for limited analysis of wages, property, debt, and domination. Analysts should specify whether they are criticizing ambiguity in the name, the explanatory structure, institutional usage, or the actions of specific people, so that criticism does not create yet another undifferentiated abstract object.

VII. How to Use Concepts Properly

Using a concept properly requires first explaining which material it points to at this moment. In speaking of the state, does one mean legal texts, household registration, registration, school places, implementation at service counters, or administrative boundaries? In speaking of the market, does one mean prices, wages, rent, credit, competition, or opportunity costs? A name cannot replace this explanation. One must also explain what the compression has retained and what it has omitted. If a judgment sets out only the material it has seen, readers cannot know which relations it has omitted or whether those omissions would change the conclusion.

The scope of a concept's application should also be stated. A name being helpful for one kind of problem does not mean that it can cover all problems; its grasping a key relation at one moment does not mean that the same relation will always retain the same operative weight. A concept's valid scope may change with the research question, but cannot be moved arbitrarily after the fact. Analysts should state their material and scope at the outset. If adjustment is needed after counterexamples appear, they must make public which participants, nodes, or consequences have changed. Merely excluding unfavorable cases from a new definition does not count as conceptual calibration.

The omissions made by concepts are sometimes necessary, but what has been omitted must be capable of being unfolded again. Without compression, analysis cannot form communicable judgments. Yet readers should be able to ask what material lies beneath a concept, which relations have been downweighted, which conclusion holds only for a particular event, and what new counterexample would deprive the concept of explanatory power. This means that users must be able to unfold again the concrete material contained in a name: labor, wages, debt, housing, and risk can return to their respective problems, while law, registration, public finance, service counters, and public resources can each be examined separately. Unfolding again still preserves a concept's limited uses. Its purpose is to prevent concepts from adjudicating in advance on reality's behalf. A limited concept should remain correctable: it can aid memory, comparison, transmission, and public judgment, but must leave an exit back to concrete material.

A concept's clarity depends on whether the basis of its formation can be traced. If, after a macro-level judgment returns to material, nodes, and relational chains, it is no longer apparent how the name was formed through extraction, weight assignment, and consequences, compression may have gone too far. If the core inference can still be re-examined by following the material, the concept remains open to inspection. This does not require writing to reproduce all of reality. It requires that names not allow an argument to leap over stages that have yet to be explained.

In the case of class theory, one cannot say that “there is no problem with using the concept of class.” What can enter analysis are concrete differences such as labor positions, wages, property, employment, debt, housing, resource buffers, the bearing of risk, the ability to exit, and domination. Returning these differences to their respective problems will not assemble them into a safe total class image.

Reopening concepts does not mean abandoning generalization. Analysts may retain “the family,” “the market,” “the state,” and “the nation” as provisional entry points, but must indicate the material they currently cover, what remains outside them, and the time span within which they apply. When counterexamples show that an entry point is too coarse, analysts should add differentiating units, split nodes, or narrow the conclusion, rather than wrap the problem up again in new grand words. When multiple concepts intersect, one should not establish a still higher total term to gather them all in. Family, state, market, and nation can affect one another within the same event; analysts must explain through which people, material, and procedures each enters consequences. The intersection of relations supports multiple traceable paths, not a new omnipotent concept.

The use of concepts must accommodate counterexamples. When new material appears, interpreters must be able to narrow, adjust, or abandon their original judgments. Names cannot become shields against revision. When new records, relations, or consequences incompatible with the original judgment appear, users must address them directly, rather than dismiss them all as exceptions. Whether a concept has been overextended can be examined precisely through boundary cases: when an event fits the name in only some of its material while other relations point to different outcomes, can the interpreter acknowledge that the classification does not fully apply? When two events bearing the same name produce different consequences, can the concept be broken back down into nodes and relational chains? If every difference can only be gathered back under the same name, the concept loses the boundaries through which reality constrains it.

Whether a concept can return to reality ultimately depends on whether it allows material to change the concept's own organization. If new evidence is merely added to an existing framework without being able to change weights, paths, or scope, its supposed openness is merely formal. A concept that can truly be calibrated leaves room for revision: it can be narrowed, differentiated into levels, or given a different entry point, and it can be withdrawn if it continues to fail.

Concepts can form a public language that allows scattered events to be compared and downweighted experiences to enter discussion. This function does not require all material to submit to the same name. New records may break up existing generalizations, and other research can pose different questions on the basis of law, history, institutions, or the experiences of those involved. As long as the shared language still allows participants to add material, dispute the scope, and change judgments, concepts can enter comparison. If the unknown, objections, and outside research can only be taken in as examples of the concept itself, it begins to lose its limited boundaries. Concepts remain necessary theoretical tools. They allow different events to be compared and long-term relations to enter an explanation. The greater their power to generalize, the more they must be able to return to concrete relations and indicate what material they have retained, what differences they have downweighted, and under which conditions they offer only a partial explanation. Concepts are therefore neither temporary labels nor ultimate answers, but forms of argument constrained by the boundaries of reality and the conditions under which they fail.

VIII. Turning to How Differences Produce Consequences for Action

Once concepts have been reopened, concrete analysis must avoid the closure of grand concepts while also avoiding listing differences as unrelated fragments and breaking every person down into countless unmanageable details. The question is no longer how to add more names to the same matter, but how concrete differences move from the background into qualifications, positions, responsibility, action, and consequences. People can certainly use concepts to explain reality. Whether that account can withstand correction by reality, however, depends precisely on how concrete differences enter consequences: analysis must explain which differences in the problem at hand have already acquired operative weight, how they enter consequences along relations, and what material might change the judgment. Consequences always take shape at points of connection and continuation. What must be asked is which differences have already connected with institutional procedures, the taking up and sustaining of differences through relations, and temporal conditions, thereby enabling people to act, requiring them to wait, allowing them to exit, or forcing them to bear consequences.

These questions all require tracing the places where differences connect with procedures, relations, and the ways differences are taken up and sustained: under what conditions a residence permit changes eligibility for school admission; how surveillance footage enters the determination of responsibility for workplace injury; how records of wedding and funeral exchanges affect local reputation; how accents connect with closeness and exclusion; and how debt deadlines change whether people can afford to resign, marry, be ill, or refuse work. Differences do not produce consequences as soon as they appear. Some material must be registered, some recognized, some transmitted through relations, and some supported during a period of waiting before it can alter the room available for action. When material is recognized, differences may enter qualifications; when records are preserved, differences may reappear later; when relations take differences up and sustain them, or refuse to do so, differences change the room available for action. Nor do the same differences acquire equal weight in every problem. When work arrangements, family care, institutional deadlines, local relations, and prior records connect with one another, material that was previously inconspicuous may suddenly affect choices; material that appears weighty may also temporarily fail to enter the outcome because it has not been taken up and sustained.

Chapter 7. How Differences Produce Consequences for Action: Differentiating Units from Background Differences to Chains of Consequences

Some differences have already been seen, extracted, and used in judgment, yet have no public name and have not been recognized as legitimate grounds. They can still alter eligibility, responsibility, closeness, and available exits. To see whether a difference enters into consequences, we must look beyond whether it has been formally named: we must also ask where it was extracted, by whom, and to what form of handling it was then connected.

The existence of a difference does not in itself automatically produce consequences for action. Its passage from the background into action involves relations, materials, timing, comparison, and how it is taken up and sustained; once consequences have formed, they may also leave new records, memories, and positions. This chain identifies the links at which consequences are advanced or blocked; it does not compress reality into a single path. Here we trace only how differences enter into consequences, setting aside for now the question of whether those consequences have moral legitimacy. If the grounds for a judgment are not explained, those concerned may sense that their treatment has changed yet find it difficult to know whom to ask, what to offer as proof, or how to appeal. There is no need to begin by attributing this difficulty to some fixed motive. What it first indicates is that part of the formation of consequences remains within relations that those concerned cannot see or directly check. Whether the grounds can be brought into a position where they can be explained, substantiated, and responded to will change the action space available later. Whether public reasons are given for the treatment will also affect people's ability to rearrange relations.

I. A Difference's Existence Does Not Mean That It Is Operative

An accent, a residence permit, a debt, a medical record, and records of wedding and funeral exchanges may all really exist, but they will not produce the same consequences in every relation. Having an accent does not mean being excluded everywhere; having a residence permit does not mean that it governs every moment of daily life. Existence tells us only that the materials, experience, or position are already there. It does not yet tell us that they have entered into the handling of the matter at hand.

“Operative” means that a difference enters into the handling of relations within a concrete relational field, connecting to eligibility, responsibility, recognition, shame, time, available exits, or choice. Being operative is not a fixed category, nor does it mean that the difference has acquired permanent power. Being operative is only a state of operation over a period: here and now, a particular difference has had an effect on certain people and the handling of a particular matter.

A difference that has temporarily not entered into the consequences at hand has not disappeared. It may remain in the background until an event, procedure, dispute, or change in relations brings it back to the center. Remaining in the background does not mean that a difference does not exist or has no meaning; it simply has not yet been treated as a basis for handling the matter at hand. To treat background differences outright as inoperative makes it easy to mistake a gate that suddenly appears later for something created out of nothing. Being operative refers to concrete operation. It neither divides differentiating units into two eternally fixed kinds of entity nor declares temporarily silent materials false, much less assigns a difference an eternal identity. Once an application is over, a document that previously carried substantial operative weight may

recede into the background. A residence permit may become a gate in a school admission application, yet on days when no application is involved it may change none of the choices at hand. Conversely, a seemingly irrelevant old record will be extracted in a new dispute; a debt may not constrain action while its deadline is distant, but alter the capacity to wait once the deadline approaches. A difference's effects can shift. This does not mean that the difference itself moves back and forth between existence and nonexistence.

Nor does a name guarantee that a difference is operative. Someone may repeatedly emphasize a difference without necessarily being able to bring it into current eligibility, responsibility, or choice; another difference with no formal name may already be changing judgments in social exchanges. Accents, forms of address, and past exchanges often do not appear as explicit rules, yet they may lead to someone being asked an extra question, trusted on one fewer occasion, or placed at a greater distance. Analysis must therefore ask separately whether a difference exists, whether it becomes apparent, whether it is extracted, whether it is adopted, and precisely what kind of consequence it connects to after adoption. These steps cannot substitute for one another. To write “exists” directly as “causes” skips the relations in between; to write “unrecognized” as “without any effect” misses judgments operating out of sight.

II. How Differences Become Apparent from the Background

The background is not empty of differences. A residence permit lies in a drawer, a debt deadline is not yet approaching, an accent blends into everyday speech: they simply have not yet become central to the relations at hand. These materials need not be constantly brought to mind, but at a particular moment they may be requested, asked about, or noticed by those involved, changing the direction of conversation and handling. When someone applies for school admission, a residence permit, a rental contract, and other materials become apparent; as a repayment date approaches, the debt deadline becomes urgent. When a difference becomes apparent, an existing difference acquires a position within events and relations in which it can be handled. This process does not create the difference out of nothing. It makes what was previously set aside into something that must now be answered, supplemented, or explained.

Differences do not become apparent at the same speed or over the same range. Deadlines, disputes, applications, rituals, and negotiations bring different materials to the center; without these triggers, existing differences may remain in the background. Some differences become apparent as soon as a checklist appears; others become clear only when someone raises a question, refuses to take something up, or demands proof. The background is a difference's position within current relations, not an abstract warehouse containing everything. A single event brings only some materials into view while others remain obscured. In a school admission application, a residence permit and contract may become central, while an accent and records of weddings and funerals may not enter at all. This does not mean that the latter two are unreal, only that they have not yet connected to the handling of this particular relation.

Becoming apparent does not mean immediately acquiring greater weight. A reviewer may see an item of material yet decide that it does not meet the rules; an applicant may bring materials that cannot be used because of time, available places, or other conditions. After a difference moves from the background into view, it must still pass through extraction, use, and connection to consequences before it can change a position. Being seen opens a possibility; it does not mean a judgment has already been completed. Nor do participants in the same event have access to exactly the same materials. Who holds existing differences such as contracts and deadlines, and whether these can be explained and preserved, affect the range over which they become apparent. The event itself does not automatically illuminate everything. Different informational and procedural positions may mean that different materials enter subsequent handling.

III. How Differences Are Extracted and Used

Being seen, being extracted, being used, and gaining public recognition are four distinct steps. School reviewers check materials, workplace managers handle attendance, participants in procedures examine evidence, and relatives look back through old records during their exchanges. These are all ways in which specific participants extract differences. A difference does not leap into the center of judgment on its own; it must enter the handling of a matter through questioning, checking, recollection, retelling, or recording. Extraction always has a scope. A reviewer will not put everything a person has experienced onto a checklist, nor will relatives revisit every old incident during a single exchange. Who has the authority to ask questions, what can be proved, and what materials are recognized as relevant determine which differences can move from the background into judgment. Extraction is itself already a selection: it makes certain things into grounds while leaving others outside those grounds.

A residence permit may be used in reviewing a school admission application; surveillance footage, medical records, contracts, and testimony may be used in judgments about responsibility for a workplace injury. Such uses are sometimes written into rules and sometimes occur at service counters, in interviews, around dining tables, in rental negotiations, and in exchanges among relatives. The former often leave checklists or procedural nodes; the latter may leave no clear trace, yet they can likewise push people toward different answers, periods of waiting, or concessions. When materials are used, they have already entered into a judgment; they are no longer merely lying on the table. A contract may be brought out to establish an employment relationship; a medical record may be consulted to address injury and responsibility; records of wedding and funeral exchanges may be retrieved to weigh those exchanges and the obligations to be fulfilled. The same materials have different uses under different questions. Their consequences cannot be inferred from their names alone.

Some differences have already been extracted and used but have no public name, formal recognition, or legitimate standing. A lack of formal recognition does not mean that they have produced no consequences. Accents, forms of address, past exchanges, and family relations can all change judgments out of sight. When a basis for judgment cannot be stated aloud, those concerned may not know what they should supply or rebut, nor be able to identify where the decision has already been made. Formal recognition brings a difference within the scope of appeal, recording, or contestation; covert use may leave no such position. Both can produce consequences. The difference lies in whether those concerned can see the grounds for judgment, present proof, or demand a response. Thus, analyzing covert use does not mean attributing every adverse outcome to secret rules. It means asking how the grounds were extracted and whether they can be examined.

Extraction may also stop halfway. A contract is found but not recognized as relevant; testimony is heard but not entered into the record; a past exchange is brought up but fails to alter how the matter is handled on the spot. All these indicate a distance between extraction and adoption. Collapsing the two into a single step misses where a difference is set aside, weakened, or reinterpreted.

IV. How Differences Are Assigned Operative Weight

Weight forms within concrete relations, standards of judgment, time pressures, and connections to consequences. It is not a fixed intensity that differentiating units carry by nature. Operative weight means whether a difference can advance, block, or change the handling in this particular judgment; it does not mean that a person is inherently more “important.” The same document may carry great weight in a school admission application yet not be central on days when no application is being made. The same accent may bring closeness among acquaintances but distance in rental dealings or judgments at a service counter. The difference has not changed; the connections between relations and consequences have changed. Treating weight as a fixed essence of the difference makes this shift inexplicable.

How weight enters into consequences depends on who adopts which standards, when a judgment must be made, and what costs missing materials entail. What is at issue here is a difference's actual operative weight in a concrete judgment, not abstract rankings or moral importance. The operative weight of a medical record in a workplace injury dispute comes from whether it can be used to connect the accident, treatment, and responsibility, not from medical records being more valuable in every relation.

Time pressure can change weight, but it is not the only condition. With a generous deadline, the same materials may await correction or supplementation; at a deadline or in a dispute, they may immediately become a gate. The materials exist in either case. Whether they connect to consequences depends on their connections with procedures, relations, and standards of judgment. A deadline makes a gap that could previously be addressed later difficult to ignore, but it does not replace the other conditions. Operative weight also changes through comparison. If other materials can make up for something missing, a missing item need not dominate the outcome; if no alternative proof is available, a previously inconspicuous detail may suddenly become a decisive gate. No difference has mysteriously grown larger. What has changed are the surrounding conditions for taking it up, supplementing or correcting it, and substantiating it.

Being assigned operative weight does not mean that a judgment is already legitimate. Materials specified in rules may be given excessive weight, while the importance attached to accents or forms of address in informal relations may not be publicly defensible. The purpose of analyzing weight is to see clearly what actually constrains choice, not to endorse the operative weight already assigned. Whether something is actually operative and whether it ought to be so are two questions that must not be collapsed into one another.

Weight must therefore be understood within the concrete chain: how it is put forward, by what standards it is amplified, what time limits it encounters, and what consequences it makes possible. Merely saying that a difference is “very important” is still too crude. Only by identifying whom it prevents from waiting, passing through, or receiving support does operative weight acquire content that can be analyzed.

V. How Differences Enter Comparison

Comparison may be written into application checklists, procedures for determining responsibility, or records, or it may remain unspoken. Who has a complete set of materials, who can wait, who has testimony, who is more closely connected to local relations: these judgments may all connect differences to eligibility, order of precedence, credibility, and closeness or distance. Those involved in judgment refer to a range of differences while handling the same matter. What is at issue here is how differences serve as references for one another, not an abstract ranking of people from high to low. In school admission, a residence permit must be considered alongside application materials, available school places, and the deadline; in a workplace injury case, medical records must also connect with contracts, surveillance footage, witnesses, and procedural requirements. Comparison need not be explicitly announced by anyone, yet it changes the operative weight of materials. An item of material that seems sufficient on its own may prove insufficient or crucial when placed among limits on places, timing, and other proof.

Nor do records of weddings and funerals concern only amounts of money. They are considered in relation to past exchanges, family circumstances, and local customs, allowing closeness or distance and responsibility to become apparent anew on specific occasions. Comparison here is often not presented in a formal table, yet it still has references that people can recognize: who attended, who was absent, and who offered a hand in times of difficulty become the background to what is said and arranged on the spot. Comparison brings differences of different kinds onto a common plane of judgment. Whether materials are complete, whether a deadline is approaching, whether testimony can be found, and whether someone is willing to provide support may not be reducible to a single number, yet together they influence how a person is treated. This is precisely the difficulty of comparison: it is not always an explicit calculation, yet it still produces differences in precedence, advance or retreat, and credibility.

Comparison can also yield different results in different hands. Those holding materials, those under time pressure, and those with decision-making authority do not see the same conditions. Who can offer further explanation, which difficulties count as relevant, and which statements can be substantiated all affect judgment. The setting of this mode of reference is not neutral: it makes some differences visible while leaving others outside judgment. Looking only at a checklist may exclude the person's capacity to wait, family support, or difficulties in obtaining proof; talking only of closeness or distance may obscure the person's actual economic and time constraints. Which differences those making judgments place on the same plane of reference, and which they leave outside it, changes the conditions under which the outcome forms.

In examining comparison, we must therefore ask both “What was compared?” and “What was not compared?” Excluded differences may not immediately produce an outcome, yet they may make a later outcome appear a matter of course. Only by laying out the plane of reference can we see clearly how eligibility, responsibility, or closeness and distance have been pieced together.

VI. How Differences Connect to Channels and Responsibility

Actual facts do not turn into eligibility or responsibility on their own. The channels discussed in this chapter include materials, contracts, medical records, records, testimony, procedures, and forms of recognition. Those involved in handling a matter use these forms to bring facts into judgments of eligibility and responsibility. Channels are not the facts themselves. Precisely because facts concern people's lives, we must ask why they can or cannot be brought into a procedure capable of producing eligibility, compensation, permission to take leave, or responsibility.

A residence permit really exists, but it must still enter channels such as school admission review, checklists, application rules, and available school places before it can affect eligibility. The document's power does not lie in the paper itself but in which process it is permitted, required, or refused entry into. Injury, too, is a real fact; surveillance footage, medical records, contracts, testimony, and records do not create the injury. Whether those handling the matter can obtain and use these materials affects how an accident enters a judgment of responsibility and whether responsibility can be traced. This does not mean that without materials there is no injury. It means that obtaining, certifying, and using materials still stand between an injury and its becoming something that can be confirmed and for which a response can be demanded.

The same fact will also have different consequences when it passes through different channels. Complete materials do not necessarily guarantee that responsibility is established, nor do missing materials erase the injury or labor itself. The difference lies in whether procedures can obtain, certify, and use them. The person's capacity to wait, others' testimony, and existing records change the available paths at this step because they affect whether the channels can continue to be maintained. Channels also include handling outside formal procedures. What is said in rental negotiations, whether relatives are willing to step forward, and whether a service counter demands supplementary documents can also lead to certain facts being taken up or set aside. It is usually harder for informal channels to leave clear reasons, but this does not mean they have no consequences. Identifying them still requires returning to concrete questions, refusals, delays, and arrangements, rather than filling gaps with guesses alone.

“Where there is a fact, there is responsibility” does not adequately explain how responsibility forms. Responsibility also involves who is treated as relevant, what relations can be confirmed, what materials suffice to support tracing responsibility, and who has the time to follow this line through to the end. These steps do not deny the facts; they determine whether facts can give rise to consequences that can be demanded of others. When channels are blocked, the additional burden often falls on the lives of those concerned. Waiting for supplementary materials, seeking testimony, explaining repeatedly, and enduring procedural delays all take time and resources. Whether channels are open is therefore no mere technical background outside the consequences: it affects who can wait, who must concede first, and who can keep the matter open to further questioning.

VII. How Differences Change Recognition, Shame, and Distance

Social consequences do not appear only in tables and legal outcomes. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges, cash gifts, forms of address, seating order, accents, and past interactions also change recognition, shame, distance, trust, and the ability to seek help. These consequences may have no single procedural name, yet they bear on how people are greeted, whether they can speak up, and what they are expected to take on. Wedding and funeral occasions bring out again records of who attended in the past, who did not, and who offered a hand in times of difficulty. The amounts of money are not isolated numbers: they connect to relatives' memories, local reputation, and demands of responsibility. Being seen as distant may affect a person's subsequent borrowing, care, or attempts to seek help. “Records” here mean more than a ledger; they also include traces of exchanges that people repeatedly bring up and use to arrange relations.

Accents and forms of address are likewise not merely matters of individual personality. In local exchanges, renting, job seeking, or judgments at service counters, they may change closeness and exclusion. We cannot reduce these experiences to purely subjective feelings, still less erase the real support provided by community relations. Whether a form of address is recognized as appropriate or a way of speaking is seen as approachable may affect whether others are willing to go one step further in explaining something.

Recognition and shame alter action; they cannot be treated merely as inward feelings. Being treated as an insider or outsider affects whether a person dares to speak, whom they can ask for help, and whether others will testify or take on risk. Distance in local relations may also be used again in the next exchange, becoming a difference in whether someone is informed, whether others step forward, or whether the person is believed.

These do indeed have practical consequences, but that does not permit all emotion to be reduced to calculations of interest. Closeness, embarrassment, misgivings, and trust are lived in concrete ways, yet at the same time they change the conditions under which action is possible. To write them only as private psychology is to miss how they connect to care, lending and borrowing, information, and testimony; to write them only as cold resources is also to lose the real shame and injury within relations.

Recognition can also be repaired or rearranged. A new exchange, an occasion on which someone steps forward to provide support, or a fresh explanation of old events may change an existing distance. This does not guarantee everyone an equal opportunity to repair relations. It simply reminds us that analysis should not treat a reputation or form of address at a particular time as an unchangeable essence. What matters remains who is willing to provide support later and which memories are extracted again. Thus, analyzing recognition, shame, and distance requires attention both to their informality and to their actual efficacy. They may leave no entry in an explicit table, yet they can make it harder for someone to explain themselves or find help, or easier for them to be believed. These consequences are not subordinate footnotes to institutional outcomes; they are part of the conditions of action.

VIII. How Differences Change Time and Choice

Debt deadlines, rent due dates, when wages are paid, application deadlines, and recovery time change choices by constricting the capacity to wait. They do not directly command a person to act in a particular way, yet they change the room for refusal, trial and error, rest, and exit. Time is not a neutral background. Whether different people can sustain themselves through the same period of waiting is itself a link in the chain of consequences. Repayment in three days and repayment in three years are different situations. As a deadline approaches, work, borrowing, medical care, marriage, and rest may all be reordered. Differences lie not only in the amount of debt but also in the deadline, whether negotiation is possible, whether someone provides support, and what consequences postponement would entail. Together, these conditions determine whether a person has time to look for another path.

Time pressure does not mechanically determine action. Under pressure, people may still obtain family support, a postponement, negotiation, or new income. But these forms of support are themselves part of the chain of consequences; the pressure of a deadline must not be erased by appeals to abstract freedom of choice. Being able to negotiate, having someone temporarily advance the money, and being able to wait for the next payment of income are not conditions everyone possesses equally.

When time enters into consequences, it often specifically changes the order of actions. Those who can wait can supply additional materials, look for work, or reject unfavorable terms; those who cannot afford to wait may deal with the immediate deadline first and bear the subsequent costs. This does not make people appendages of a countdown. It explains how the width of available exits becomes a perceptible difference through time. Deadlines also change the operative weight of other differentiating units: a residence permit or contract that could ordinarily be supplied at leisure may become a gap that cannot be bridged before the deadline; testimony that could otherwise be awaited may not be obtainable in time when urgent handling is required. Time does not replace materials and procedures, but it changes whether they can still be used in time.

The cost of waiting is not reckoned by the calendar alone. It may prevent people from working, moving, or resting, or force them to explain repeatedly and run from place to place. Some can bear it; others cannot. In analyzing choice, formally listing a number of paths is not enough. We must also ask how long each requires one to wait, who bears the cost, and which previously available paths close during the wait. Action under time pressure should not lightly be understood as preference. Someone may accept unfavorable terms, suspend treatment, borrow money first, or abandon further questioning because the immediate deadline has already constricted other paths. Understanding this does not prejudge any decision; it places choice back within the time and exits actually available to it.

IX. How Consequences Are Written Back as New Differences

Consequences may settle into new records, new evaluations, and new states of relations, becoming materials for the next round of judgment. Failure to secure school admission may leave gaps in materials and pressure on a family to move; the outcome of a workplace injury determination may leave procedural records; a breach of propriety at a wedding or funeral may leave memories among relatives and a local reputation. Consequences do not always dissipate when an event ends. They may be preserved and await extraction once more.

Once consequences have appeared, analysts must still distinguish three levels: the direct effect, the formation of write-back, and taking effect again. A refusal may immediately interrupt eligibility: this is the direct effect of the handling. When the result of earlier handling is preserved as a difference that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. Preservation itself does not guarantee future adoption, and subsequent retrieval is not a condition of write-back's first coming into being. Only when later participants identify and extract these contents anew, and decide in light of subsequent relations, rules, and materials whether to interpret them, adopt them, or assign them weight, can the contents of write-back connect again to real consequences. Conflating these three levels misjudges their temporal relations and misrepresents records not yet adopted by subsequent procedures as already exerting a continuing effect.

Write-back means that consequences can become materials for the next round, but this is not fatalism. Misreading the writing back of consequences as the inevitable accumulation of fate occludes the real conditions of preservation, forgetting, and repair. That consequences leave traces does not mean those traces necessarily continue to govern action, nor that all consequences permanently determine people's fate. Administrative outcomes left by procedures, evaluations left by relatives, and silence left by those concerned may all be taken up in later relations, or they may cease to have an effect. Whether a consequence is preserved, by whom, and when it is extracted again determines whether it remains operative. Some records are revoked, forgotten, or no longer adopted; some relations change through new ways of taking them up and carrying them forward. Administrative outcomes may be explained anew in new procedures, and relatives' evaluations may loosen through fresh exchanges. New proof, new ways of taking up and carrying relations forward, or the repair of relations changes how old consequences continue to operate. Even if a trace remains, whether it carries operative weight later still depends on its becoming apparent, being extracted and adopted, and entering comparison anew.

These remaining traces do not mean that the past has sealed off the future. They mean that prior handling has left materials that can be mobilized again, thereby changing the starting point at which differences next become apparent. Materials once requested as supplements, disputes that have occurred, and distances that have formed may lead to certain questions being asked earlier, or to those concerned making preparations earlier.

Thus, to judge whether the contents of write-back can have an effect again, we cannot look only at whether a record exists. We must also ask who holds it, who can obtain it, what relations it is placed within, and whether it is still recognized as relevant. Materials no one looks at anymore and that can no longer enter a procedure, and materials that can be retrieved at any time, both exist, but they do not have the same effect on the next round of action. This brings analysis back to the opening argument: existence does not mean being operative. Yet if we do not ask how traces are preserved and reused, we will also miss why relations later present unequal starting points.

X. The Explanatory Boundaries of Chains of Consequences

Becoming apparent from the background, being extracted and used, acquiring operative weight, entering comparison, connecting to channels, forming consequences, and being written back constitute an analytical path. Reality need not pass through these steps at equal intervals. Their value lies in breaking apart the overhasty statement “differences cause consequences,” making the concrete points that drive consequences visible. Reality may involve leaps, missing steps, parallel paths, or informal handling. A difference may already have created distance without public recognition; some consequences may occur first and be recognized afterward through records and procedures. Sometimes, before materials have been fully checked, misgivings within relations have already changed speech and choice; sometimes a formal outcome has been issued, yet actual recognition has not followed.

Chains of consequences must explain the choices of those responding and the relations among multiple paths. People may wait, refuse, supply further proof, pass materials on, negotiate, or carry something out directly. Different actions lead the same materials toward different consequences. The chain must not be written as an assembly line that advances automatically once a difference appears; every continuation includes an identifiable taking up or interruption. Consequences may also form along parallel paths. A family handles unpaid wages and care at the same time, schools and hospitals each require materials, and local relations provide or refuse support. Parallel operation does not mean that all paths are equally important. We must still examine which first connects to deadlines, eligibility, responsibility, or resources, and how it affects other paths. Such analysis preserves the plurality of events without turning plurality into an inability to judge.

When reexamining a chain of consequences, we must retain the links that failed to form. If materials were not received, passed on, or recognized at some point, the interruption itself was part of the judgment at that time; conjecture cannot fill it in to make a complete causal account. New evidence that appears later may establish a separate connection, but it cannot erase the fact that the original judgment lacked an intermediary link when it formed. A chain's completeness cannot be measured by its number of links. When a few key nodes suffice to explain the consequences, analysis can draw to a close. Listing many unproven intermediate positions only adds superficial complexity. Completeness means that materials, actions, direction, and consequences can connect, not that more words make an account more reliable.

A chain cannot replace an understanding of specific people's experiences and circumstances. It shows how materials, procedures, and relations connect, but should not reduce shame, fatigue, injury, or hesitation to a few nodes. If analysis is left with nothing but mechanism names, it will once again obscure what those concerned are actually waiting for, losing, or being forced to bear. Likewise, this account does not predetermine that every consequence is caused by a particular kind of covert discrimination or a single institution. Consequences may form through insufficient materials, urgency, distant relations, procedural rules, and other people's choices. We must return to identifiable steps and examine them one by one.

Avoiding crude attribution does not mean denying that informal use and unequal ways of taking up and sustaining relations do in fact occur.

Chains of consequences promise no prediction. Knowing that a difference has become apparent does not justify asserting that it will necessarily connect to eligibility or responsibility; knowing that it has left a trace does not justify asserting that it must govern the next judgment. This framework offers a way of tracing: when an outcome has already appeared or is forming, identify the steps that opened, delayed, or closed a path. A complex society cannot be written as a mechanical assembly line. Differences do not necessarily produce the same consequences merely because they exist or because of a particular rule. Concrete analysis must examine which steps of becoming apparent, extraction and use, comparison, taking up and sustaining, and write-back actually occurred and which did not. Separating these steps is not an attempt to manufacture a tidy model. It prevents the real gates from hiding inside the vague word “difference.”

A single differentiating unit usually cannot explain the full consequences on its own. The questions remain: which differences were extracted in the relational field at hand, and through what materials, relations, and procedures did they connect to actual consequences? Residence permits, contracts, medical records, deadlines, records of exchanges, and accents often enter judgment together in the same event; the full consequences therefore cannot be attributed to any one of them. This chapter only establishes the boundary of single-cause attribution here. It does not go on to develop the mechanisms by which they form configurations with one another.

Chapter 8. Superposition, Occlusion, and Generation among Differentiating Units: How Differences Form Relational Structures

Social analysis cannot stop at a list of differentiating units. It must also trace how, within concrete relations, these differences amplify one another's weight, occlude one another, and form new conditions of difference. School admission for children, compensation for workplace injury, medical insurance reimbursement, care arrangements, and platform employment each appear to present an immediate problem of their own. Yet what actually enters the handling of each is often a set of interrelated differences. Income, debt, residence permits, rental contracts, continuity of social insurance, deadlines, patient accompaniment and care, and records do not automatically arrange themselves into a fixed table. They must be extracted within concrete arrangements before they can change eligibility, responsibility, waiting, and available exits.

I. Differentiating Units Are Not Isolated Points

A single difference is not enough to explain relational structure. Residence permits, contracts, medical records, educational qualifications, years of work, care responsibilities, and overdue status can all be identified, but none produces consequences in isolation within a closed sphere of its own. When they enter the same matter, they connect through materials, procedures, arrangements among relatives, work arrangements, and time limits. Some differences are preserved, some asked about, some adopted, while others remain in the background. Differentiating units can be distinguished, represented, extracted, and brought into consequences; their operative weight and direction still depend on concrete relations. In school admission, a residence permit may become a gate not because the paper carries power of its own, but because it connects with such conditions as the rental contract, application timing, school requirements, and whether the family can supply additional documents.

School admission materials are not equivalent to one another. When a residence permit, a rental contract, and continuity of social insurance enter the same application, the family must also deal with whether its housing is stable, whether time off work is possible, whether transport is affordable, and who will look after the child. Failure to obtain a particular item in time is not necessarily just a last-minute oversight: shifts, commuting, care, and arrangements for expenses may already have squeezed the time for supplying additional documents. Nor does the real existence of materials mean that they are currently eligible to enter the handling of the matter. Someone has control of the materials but may not be able to obtain them within the deadline; someone who has obtained them may be unable to explain their relation to the immediate question; someone able to explain may still face restrictions on format, checking, or adoption. Only when specific participants raise questions, recognize relevance, and leave a position for entry can materials connect to consequences.

The same holds for workplace injury compensation. Injury, contracts, surveillance footage, medical records, and testimony are not unrelated items. What materials can be obtained, who can testify, and when a procedure requires supplementation all affect whether responsibility can be traced. Analysis does not consist in listing the names of materials. It asks how they enter the same handling process, how people use them, and where they lose a position from which to serve as grounds. Relational structure is neither a juxtaposition of material names nor a fixed framework completed in advance. Relatives, schools, medical processes, residence registration, platforms, and credit records may all preserve or process differences, but connections form in the

course of handling only as concrete people check, explain, refuse, wait, accompany and care for patients, arrange shifts, or take matters up and carry them forward.

II. Superposition Is Not Simple Addition

Superposition does not mean an increase in the number of differences, nor does it mean putting several difficulties together to obtain a larger total. It occurs within the same relational arrangement: one difference changes another's operative weight, visibility, and path to consequences. When limited income, debt falling due, increased care responsibilities, and less time to wait enter arrangements for daily life at the same time, none continues to operate solely in its previous way.

Medical insurance reimbursement reveals this relation. Filing, referrals, and hospital level bear on whether information can be obtained and handling can continue; advance payments, family savings, and the wait for reimbursement bear on whether expenses can be borne in advance; accompanying and caring for a patient, leave, transport, and treatment arrangements bear on whether time can be freed up. An arrangement for a medical visit connects them, and their respective availability for use changes accordingly. A change in one condition may alter whether others can be used. If filing or referral fails to connect, prepared materials and the reimbursement originally expected may not immediately enter processing; if no one can be arranged to accompany and care for the patient, transport and the timing of medical care are no longer merely matters of an itinerary. Conversely, timely access to information, temporary support in meeting costs, or arrangements for leave may also buffer the original constraints.

Different pressures may also appear in succession within the same arrangement. At the start of treatment, the problem may be information and referral; during the wait for reimbursement, it shifts to advance payments and income; as the time spent accompanying and caring for the patient lengthens, shifts and transport come to the center. These changes do not constitute a fixed chain, nor do information, cash, and time necessarily become obstacles at the same moment. Some people first face informational problems with filing and referral, and only later face advance payments and the wait for reimbursement; others can temporarily cover the costs but lose the time needed to complete the arrangements because of the time spent accompanying and caring for the patient and taking leave. Conditions change one another's operative weight anew at different steps. Analysis of superposition must therefore trace when each condition is connected and how it changes the usability of other conditions.

Income and debt likewise cannot be considered apart from relations. As a debt deadline approaches, whether income can be freed up, whether one can wait for the next wage payment, and whether transport or advance costs can be paid enter choice together with care arrangements. Debt, income, and care do not propel one another on their own; concrete arrangements for living connect them. Superposition also changes visibility. Commuting, shifts, and leave, which are not ordinarily central, may become crucial when care responsibilities arise; contracts, residence permits, or continuity of social insurance that could ordinarily wait may become gates at an application deadline or a change of work. The change is not that a differentiating unit acquires permanent power, but that it connects to new consequences in this particular relation. Income, debt, deadlines, and care therefore cannot be added into an abstract degree of difficulty. Superposition must identify how information, expenses, and time jointly change whether a path can be followed through within concrete arrangements. It must also preserve the countervailing conditions under which relations may provide support or a buffer.

Superposition also requires distinguishing simultaneous existence from mutual weight assignment. Insufficient income and illness or pain may occur at the same time, but only when treatment expenses, time

when work stops, or care arrangements connect the two does a traceable relation of weight amplification form. Without such intermediary links, analysts can retain only their juxtaposition; they cannot write co-occurrence directly as causation.

Superposition can form relatively stable patterns on different timescales. Rent deadlines and delayed wages may connect within days; credit within a family and local reputation accumulate over years; national memory may be preserved across generations. If repeated events show family care, income, housing, and education affecting one another, a long-term judgment can be proposed. But different timescales cannot be compressed onto the same plane, nor does stability mean fixed weight. Institutional change, migration, and changes in the direction of relations may still break existing superposition; analysis must preserve the timing of formation and of taking effect again. Long-term superposition may lead people to form expectations and adjust their actions in advance. Repeated wage arrears make a family afraid to take on new debt; staff alter how they accept cases because of past review results; members become more alert to boundaries because of memories of shared harm. Expectations are not an abstract structure acting on its own. They arise as concrete people preserve and extract the ways matters were handled in the past and use them in current decisions.

III. How One Difference Amplifies the Weight of Another

One difference does not amplify another's weight on its own. Weight amplification occurs within concrete handling and arrangements for living: it is through what people must complete, supplement, or wait for within limited time that differences alter one another's operative weight. Weight amplification also requires distinguishing conditions that already exist from conditions actually adopted. Years of work may exist within past experience, yet connect to eligibility only through proof, checking, and application. Care responsibilities, too, may have existed for a long time, yet change the operative weight of a decision only when shifts change or leave is restricted. This distinction prevents weight amplification from being written as an automatic chain reaction among differences.

Weight amplification in occupational qualification comes from application and work arrangements. Educational qualifications, training fees, years of work, application timing, and qualification certificates are not the same kind of material, yet they may constrain an application together. Fees affect whether someone can attend training; training time may conflict with shifts and care; years of work require proof that can be adopted. A particular gap may not determine the outcome on its own, yet may prevent other conditions already met from connecting to job requirements. Nor are care responsibilities a fixed burden. When people pick someone up or drop them off, accompany someone, or attend to family matters, shifts, commuting, leave, and income stability may be pushed to the center. If work arrangements change, someone takes on the care, or deadlines are adjusted, the original weight amplification may cease to operate or be compensated for. Analysis of weight amplification must preserve these changes in relations; it cannot write any one difference as a permanent cause.

The consequences of weight amplification are not confined to exclusion. Some arrangements make a qualification easier to substantiate, allow leave to be recognized, or make time available for care to continue. The key is not to equate weight amplification with oppression in advance, but to ask which change within relations makes another difference heavier, lighter, or more usable. Once a school disciplinary record is preserved, it may be extracted again in later evaluations. But whether it is adopted, whether new explanations are allowed, and whether later changes enter the handling still depend on specific participants and relational arrangements. A record does not expand into fate on its own; only when reconnected to evaluation and handling can it change subsequent operative weight. These conditions cannot be reduced to a single cause.

Analyzing weight amplification means examining how a range of differences change one another's usability within the same relation, rather than attaching a fixed label to a person by adding several conditions together.

Relations of superposition first require identifying direction. Wage arrears may amplify the weight of a debt deadline, and that deadline may reduce the ability to change jobs; but a job change may also bring new income and, in turn, ease the debt. The presence of pulls among differences does not mean that they always act in the same direction. Analysis must specify whose handling increases a difference's weight and which consequence in turn changes another difference. Relations among differences may also be asymmetric. A change in A's income can alter B's care arrangements, while B's choices about care may not alter A's work with the same force; format requirements from higher levels can constrain handling at lower levels, while objections from lower levels may lack an upward channel. Symmetrical names cannot substitute for actual differences in direction, authority, and consequences.

Analysis of superposition must also preserve actors' responses. People may actively separate pressures, seek alternative materials, change relations, or reject existing evaluations; these actions loosen differences that had been amplifying one another's weight. Recognizing the capacity to respond does not mean that will determines outcomes. It places people's choices back within available resources, authority, and relational conditions.

IV. Occlusion Is Not Disappearance

Occlusion does not mean that a difference disappears, nor does it make an occluded difference false. It means that certain differences are downweighted or excluded in current judgment, explanation, or procedure, or lose a position from which to enter as grounds. Occluded differences may remain in life; they simply are not adequately seen in the handling at hand.

Occlusion may occur when a checklist of materials is the sole basis for judgment. What can be entered into a table, preserved, and checked more readily becomes grounds; accompanying and caring for a patient, running from place to place, changing shifts, commuting, and the time required to obtain materials may not enter the same judgment if no corresponding position exists for them. Materials still need to be checked. At the same time, we must ask how differences outside the format that already affect action space are downweighted.

Handling an event solely through disciplinary records may likewise retain only the conflict while downweighting subsequent care pressures, repair of relations, and time limits. Moral or cultural accounts that quickly attribute an outcome to insufficient effort, habit, or personal choice may similarly obscure deadlines, expenses, and bodily conditions. Interpreters who adopt a market image may downweight shame, recognition, local standing, and support from relatives. In making judgments, specific participants adopt particular materials, accounts, and points of reference, thereby causing some differences to be occluded; this result cannot be attributed to abstract nouns themselves. The issue is not that every such account is necessarily wrong, but what specific participants extract and downweight, and whether they still allow downweighted contents to re-enter examination.

Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract real differentiating units such as labor, wages, debt, housing, and risk. Class is not a social entity; the limited explanatory capacity formed through this process of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression cannot give the total class image a monopoly on explanation. If circumstances are explained only through the class image, residence registration, continuity of social insurance, care, deadlines, local records, and forms of proof may be downweighted.

Nor does occlusion mean that everything not adopted carries the same operative weight. Some differences need further explanation, checking, or comparison before we can know whether they really changed the handling at hand. But failure to adopt something immediately should not be rewritten as its never having existed. Preserving this boundary is necessary both to avoid treating a checklist as all of reality and to avoid taking any account directly as a conclusion. Different accounts can also correct one another. What a checklist does not include may re-enter handling through new explanations, supplementary materials, or subsequent relations; disciplinary or market accounts that were formerly central may also lose some explanatory force in light of new facts. Occlusion is a situation that requires examination, not an unchangeable endpoint.

Occluded differences may still produce consequences. A procedure's failure to list patient accompaniment and care among its grounds does not mean that such care does not affect access to medical treatment; a market account's omission of commuting does not mean that commuting does not alter shifts; an interpreter's failure to extract residence registration when adopting class theory does not mean that residence registration does not affect school admission. Whether consequences continue must still be checked against concrete relations. Occlusion often causes consequences to be misrepresented as having a single cause. To describe admission difficulties only as incomplete materials may miss the time needed to obtain them and the arrangements for residence; to describe difficulties in obtaining medical care only as insufficient funds may miss referral, patient accompaniment and care, and transport; to describe a work adjustment only as personal choice may miss shifts, care, and leave. Bringing downweighted differences back in does not cancel judgment; it gives judgment a more complete relational basis.

Occlusion also has different sources. Sometimes a difference has simply not yet been raised; sometimes it has been raised but is downweighted by format or authority; sometimes it temporarily loses its voice because another judgment with high weight takes the foreground. None of these three situations means that the difference has disappeared. Their conditions for repair differ in terms of materials, carriers, and procedures. To call all occlusion the same kind of oppression loses distinctions that can be acted on. A difference may also be occluded because a position at which handling occurs lacks the capacity, rather than because of deliberate exclusion. Staff may lack authority to read materials, a family may have no one able to present proof, or data formats may fail to connect; any of these can prevent adoption. In judging responsibility, deliberate refusal, insufficient resources, lack of authority, and procedural restrictions must be distinguished. Motives cannot be inferred directly from outcomes.

Nor does lifting occlusion guarantee that a difference immediately acquires high weight. New witnesses, materials, or objections may merely make the question visible again; certification, comparison, and judgment of responsibility must still follow. To describe a matter being raised again as though a conclusion has already been overturned is once again to skip weight assignment and connection.

V. How New Relations Generate New Differentiating Units

Generation does not mean manufacturing differences at will, nor does it mean subjectively constructing the world. When specific participants, through new institutions, methods of recording, ways of life, and channels of interaction, require, preserve, extract, and transmit certain differences, what was not central before may become new differences bearing on proof, eligibility, or responsibility, or new temporal nodes. Generation depends on record formats, channels of preservation, and subsequent handling; it cannot occur out of nothing.

Within medical processes, filing, referral, the place of insurance enrollment, hospital level, advance payments, and patient accompaniment and care acquire new positions in which they can be handled. When these are used to determine reimbursement, leave, care, and the bearing of costs, they become differences that

can subsequently be preserved, checked, and contested. They acquire new ways of being used within relations; they are not new social atoms. Residence registration and school administration also change the shape of differences. Once residence permits, rental contracts, continuity of social insurance, admission materials, records of school activities, disciplinary records, and comprehensive evaluations are preserved and connected to application, administration, or school transfer, they may form new gates to eligibility and grounds for evaluation. Specific participants use institutional records to bring certain differences into subsequent handling. This does not mean that institutions determine people's entire circumstances apart from such handling.

In platform employment, records of work assignments, traces of work activity, and online status can be preserved as new proof of work, grounds for responsibility, and temporal nodes. When managers, users, workers, and participants in procedures use these records to arrange work assignments, explanations, appeals, and responsibility, the records thereby acquire operative weight within relations.

New differentiating units may be generated through the handling of relations. A correction or supplementation turns an existing fact of residence into a verifiable difference in eligibility; an evaluation turns absence from care into a matter of credit within the family; preserving a shared experience of harm connects individual experiences to community memory. Generation does not create differences from nothing. Rather, existing experiences acquire new forms of consequences through naming, recording, recognition, and transmission. Generated differentiating units often change subsequent standards of comparison. Once a disciplinary measure forms a record, later participants may use it to judge credit or eligibility; once an instance of shared protection is preserved, members may judge responsibility on that basis. Analysts must trace who establishes the new standards, in which events they are adopted, and whether counterexamples can limit their scope.

Once a record has formed, not all participants can access it in the same way. Some are responsible for preserving it, some have the authority to retrieve it, and some can only offer explanations or request corrections. These differences in position affect whether the record can enter eligibility, responsibility, and evaluation. Generation does not refer to the addition of a name. It means that a difference has acquired a form and a path through which it can be handled later. Generation also changes how people arrange their lives in advance. Knowing that certain contents may be preserved or retrieved, people may prepare materials, maintain records, seek explanations, or adjust how they interact. These responses are not the result of records themselves making demands. They are arrangements people make in anticipation of subsequent handling, and may in turn become new relational conditions.

Credit records preserve overdue status, guarantees, and repayment histories, allowing the past to be extracted again later and possibly used in borrowing, renting, or judgments of responsibility. Who retrieves a record, for what question, and whether new explanations of repayment are accepted still affect the consequences; the record may also obscure the income, deadlines, care, and housing arrangements in place when the debt formed. New records may bring a public response to facts that were previously difficult to explain. They may also make it harder for waiting, commuting, care, and informal ways of taking matters up and carrying them forward to enter judgment when these have not been recorded. Generation therefore cannot be written as institutions or records acting autonomously, nor as a one-way intensification of consequences. We must examine what specific participants preserve and retrieve, and what they leave outside the format.

Preservation does not mean permanent efficacy. Whether medical records, residence registration, school records, traces of activity on platforms, and credit status can be used later still depends on whether they can be obtained, are recognized as relevant, and connect to the new question. Generating a new position in which

something can be handled does not pin the past directly into a conclusion; it allows the past to enter concrete handling again as a possibility.

For newly formed differences to persist across events, they need continued carriers and must remain open to contrary materials. Once eligibility, an evaluation, or a shared memory has formed, it may quickly lose its effect if no one preserves, retrieves, and recognizes it. Only if multiple nodes use it repeatedly can it become a more stable pattern of differentiation. Even then, new eligibility may not be recognized in another procedure, and an existing evaluation may be overturned or rewritten. Stability comes from the continuity of relays; it does not mean that the meaning of what has been generated is permanently fixed.

Generation, as used in this chapter, is therefore a conditional concept. It requires materials to move from one form of handling into another and to acquire traceable consequences at new nodes. Without preservation, forwarding, recognition, or taking up and carrying forward, similar names alone do not warrant a judgment that a new difference has been generated. This keeps superposition, occlusion, and generation within the actual operation of the differentiation network.

VI. Why a List Is Still Not Analysis

A list can only make differences visible; it cannot yet explain how consequences form. Analysis must go further to identify which differences enter the same relation, which are amplified in weight or occluded during handling, and which are preserved as conditions that can be extracted next time. Merely saying that someone simultaneously faces problems of income, debt, care, and materials still tells us nothing about whether these conditions are juxtaposed, amplify one another's weight, occlude one another, or form a new usable position. Nor does it tell us which condition changed another's conditions of use, or when. More importantly, we must establish whose eligibility, responsibility, time, or choices these connections actually changed.

This requires analysis to reach concrete relational paths and gates. The same set of materials may make different demands on analysis at different times. For medical insurance reimbursement, it is not enough to list filing, hospital level, advance payments, patient accompaniment and care, and transport: we must examine how they connect into relational paths of information, cash, and time. During the wait for reimbursement, the question is how expenses and time are coordinated as the process continues. For occupational qualification, it is not enough to list educational qualifications, fees, and years of work: we must examine how they connect to channels of eligibility for applications and jobs. During the qualification application, the question is how proof, training, and deadlines constrain one another. Nor can care responsibilities be treated merely as background: we must examine when they form concrete gates together with shifts, commuting, leave, and the family's taking on responsibilities. In care arrangements, the questions are who actually takes on the care, when leave is taken, and how income is maintained.

"The more differences, the worse the circumstances" cannot substitute for analysis. Differences sometimes amplify one another's weight, but they may also supplement or delay one another, or change visibility. What actually occurs must still be checked against concrete relations, materials, timing, and handling. Superposition, occlusion, and generation require separate questions; they cannot be merged into a single vague name. A list can serve as a point of entry. But if it is merely replaced by a longer list of mechanisms, without specifying concrete connections, handling, and actual consequences, superposition, occlusion, and generation become only new names and still do not amount to analysis.

This also requires analysts to state the limits of their judgments. When materials are insufficient, unrecorded relations cannot be treated as nonexistent; when materials increase, not everything can immediately be treated as equally important. Only by returning to concrete handling can we distinguish conditions that actually

entered into consequences from possibilities that still need checking. If some relations have not been preserved, cannot be accessed, or have not yet entered handling, judgment must provisionally stop at known connections. Concepts cannot be used to fill what has not yet been established with settled conclusions.

Nor can these questions be used to assign people positions in advance. The materials that can be obtained, the responsibilities that can be taken on, and the explanations that can be adopted may all change across relations. Analysis can identify only the connections and constraints that have emerged; it cannot expand one instance of handling into a person's unchanging fate. The same matter can also be analyzed from different points of entry. We can begin with how materials enter a procedure, how time is compressed, or how records change evaluations. But we must ultimately return to whether these points of entry connect within the same relation and whether they change actual consequences. Without this step, analysis falls back into a list whose names alone have changed.

VII. The Analytical Boundaries of Superposition, Occlusion, and Generation

Superposition, occlusion, and generation are not three fixed steps, nor a process through which every event must pass at equally spaced intervals. They ask, respectively: which differences change one another's operative weight and paths to consequences within the same arrangement; which differences are downweighted in current judgment yet may continue to act; and which new records, procedures, and channels of interaction give differences positions in which they can be preserved, extracted, and transmitted. The three mechanisms may operate in parallel, but cannot be merged into an all-encompassing name. They cannot recast society as a static framework: relations may break, change, or be rearranged; records may lose their effect; and new explanations and new ways of taking matters up may reopen paths that were previously closed.

The complexity of relations does not cancel valid judgment. Analysis can still ask which differences an explanation extracts, which consequences it downweights, and whether it can return to concrete materials, relations, and counterexamples for testing. This does not define other concepts fully in advance; it preserves necessary boundaries for the three mechanisms in this chapter. Materials, records, and relations also hold possibilities in the opposite direction: an increase in materials may bring recognition to facts that were previously difficult to explain; relatives' taking on responsibilities may provide an exit or create new responsibilities; and a new procedure may bring some differences into a public response while making others harder to explain. We cannot assume that they always intensify consequences or always alleviate them.

The three mechanisms have explanatory force only if they remain distinguishable. Superposition must explain how existing differences amplify one another's weight; occlusion must explain at which position in handling a difference loses visibility or recognition; generation must explain what actions form new representations and consequences. If every result is summarized as the same network effect, these distinctions cease to function. Once materials show that a classification is inappropriate, the original judgment should be moved to a more suitable mechanism, or we should acknowledge that an adequate explanation is not yet available. A single event may also pass through more than one mechanism in succession: existing differences first amplify one another's weight, one of them is then occluded by a high-weight record, and subsequent handling generates new eligibility or an evaluation. We should not invent another master term to take charge of the entire process. Instead, we must preserve the sequence, transitions, and different carriers, so that each mechanism explains only the part in which it actually participates. If we cannot yet establish the node at which a transition occurs, we should suspend the naming of mechanisms and first preserve the demonstrable changes from before to after.

Whether the three mechanisms hold must be open to rechecking against the grounds on which they formed. A judgment of generation should identify the existing differences, those handling them, and the forms in which they are preserved. A judgment of occlusion should identify where a difference loses expression or recognition. A judgment of superposition must disentangle the various pulls and their directions. Materials that show only an overall result are not yet sufficient to prove that superposition, occlusion, or generation necessarily occurred within it.

Superposition, occlusion, and generation may therefore begin as provisional classifications, but must ultimately be verified and corrected through the actions and consequences in the event. A relation that initially appears to be superposition may later show that one difference is in fact a new form created by the handling of another. A difference thought to have disappeared may merely be occluded by a high-weight record. The same materials are merely juxtaposed in an earlier event, yet may be used by participants to form a new evaluation in a later one. Counterexamples can change judgments about all three mechanisms: new materials may show that apparent superposition was only juxtaposition, that a supposedly occluded difference never actually entered the question at hand, or that a purportedly new differentiating unit is only an old record renamed. Analysts must revise each judgment in light of evidence. They cannot carry a previous mechanism's name straight into a later event, still less dismiss different errors together by invoking "the complexity of relations."

An abundance of visible materials does not mean that the key differences have entered judgment. Repeated copies of the same record may swamp a piece of counterevidence from an independent source. Later participants may also rename existing differences, increasing their public visibility or introducing new responsibilities and classifications of friend and enemy. Analysis must therefore separate the quantity of materials, the independence of sources, and actual efficacy, and check carriers, authority, and consequences before and after a change of name. A changed name does not prove that a relation has changed; an unchanged name does not prove that the relation remains continuous.

The three mechanisms cannot replace concrete investigation. They can only require us to return to existing materials and relations to identify how differences enter together, how they are excluded, and how they acquire new forms of preservation. Without this step, however long the list, it will pull apart problems that are actually connected. Superposition and generation cannot take the place of concrete responsibility. If a difference acquires new operative weight through handling by those who record, review, or organize, analysts must attribute the actions to the corresponding positions. If differences have merely happened to appear at the same time, a relation of generation cannot be invented. The more complex the relations, the more necessary it is to preserve the distinction between links that have been demonstrated and those that remain conjectural.

This examination also requires distinguishing provisional results from fixed conclusions. Materials adopted in one instance of handling may not remain central in another; an explanation not adopted on one occasion may re-enter judgment through new records, relations, or procedures. Mechanism analysis cannot let concepts take the place of events. It must still ask who checks, who explains, who adopts, who takes matters up, and what conditions open or close a path.

Analysis must ultimately return to concrete people's circumstances for action. Only as people make arrangements, refuse, take matters up, and respond amid materials, relations, records, and pressures of time do differences change action space within those activities. The role of analysis is not to draw conclusions about life in advance, but to identify its real gates.

Chapter 9. Why Differences Carry Different Weights: How Weight Forms within Relations

I. Why the Same Difference Carries Different Weights in Different Relations

A difference's existence and its coming to matter in the relation at hand are two different things. The former says only that a certain difference can be identified; the latter concerns whether it is extracted, assigned operative weight, and changes people's circumstances. Nonlocal status exists throughout. When someone buys vegetables at a market, that status may relate only to accent, familiarity, and whether one is a regular customer. What matters more to the stallholder at that moment may be whether one pays, bargains, or comes often. When a child enters school, however, nonlocal status may connect with residence permits, rental contracts, continuity of social insurance, school places, document deadlines, the landlord's cooperation, and the parents' ability to take leave. It no longer manifests only as an accent, but enters the handling of eligibility, deadlines, and supplementary documents. In medical insurance reimbursement, rental registration, or eligibility review, this difference enters relations again through different materials and thresholds. The difference has not become something else. What has changed is how it is extracted and the consequences to which it connects.

The same holds for poverty. In everyday food and clothing, it may appear as economizing; at relatives' weddings and funerals, it connects with cash gifts and the parents' standing; when paying hospital bills, it bears on whether treatment can continue; in a bank loan, it connects with credit and guarantees. When a child moves on to further schooling, poverty also connects with training, accommodation, transport, and waiting for opportunities. These different consequences cannot all be attributed to a fixed power belonging to poverty itself. Its operative weight in each instance must be judged within concrete relations. Accents have no fixed operative weight either. Among people from the same hometown, an accent may bring closeness; in a job interview, it may bring distance; in negotiations over renting, it may change the landlord's expectations; in a local conflict, it may become a marker of exclusion. The same difference can become lighter or heavier. Weight concerns precisely these changes within relations, rather than a ranking of differences that holds forever.

When analyzing a particular identity or status, we must also ask whether it is adopted in this interaction, to what extent, and how it changes the handling together with other available materials. Otherwise, differences between situations can easily be misrepresented as sudden increases or decreases in the difference itself.

In judging these levels, we cannot leap straight from "already seen" to "certain to produce consequences." Someone who notices a difference may treat it only as background. Someone who extracts it may still keep it from becoming decisive because materials are insufficient, its relevance is not recognized, or other conditions impose limits. Only by explaining the grounds at each step can we know why operative weight rises here but may not rise elsewhere. Within the same situation, someone may see a difference yet choose not to adopt it, or adopt it while giving it very little operative weight. Analysis must specify where this turn occurs; otherwise, "differences have an influence" is an empty generalization. The operative weight of the same difference is therefore not determined in advance outside the situation. The scope within which it can be adopted becomes apparent only in concrete judgment.

Judgments of weight must attend to the capacity to bear consequences. The same monetary loss has different consequences for different families because their income buffers, debt deadlines, care responsibilities, and

alternative channels differ. This has nothing to do with people's worth. These conditions must be explained through concrete materials and relations; they cannot be deduced directly from the names of identities or statuses.

Visibility and efficacy must also be distinguished. Readily available numbers, official documents, and public records often stand out more, yet may not change consequences more than care, pain, local recognition, or community responsibilities that are difficult to fit into a format. The visibility of materials is only one condition of extraction. Their actual operative weight still depends on how they are adopted and connected to action space.

II. Weight Is Not a Ranking of People

Weight does not mean that a difference is inherently higher. Nor is it a ranking of people: it does not mean that one person is higher or lower, much less refer to moral worth. Accent, household registration, the set of differentiating units extracted by class theory, gender, and medical records do not carry great weight forever. Whether they enter into consequences depends on whether current relations extract them, give them operative weight, and connect them to concrete handling. Weight is the degree to which a differentiating unit, within concrete relations, is extracted, is assigned operative weight, and affects judgment, channels, responsibility, recognition, risk, time, and choice. This definition does not treat weight as a fixed numerical value carried by a difference itself. It may take the form of thresholds and eligibility, or of responsibility, risk, shame, the capacity to wait, the ability to exit, and the range of choices. The same difference can connect to different consequences in different relations.

A difference not extracted within current relations may remain mere background. Even if it has been seen, it may not actually change circumstances if it has not been given operative weight. Weight therefore does not mean being seen. Being seen, being recognized, being given operative weight, and connecting to consequences are different relations that cannot be collapsed into one. Nor does weight mean a "root cause." It indicates only the strength with which a difference enters consequences in this relation. To declare abstractly, apart from concrete relations, that it is always the weightiest already exceeds the bounds of judging weight.

Treating weight as a label that can be preserved apart from relations readily occludes the conditions of extraction, the grounds of operative weight, and the direction of consequences. If any of these links cannot be explained, the judgment of weight must remain provisional. Such a judgment must therefore explain its grounds, scope, and provisional character: it must specify the handling in question, the materials supporting it, and the kind of consequences affected. Merely saying that a difference is "weighty" without explaining these conditions slips back into an abstract label that conceals rather than explains the actual handling. Whenever the scope, materials, or points of reference adopted by participants change, the original judgment must be checked again. This also requires separating judgments of weight from language that evaluates people. To say that a difference has greater operative weight in a particular handling only explains the consequences of its adoption; it cannot be extended into a judgment of the person's worth, ability, or deserved position.

III. How Differences Gain Weight within Relations

A difference gains weight not because it grows larger on its own, but because specific participants begin to require, adopt, or compare it within relations. We can approach this through several connected points of observation that must not be treated as a fixed process, such as extraction, the assignment of operative weight, comparison, and connection to consequences. The differences participants extract vary with the handling. When buying vegetables at a market, they may extract whether one pays, is a regular customer, or bargains. In admission review, they may extract household registration, residence permits, rental contracts, continuity of social insurance, school places, and document deadlines. When hospital bills are paid, those involved may extract medical insurance status, medical records, balances, reimbursement rates, and the capacity to advance cash. At relatives' weddings and funerals, closeness and distance, records of exchanges, the parents' standing, past dealings, and attendance may also enter judgment.

Extraction, however, does not mean that operative weight has already been assigned. Consequences cannot be inferred directly from the mere existence of a differentiating unit, and handling does not always begin with complete materials and proceed in sequence. Some differences are merely seen, some become decisive, some are seen but not recognized, and some are recognized yet lack sufficient operative weight. Existing medical records may carry insufficient operative weight if they do not meet reimbursement or compensation requirements. An accent can bring closeness at a gathering of people from the same hometown, yet create distance in an interview. In some settings among relatives, poverty may bring shame rather than sympathy. Even where a workplace injury has occurred, the operative weight bearing on responsibility may be insufficient without a contract and evidence. Someone may first face time pressure and only then seek medical records, contracts, or available witnesses; alternatively, the materials may already be complete, yet temporarily unable to change the result because they have not been adopted. If analysis mistakes an order of observation for a procedure that reality must necessarily follow, it will miss the concrete nodes at which extracted materials are not adopted, fail to take effect, or are interrupted.

Comparison brings extracted differences into the same handling, giving them concrete positions. Whose materials are more complete, whose social insurance is more continuous, who owns property and who does not, who can wait and who cannot, and who has a local kinship network and who does not may all become objects of comparison. Who gives more or less in cash gifts, who seems more like an insider or an outsider, who has savings and who can only borrow, and who can provide proof and who cannot also change how the handling at hand can proceed; they do not rank people in an eternal hierarchy. Different points of reference may also produce different results in such comparison. The same materials may not be viewed in the same way in different questions. Both the points of reference and the consequences must be recorded to distinguish insufficient materials from a change in their operative weight caused by how they are adopted.

Differences must ultimately connect to consequences: residence permits to school-admission eligibility; medical record documents to reimbursement, leave, and compensation; accents to trust and distance; and debt deadlines to time pressure. Family responsibilities connect to migration and choices of work; savings to the capacity to wait; local kinship networks to available exits, information, and care; and national memory may connect to trust, fear, and community boundaries. The more direct the consequences, the more readily weight rises. But this is only an empirical tendency, neither a fixed formula nor something that can determine weight on its own. We must still ask what other differences are extracted, downweighted, or assigned weight anew at the same time. Someone may first feel the pressure of consequences and only then look back to identify which differences have been treated as grounds. These points of observation are connected but cannot replace

one another. Every link must remain open to examination against materials and consequences, allowing analysis to verify each part rather than supply a prefabricated answer to the circumstances.

Weight may also change repeatedly over time. A record may carry great weight in one application, then temporarily recede into the background once correction or supplementation is complete. Local recognition may provide support in a crisis, only to become a constraint later through conflict. Analysts need to record the conditions under which weight increases, recedes, and increases again, so that a ranking on one occasion is not presented as a permanent hierarchy.

IV. Why the Differentiating Units Extracted by Class Theory Often Carry Weight

The class image readily attracts interpreters because the set of differentiating units extracted by class theory often bears on whether someone can wait, exit, or proceed by trial and error. What must be acknowledged is not class as what society fundamentally is, but the real weight of these differentiating units in many relational fields. Class theory extracts a set of differentiating units whose weights are amplified together within economic relations and relations of labor, property, risk, and domination. It does not extract a single difference. Wealth, labor, resources, domination, risk transfer, the capacity to wait, the capacity for trial and error, and the ability to exit may all belong to this set.

In illness, having or lacking savings changes the path of treatment. For someone without savings, treatment quickly connects with borrowing money, stopping work, reimbursement, pressure from relatives, and debt deadlines. In unemployment, whether a family provides a fallback changes the capacity to wait. Some people can wait a month, three months, or half a year; others face pressure to pay rent and buy food after three days without income. In children's education, property, the capacity to obtain training, access to transport, and time available to spend with a child change the channels. In workplace injury and debt, this set of differentiating units also changes bargaining power, the capacity to wait, and the ability to bear failure. Thus, in circumstances involving wages, unemployment, workplace injury, debt, medical care, housing, and buffers against risk, this set of differentiating units extracted by class theory may indeed press to the fore. In opposing the class image, we cannot write off the differences extracted behind it as irrelevant.

But this acknowledgment cannot be inverted into an assertion of a class entity. What is real and weighty consists of concrete differentiating units and their relations. What is called class is an image formed when class theory subjects a set of these differences to low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming.

This capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope cannot change the basic structure of class theory. Class theory is precisely Model C: total-image subsumption. It is neither Model A nor Model B, nor an ordinary limited model. On the basis of a set of real differentiating units that may carry high weight, it compresses them into a total explanatory image and thereby crowds out or subsumes other explanatory spaces. This is precisely why the class image must be dismantled back into concrete differentiating units, relations, and consequences, and why the image cannot be treated as society itself.

Differences extracted by class theory and compressed into the class image often carry real weight, but this cannot replace checking concrete relations. Unless we go on to ask who adopts property, labor, debt, or risk in what kind of handling, it is easy to mistake the limited explanatory capacity formed through real differentiating units and their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression for the action of an entity itself.

Three levels of distinction must be maintained here. Concrete differentiating units may carry great weight in certain relational fields; this explains only the material source of class theory's explanatory appeal. When

class theory extracts these differences, assigns them weight, connects them, and subjects them to low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming as a class image, it has already organized them into a Model C structure in which the total class image prearranges the explanatory positions of other differences. The class image is only the low-dimensional output of this process; there is no antecedent, safe class image of an ordinarily limited kind. These three levels cannot replace one another. The distinction also prevents another misunderstanding: the weightiness of the differences marked by the image does not mean that class theory has extracted every weighty difference. All relations placed outside the image that nevertheless affect recognition, responsibility, or available exits must re-enter examination. The image's appeal comes from a set of recurrent pressures. The problem is that, from the very formation of the class image, class theory organizes this set of pressures into a Model C structure that prearranges the explanatory positions of other differences.

V. Why No Set of Differences Can Be Presupposed to Carry the Greatest Weight Forever

The set of differentiating units extracted by class theory can carry great weight, but cannot be declared in advance to carry the greatest weight on every occasion. The same low income does not mean the same circumstances. Someone with a local kinship network may be able to borrow money, obtain information, receive care, or have someone introduce them to a job; someone without one may be more isolated. These relations change how the same income conditions enter consequences. Two people whose low-dimensional positions as marked by the class image are similar may nevertheless differ: one has a local fallback and the other does not; one knows local rules and the other does not; one has help caring for older people and children and the other does not. Their structures of weight are not the same.

Boundaries between national communities, memories of war, and religious relations may also outweigh differences in income, employment, and property. Two poor people do not necessarily trust one another simply because they are poor. Language, religion, historical injuries, community memory, and boundaries may change alliances, fear, recognition, and exclusion. Interpreters adopting class theory can extract some resource differences, but this explanation cannot automatically generate trust and community. Locality, language, clan, ethnicity, religion, institutional status, gender, age, medical records, and responsibilities to relatives may all gain weight within certain relations. Listing these differences is not meant to add them to another total table, but to reject the advance designation of a single center of high weight. Judgments of weight must return to concrete relations. They neither deny that differences extracted by class theory may be weighty nor allow that set of differences to subsume other differentiating units that have already changed consequences.

This limitation still allows valid comparison. Every judgment must establish which differences actually change the consequences at hand more strongly, while acknowledging that such comparison is constrained by materials, time, the ways matters are taken up and sustained, and changes in relations. Refusing to presuppose the highest weight does not mean assigning equal weight to all differences. When materials are sufficient, we must still judge which differences more directly change channels, responsibility, waiting, or available exits in the immediate question. But this greater operative weight holds only for this relation and this handling; it cannot be passed off as a permanent overall ranking. Economic, labor, and property differences may be the first to change whether people can wait and exit in some circumstances. That judgment, however, must be supported by the consequences at hand, rather than declared before any comparison. This is precisely why opposition to assigning equal weight to all differences and opposition to a total image can both hold.

Macro-level judgments across events cannot rely solely on high frequency. A difference may recur because the same institution repeatedly extracts it, or simply because the materials are easy to record. We must also

compare whether it actually changes eligibility, risk, or action space, and which counterexamples show no such effect. Frequency is a clue, not sufficient proof of weight.

VI. What Changes When Differences Gain Weight Is Action Space

When a difference gains weight, this is more than another item in an explanation: people's paths may narrow or widen. Once a difference acquires higher weight within concrete relations and connects to consequences, people's channels, responsibility, recognition, shame, waiting, available exits, and choices may all change. When a residence permit gains weight, it may change the channel to school admission; when medical records gain weight, they may change reimbursement, leave, and compensation; when an accent gains weight, it may change trust, distance, and the degree of scrutiny one faces. When a debt deadline gains weight, it changes the ability to wait, resign, rest, or refuse poor-quality work. When family responsibilities gain weight, they change migration, shifts, leave, commuting, and physical wear. When a local kinship network gains weight, it changes information, borrowing, care, and available exits; when national memory gains weight, it may change recognition, vigilance, alliances, and exclusion. These consequences need not occur simultaneously, nor can they be written as a fixed chain.

A person may not immediately be ordered to do anything, yet action space has already changed: some paths open and others close; some choices become costly, some refusals dangerous, and some waiting impossible. Weight therefore cannot serve merely as decoration in an explanation. Analysts must also explain how a difference concretely changes the costs of choice, the bearing of responsibility, and the width of the paths that can be taken.

Analyzing a difference's weight is not meant to fix a person in a position. It is meant to explain what certain choices cost at the time, which support remains available, and which support is already insufficient. Only by making these conditions clear can we understand why the same refusal, waiting, or exit poses different degrees of difficulty for different people.

Channels, waiting, proof, refusal, exit, taking matters up and sustaining them, and available exits are not the same thing. Someone may still have a channel through which to make a demand, yet lack the conditions needed to wait for a reply. Someone may be able to offer proof but have no fallback for bearing failure. Someone may refuse one arrangement but be unable to bear the cost of repeated refusals. Only by separating these can we see how action space concretely contracts or expands. Action space also depends on whether different conditions can be obtained at the same time. The ability to provide proof does not necessarily mean the ability to wait; the ability to wait does not necessarily mean the ability to exit; having a fallback does not necessarily mean that matters will be taken up and sustained for one. No single one of these conditions can therefore substitute for a judgment of the circumstances as a whole. Changes in channels and available exits also affect, in turn, whether people can wait, supply further proof, and bear refusal, so we cannot look only at a single result.

VII. Why Judging Relative Weight Cannot Stop at a List

A list makes differences visible; their relative weight brings circumstances into view. In school admission, one can list household registration, social insurance, rental contracts, residence permits, school places, parents' leave, the landlord's cooperation, and information channels. Yet without knowing which of these outweighs other differences under current rules and at the current temporal node, analysis still stops at the list. The same holds for paying hospital bills: medical records, medical insurance, balances, reimbursement rates, patient accompaniment and care, and transport costs are all present, yet what pushes a family to the edge of borrowing may be its capacity to advance cash at that moment. At relatives' weddings and funerals, records of exchanges, closeness and distance, the parents' standing, past dealings, and attendance enter judgment again. The source of shame still depends on whose evaluation, which past relation, or which absence has acquired greater operative weight.

Listing can tell us only which differentiating units are present. Judging their relative weight requires asking within what relations they are extracted, compared, and assigned weight, and what consequences they thereby connect to. Such judgment does not cancel comparison; it demands more concrete comparison. The multiplicity of differences cannot justify writing them all as equally important, nor can complexity be an excuse for abandoning judgment. Lists and comparison do not exclude one another: a list offers points of entry that can be checked, while comparison must explain when those points of entry actually lead to consequences. Without materials, we should not pretend that comparison is complete; once materials appear, we cannot invoke an earlier provisional judgment to refuse revision.

Valid comparison also requires knowing what is being compared: different materials within the same handling, different ways of taking matters up and sustaining them in similar circumstances, or the effect of the same difference at different temporal nodes. However abundant the materials, unclear objects of comparison cannot yield a reliable conclusion. Retaining a provisional judgment when materials are insufficient is not an abandonment of analysis; it avoids writing the unknown as a fixed position. Comparison yields provisional conclusions that can be questioned, rather than turning materials into unalterable verdicts. If consequences differ from what was expected, we must also return to examine what went wrong in extraction, operative weight, or comparison. The revisability of judgment is not weakness. It is a necessary condition for keeping abstract names from closing comparison in advance.

When several differences gain weight at the same time, weight analysis need not rank one difference above all the rest. It can explain how multiple paths run in parallel, who bears which part of the consequences, and which relations counteract or amplify one another. This differentiation into levels preserves the real structure of an event better than converting all differences into a single total score.

A judgment of weight must leave an argument sufficient for others to understand its grounds. Where materials come from, who extracts them, at which node they act, how far the consequences extend, and what contrary materials still await handling together explain why a difference gains weight. These need not be converted into scores or fitted into a fixed format. What matters is that readers can follow the argument to identify omissions and distinguish operative weight supported by materials from an interpreter's intuitive ranking.

VIII. How Weight Rearranges Other Differences

Once a difference gains weight, the operative weight of other differences may also be rearranged. Without local household registration, if local admission policy lists residence, social insurance, or rental materials among application conditions, the weight of some of these materials may rise; whether the landlord cooperates in producing materials is a living condition faced by the family as it goes through the procedure. Without savings, debt deadlines, dates when wages are credited, and rent dates may also gain weight. Formal institutional requirements and informal conditions for carrying things forward must be understood separately. Greater weight in care responsibilities may amplify the weight of shifts, commuting, and leave rules; incomplete medical records may amplify the weight of the burden of proof, witnesses, surveillance footage, and the capacity to wait; greater weight in local kinship networks may also amplify the weight of local reputation, past relations, forms of address, and cash-gift exchanges. Differences do not propel other differences on their own. Concrete handling and arrangements for living make them alter one another's operative weight within the same relation. Which connections actually occur must still be checked against materials, timing, and concrete relations.

When specific participants increase the operative weight of certain differences in explanation or handling, other differences may be downweighted accordingly. When the class image takes the center in an explanation, ethnicity, locality, religion, the private sphere, language, and rites and customs may be downweighted. When a cultural explanation is central, housing prices, working hours, debt, and institutional eligibility may be downweighted; when a family explanation is central, market pressures, labor institutions, and social security may be downweighted as well. When institutional materials are given very high operative weight, care responsibilities, information asymmetry, bodily conditions, and difficulties in taking leave may lose their position as grounds. Being downweighted does not mean nonexistence; they may continue to produce consequences.

Weight cannot be understood as isolated operative weight. When specific participants increase the operative weight of certain differences within the same handling, whether other differences can be seen, recognized, compared, and connected to consequences may change accordingly. It is when participants adopt certain materials, bring them into comparison, or act on them in handling that they change the opportunities for other differences to enter judgment. This change may come from different points of reference, supplementary materials, the emergence of consequences, or changes in relations of taking up and sustaining. Once conditions of entry have changed, we must still ask who adopted what materials, to what extent, and whether the consequences really changed as a result.

Reconfiguration does not necessarily mean that certain differences are excluded from then on. It means only that, in the handling at hand, participants make less use of certain materials or have not yet connected them to consequences. A difference not adopted on one occasion cannot therefore be declared inoperative, nor can one configuration be written as a permanent structure. Once consequences become apparent or materials are supplemented, the original selections may still be rewritten. Thus, in saying that a difference is downweighted, we should also specify which materials were given priority, which kind of comparison occupied the position, and when the point of entry may need to be reopened. Only then does downweighting avoid rewriting complex relations as yet another abstract verb.

Different nodes may conflict in the weight they assign to the same difference. Medical staff focus on bodily conditions; workplace managers may focus on attendance at work; family members are concerned with income and care. No one side's judgment can automatically substitute for those at other positions. Analysts

must trace what capacity for execution each judgment has, while also preserving the constraints that conflicting materials place on subsequent handling.

Weight is also affected by alternative channels. If a node rejects materials but the person concerned can supply further proof through another procedure, the original constraint may be lighter. If the same record or deadline cuts off all alternative paths, the weight increases. When judging a difference's operative weight, we must examine both the main channel and available exits.

Nor does high weight automatically mean a high degree of responsibility. Materials may be important to a result without those who produce them having authority to decide the consequences. Conversely, staff at the end of a process may carry out an action while remaining constrained by upstream configurations and authorization. Weight explains the strength of a difference's effect; responsibility must still be judged according to action, knowledge, authority, and the capacity to revise.

Weight in intergenerational relations cannot be measured by whether those concerned experienced something directly. Later generations may extract old differences anew through family memory, education, institutional records, and community practices. Only when these carriers give them consequences in the current event do past materials gain weight. Historical weight requires present relays; it is not the past governing the present on its own.

IX. The Boundaries of Judgments of Weight

Analyzing differences' weight reveals their relative weight, but cannot yield a permanent ranking detached from relations. To judge why a difference gains weight at this moment, we must still ask what relations it has entered, who extracted it, under what rules it was assigned weight, what consequences it connects to, and what other differences amplify its weight or downweight it. The same accent can bring closeness among people from the same hometown and distance in an unfamiliar institutional setting. The same poverty can take the form of economizing in daily life and direct pressure in hospitals and at weddings and funerals. These differences have not changed their essence on their own; what has changed is how they enter relations. Differentiating units such as labor, debt, risk, and domination, extracted by class theory and compressed into the class image, may carry great weight in workplace injury and debt, yet cannot automatically explain boundaries between national communities and religious memory. This does not deny their weight. It refuses to treat an image produced by distinction extraction within a limited scope as society itself.

Judgments of weight therefore cannot turn every increase in weight into irreversible fate, nor mistake a temporarily weighty difference for society's fixed substratum. Relations can change, materials can be supplemented, ways of taking matters up and sustaining them can emerge, and previously downweighted differences may re-enter judgment. Counterexamples, supplementary materials, and changes in relations do not interfere with judgments of weight; they are necessary conditions for correcting them. If new materials show that a previously overlooked difference actually changed consequences, or that a previously weighty difference did not act as expected, analysis should revise its judgment rather than defend the previous ranking. This caution neither refuses to explain consequences nor provides an excuse to delay judgment. It prevents the consequences that can currently be explained from being expanded into conclusions about all relations, so that every attribution of greater operative weight can state its grounds, scope, and conditions of refutation, and remain subject to counterevidence from consequences.

The calibration of weight must ultimately be grounded in the retractability of judgments and an honest account of what remains unknown. If materials previously judged central are shown by later comparison not to have entered actual handling, or if different results arose through another path, the operative weight

attributed to them should be reduced. If the core path persistently fails, the conclusion should be withdrawn. Without this condition, weight becomes merely flexible language through which analysts preserve their original account. Likewise, if the materials establish only that a difference was raised but cannot establish how much operative weight it acquired, the conclusion should stop at "possibly relevant" or "still to be checked." Vague claims of high weight cannot conceal insufficient evidence. Reducing the strength of a judgment is itself part of keeping weight constrained by reality.

The responsibility of judging weight is not to assign people positions in advance. It is to explain which differences changed action space within which relations, which were downweighted, and which still need checking. Only by preserving these conditions, countervailing possibilities, and the responsibility of comparison can weight avoid becoming an abstract term of rank once again. It must guard against two errors at once: writing a temporarily weighty difference as the root of everything, and refusing to judge what is currently changing consequences simply because differences are numerous. Weight analysis can maintain an explanation open to examination and correction only between these two errors.

Chapter 10. Relational Fields: How Social Objects Undergo Distinction Extraction, Weight Assignment, and Positioning Anew

I. Begin with Concrete Objects Rather Than Identities

A relational field is not a scene, place, or background. It is the concrete relational state within which an event is already situated and specific participants, drawing on rules that can be invoked, materials, responsibilities, and time constraints, are carrying out distinction extraction, weight assignment, connection, compression, and positioning with respect to social objects.

The relational field itself is not an actor. It is the specific participants within relations who require materials, adopt records, make judgments, assign operative weight, and connect consequences. They may be the people concerned, family members, colleagues, managers, medical staff, service-counter staff, teachers, neighbors, or case investigators. They handle the problem at hand according to rules that can be invoked, materials at hand, and responsibilities they must bear.

Here, "social object" refers to people, groups, institutions, events, or things that enter relations of identification and handling. A social object is not a fixed identity; nor does it constitute what society fundamentally is, complete prior to relations. An object carries many distinguishable differences. Which differences are raised, checked, adopted, and connected to consequences still depends on what problem specific participants are handling.

Even in the same physical place, different participants, rules, materials, or ways of handling matters may form different relational fields. A change of place, however, does not necessarily change the relational field. If the same set of materials, responsibilities, and relations of handling continues, an object will not be handled anew simply because it has moved to another room, counter, or road. Beginning with identity makes it easy to mistake an already formed designation for the object itself. Only by beginning with the concrete object can we see how the designation actually forms.

A person, group, institution, or thing does not first carry a complete, unchanging identity and only then pass through different relations. A person has an occupation, gender, income, household registration, and educational qualifications, as well as bodily conditions, medical history, an accent, debts, kinship relations, a local reputation, past experiences, other people's memories, institutional records, and risk labels. These do not all act at the same moment, much less all enter consequences automatically. A difference's ordinary silence does not mean it does not exist. It may remain in the body or in relatives' memories, be preserved in a record, or simply not yet have been treated by anyone as a problem requiring handling. To understand why a person is trusted, refused, or required to provide proof, we cannot begin by asking what kind of person they really are. We must examine who extracted what within which relations, and what judgments they made on that basis.

This holds not only for people. Groups, institutions, events, and things also reveal different usable differences in different relational fields. With a knife in a kitchen, the person cooking considers its use, sharpness, feel in the hand, material, and ease of handling. These differences bear on whether it can cut vegetables, is comfortable to grip, and is durable. When it is carried through airport security, staff are more likely to check its length, sharpness, capacity to cause harm, and how it is carried, and judge whether it can pass on that basis.

In a criminal case, investigators may examine bloodstains, fingerprints, purchase records, relations involving its holder, and where it appeared; the same knife may then be handled as evidence. Once it is placed in a museum, researchers and managers attend to its age, craftsmanship, provenance, decorative patterns, and historical connections, and it may be classified as a cultural artifact. The knife has not become four knives. What differs is which differences participants adopt and how they connect them to consequences in tool use, security screening, recognition as evidence, or collection and preservation. The object has not become multiple entities. What changes is which differences participants adopt and handle in different relations. People, institutions, and groups should be understood in the same way: no single label can determine all relations. Different participants extract different parts from complex differences and bring them into comparison and handling.

II. Distinction Extraction: Extracting Operative Differences from Potential Differences

Distinction extraction does not manufacture differences out of nothing. Within a relation, specific participants extract certain items from differences that already exist but may not be conspicuous, using them as grounds for judgment. Many differences do not ordinarily change circumstances because no one is currently using them for comparison, handling, or the allocation of responsibility, not because they do not exist. Each instance of distinction extraction has a concrete point of entry: someone submits an application; someone requires materials to be presented; someone checks against existing records; or someone brings a previously unraised difference into discussion during a conflict. Different points of entry bring differences into relations in different ways. The same materials need not be approached through the same question at different points of entry.

Several steps must be distinguished. First, a difference already exists. Second, someone notices it. Third, someone requires materials relating to it. Fourth, a participant accepts the materials. Fifth, the materials are actually adopted as grounds for judgment. Sixth, only then is the difference connected to eligibility, responsibility, risk, channels, or other consequences. These steps cannot replace one another. Being seen does not mean being required; materials being required does not mean they are accepted; acceptance does not mean consequences have already changed.

Body temperature is ordinarily just a bodily condition. It does not usually determine a person's post or generational rank among relatives. In circumstances involving infectious-disease prevention and control, staff, or the managers of schools, hospitals, stations, or communities may require body temperatures, travel histories, contact histories, test records, and records of protective measures, using these to decide whether someone can enter, needs to register or undergo isolation, or requires other arrangements. In this process, body temperature itself acquires no fixed power detached from relations. Someone first notices a risk, someone requires records, and someone accepts or rejects materials under the rules; only then is it connected to entry and exit, care, the bearing of risk, and the handling of responsibility. Merely writing that "body temperature is important" leaves out how distinction extraction occurs, as well as the conditions under which consequences may differ when materials are not adopted.

The same holds for medical history. It may remain a personal experience that others do not necessarily know or need to know. In an insurance claim, those handling it may judge responsibility on the basis of prior medical history, disclosures made when taking out insurance, and examination materials. In a pre-employment medical examination, medical staff and employers may make arrangements according to examination results and job requirements. In determining workplace-injury status, medical records, how the injury occurred, diagnoses, and work records may enter judgments of responsibility and compensation. In

romantic and marital relations, the people concerned may consider medical history in relation to trust, care, and life together. Medical history alone does not determine which consequences it enters. This also depends on who adopts what materials, which rules apply, and what responsibilities they are willing to bear. If materials are insufficient or contradictory, or those handling the matter refuse to adopt them, a medical history, though it exists, may not connect to the consequences originally expected.

Nor can an accent be understood as a permanently operative marker of identity. Among people from the same hometown, someone may use an accent to confirm a sense of familiarity. In a job interview, an interviewer may use it as one point of reference for judging familiarity with local rules. In local conflicts or migration management, someone may use it as a marker of an outsider. At the boundaries of a society of acquaintances, an accent may also affect whether someone is treated as an insider. Ancestral origin, surname, language, and kinship relations may likewise be adopted during war, political campaigns, ethnic conflict, or in an environment of hostility to outsiders as grounds for distinguishing inside from outside, friend from enemy, and reliable from unreliable. The danger of distinction extraction does not lie in differences suddenly becoming false. It lies in specific participants connecting them to exclusion, punishment, or protection and thereby changing other people's action space.

Distinction extraction has clear boundaries for judgment. A difference's having been noticed does not mean it is necessarily operative; the existence of materials does not mean their evidentiary effect is already complete. Who extracted the difference, on the basis of what materials, at which step the materials gained acceptance, and whether they actually entered the handling must still be explained separately. Only by keeping these steps distinct can we avoid misrepresenting "being seen" as "having already determined the consequences."

III. Weight Assignment: Extracted Differences Are Not Equally Important

The extraction of differences does not mean they acquire equal operative weight. Weight assignment means specific participants giving different differentiating units different operative weight within a relation, on the basis of rules that can be invoked, materials, responsibilities, and foreseeable consequences. This operative weight is neither a fixed numerical value that differences carry by nature nor a moral ranking from high to low.

Different participants may give the same difference different operative weight. Someone treats a record as a condition that must first be checked, while someone else gives more attention to the immediate responsibility for care. Someone handles matters under formal rules, while someone else judges according to favors owed among relatives or local memory. These weights can conflict; they cannot be written as a fixed table applicable to every relation.

Within family relations, blood ties, generational rank, care, support for older relatives, unfulfilled obligations, sacrifice, and social standing are often put first. Outside the home, a person may be an employee, trader, teacher, patient, or debtor. At home, their parents may ask whether they have sent money, can care for older family members, have started a family, or have brought shame on the family. These judgments are not necessarily reasonable or fair, yet they may change the responsibilities the person must bear, the support available to them, and whether they can refuse an arrangement. At work, managers and colleagues may adopt job positions, attendance, performance, wages, obedience, the allocation of responsibility, and labor discipline as grounds. Someone with local prestige who fulfills their family responsibilities may still have their arrangements changed at work because of repeated lateness, failure to meet performance standards, or inability to complete tasks. Their local prestige has not disappeared. Rather, attendance and task completion have been given greater operative weight in this handling.

Even within the same handling process, different participants face different responsibilities and therefore need not put the same difference in the same position. In a hospital, doctors must consider the illness and examination results; service-counter staff must consider payment and medical-insurance materials; family members must face signing documents, providing care, and making decisions. Medical records, symptoms, examination results, ability to pay, disclosure of risks, family members' signatures, and medical-insurance eligibility may jointly affect whether treatment can continue, how costs are borne, and how responsibility is divided.

In schools, concrete life must also be converted into materials and eligibility that can be adopted. A family's many years of life in a city do not automatically mean that its child can enter a particular school. A child cared for within the family enters the handling of student registration, classes, grades, discipline, and eligibility at school. Age, student registration, household-registration materials, proof of residence, guardianship qualifications, grades, and disciplinary records may be adopted.

In local society, people may repeatedly adopt accent, local belonging, ancestral relations, exchanges at weddings and funerals, records of keeping one's word, and histories of mutual aid. Wealth does not necessarily bring immediate local recognition, nor does poverty necessarily mean a complete loss of local support. Exchanges, care, favors owed, and reputation not preserved in institutional materials may still affect trust and mutual aid among acquaintances. Weight assignment is not confined to formal institutions. Favors owed and repeatedly mentioned among relatives, old incidents in local society, and colleagues' impressions of a person's reliability may all be given operative weight in concrete judgments. Whether they enter consequences, however, still depends on the people who actually adopt them, the accounts that can be invoked at the time, and whether other materials can counterbalance them.

Formal rules, responsibilities to relatives, and local memory may also conflict with one another. Materials that meet procedural requirements may not eliminate relatives' demands for care; existing local evaluations may not replace checks on formal eligibility. In analyzing these conflicts, we cannot presuppose which side always carries more weight. We must examine which participant is handling what consequences, what responsibilities they are willing to bear, and which rules constrain them. The scope of weight assignment is always provisional. It explains only how certain differences enter real consequences here and now; it cannot turn weight into a numerical value permanently carried by an object. Without specifying participants, materials, rules, and consequences, saying that "a difference carries great weight" is merely an empty label.

IV. Connection: How Differentiating Units with High Weight Affect Consequences within Relations

Connection occurs when participants place differentiating units that have been adopted and given operative weight into other materials, rules, responsibilities, and relations, allowing their effects to extend beyond the original step of handling. A difference's gaining weight does not make consequences occur automatically. Only when relevant responsibilities are recognized, records adopted, procedures actually initiated, or support provided by someone can a relational chain extend further.

In an account book, debt may be no more than an amount owed. In market relations, lenders, borrowers, guarantors, or partners may examine credit, interest, guarantees, and the capacity to fulfill obligations. When a debt cannot be repaid, more than a single transaction is affected; eligibility for future cooperation may also be affected. In legal relations, the people concerned, their representatives, judges, or enforcement personnel adopt IOUs, transfer records, contracts, witnesses, and procedural materials to judge who bears what responsibility, which facts can be recognized, and which obligations must be fulfilled. In family relations,

parents, spouses, and children may consequently recalculate medical expenses, tuition, rent, and everyday spending. In kinship and local relations, whether one borrows and whether one repays may in turn affect social standing, mutual aid, reputation, and future trust. Debt does not transmit itself through the network. Within each relation, specific participants separately take debt, credit, evidence, or reputation as points of reference and connect them to cooperation, responsibility, care, trust, or available exits.

A relational chain is not a straight line laid out in advance. Someone may first cut family spending under repayment pressure and only later seek contracts, transfer records, or witnesses. Or legal proceedings may already have begun before relatives learn of the debt and decide whether to help.

When medical records enter leave applications, reimbursement, insurance, workplace-injury determinations, or compensation lawsuits, they may also connect bodily facts, workplace responsibilities, institutional materials, monetary compensation, family care, and the allocation of risk. Medical records used for leave are not necessarily used for insurance or compensation at the same time: different procedures have different requirements for materials, responsibility, and timing. Where medical records are incomplete, those handling matters may not adopt certain facts about treatment. Where there are gaps in the records, responsibility may be difficult to pursue. Where materials do not meet requirements, experiences of treatment may not enter a channel for compensation.

Insufficient materials, unrecognized responsibilities, records not adopted, or the intervention of supportive relations may all interrupt a relational chain that had seemed likely to extend. Once the person concerned supplements the materials, family members change their decisions, those handling the matter check again, or a new procedure begins, later arrangements may reconnect previously interrupted links. These interruptions, branches, and reconnections are precisely why connection cannot be written as inevitable, one-way causation. Connection may also bring constraints. Once one set of materials is given priority, there may temporarily be no grounds for bringing in other materials; once one responsibility is recognized, difficulties in other relations may be downweighted. Analysis must ask not only how one condition gains weight, but also which conditions have not yet been adopted in this handling, which relations have not yet been connected, and who has not been heard.

V. Compression: Identity Is a Designation for a Complex Configuration of Differentiating Units

People cannot unfold all an object's differences in full every time. Doctors cannot begin diagnosis and treatment with a person's entire family history; workplaces cannot begin every assignment of posts with the entirety of kinship relations; schools cannot incorporate each family's complete life history into the handling of student registration. To deal with problems within limited time, participants often compress a complex configuration of differentiating units into a designation. Compression itself is not an error. It makes limited handling possible, and designations have their convenience and scope of application.

For example, symptoms, medical records, examinations, payments, risks, and treatment plans may be compressed into "patient." Within treatment relations, this allows medical staff, family members, and service-counter staff to attend first to the illness, payments, and care. Yet being called a patient does not erase the person's circumstances as a parent, debtor, tenant, or member of local relations. Job positions, contracts, attendance, performance, wages, and labor discipline may be compressed into "employee" for handling matters of posts, attendance, and labor discipline. This likewise does not erase the person's care responsibilities, illness and pain, pressure from relatives, or available exits.

In other relational fields, debt, repayment, credit, evidence, and the capacity to fulfill obligations may be compressed into "debtor," allowing questions of lending and borrowing, evidence, and fulfillment to be handled. Accent, household registration, length of residence, kinship networks, and local recognition may be compressed into "nonlocal" or "local." Even being called a nonlocal cannot cancel the work, memories, mutual aid, and recognition already formed locally. Job positions, wages, employment, working hours, and production arrangements may also be compressed into "worker."

Compression retains only what has been extracted within the current relational field. When compression begins to occlude, the problem is not the existence of the designation. It is that participants no longer ask on what materials it was formed, to which handling it applies, or which differences capable of changing consequences it has hidden. Once a designation is mistaken for what the object fundamentally is, concrete handling may bypass necessary checks and treat a limited designation for handling as the complete person or their complete social position. It is only an entry point for handling, formed by compressing a complex configuration of differentiating units within a particular relational field. If analysts treat it as the final conclusion, they can no longer see how materials are adopted, how responsibilities are allocated, or which other differences may change circumstances. A designation cannot become what the object fundamentally is.

Designations must also be distinguished from positional consequences. Compression first produces a designation for handling. Only when specific participants use that designation to arrange eligibility, responsibility, trust, exclusion, or care do positional consequences form. The existence of a designation does not mean all consequences have already formed. The same designation may also connect to different consequences in different relational fields: someone called a patient need not face the same responsibilities, channels, or exclusion in all relations.

VI. The Class Image: The Power and Danger of Compressed Projection

Differentiating units extracted by class theory, such as labor, wages, employment, property, debt, risk, and domination, carry real weight. Once adopted by specific participants, these differentiating units may affect whether a person can wait, exit, bear failure, or obtain support. Analysis cannot deny the importance of these differences because it opposes the class image's total subsumption. The designation "worker" can have limited explanatory force when used to analyze factories, wages, labor discipline, and relations of exploitation. It compresses job positions, wages, employment, working hours, and production arrangements onto the same line of analysis, making certain inequalities, forms of domination, and risks visible. Yet a concrete worker may also face family relations, local relations, national memory, language, religion, bodily illness and pain, debt structures, responsibilities to relatives, care for parents, children's school admission, and local reputation. Only when participants adopt these differences in different relational fields can they enter the handling of recognition, responsibility, channels, and available exits. A designation within labor relations cannot cancel these differences in advance or replace checking them one by one. Opposing total-image subsumption does not mean declaring wages, property, debt, and risk unimportant. It requires analysis to return to concrete relations and examine which differences are actually adopted and connected to consequences.

The problem with the class image is not that the set of differences extracted behind it by class theory is unreal. It is that class theory extends the compressed projection formed through this distinction extraction within a limited scope into a total explanation. Class theory is precisely Model C: total-image subsumption. It is neither Model A nor Model B, nor an ordinary limited model. Its ability to extract real differentiating units that may carry high weight does not change this structure.

When analysts make a class designation bear the whole explanation, differences such as care, debt, local reputation, language, religion, national memory, and bodily pain may lose the opportunity to be examined independently within the theory. They have not disappeared. Analysts simply cease to examine, item by item, how specific participants adopt these differences and how that adoption changes consequences. The class image is not an actor that extracts, compresses, or subsumes on its own. It is analysts adopting class theory who perform this theoretical handling.

Returning to concrete relational fields does not mean abandoning judgment or refusing comparison. Analysis must still ask who adopted which differences, on what materials and rules, and to which kinds of consequences they connected them; it must also ask whether the original judgment needs revision when counterexamples arise. In this way, labor, wages, property, debt, and risk retain weight that can be examined, without being gathered into a total image as the sole explanation.

VII. Positioning: Social Position Is a Structure of Consequences, Not a Name

A position is a structure of consequences. When participants extract differences within a relation, give them operative weight, connect relevant conditions, and handle matters using a designation, a person, family, or organization may be placed in an actual position. A position is neither an abstract noun nor a slot occupied by nature.

A designation produces positional consequences only when specific participants use it in handling. The various kinds of consequences cannot all be replaced by an identity designation, nor can they be equated directly with one another. Eligibility concerns whether one can enter school, receive reimbursement, apply, or enter a channel. Responsibility concerns whether one must repay money, sign documents, provide care, fulfill contracts, or bear consequences. Opportunity concerns whether one can find employment, gain promotion, cooperate, form ties through marriage, and gain trust. Exclusion concerns whether one is refused, suspected, isolated, or kept outside. Shame, reputation, punishment, and recognition also have their different consequences. Only by distinguishing these consequences can we see how a position concretely limits or opens up action.

Positional consequences within a concrete position may be inconsistent with one another. Gaining one form of eligibility does not mean having access to all channels; being able to provide proof does not mean having the conditions needed to wait. Being called a patient is more than a change of name: the person may enter treatment, payment, disclosure of risks, care, and the allocation of responsibility. They may gain eligibility for treatment yet be unable to make it all the way through that channel because the conditions for payment, care, or leave are insufficient.

Likewise, bearing one responsibility does not mean other relations have already been explained; gaining recognition in one respect does not necessarily exempt one from responsibilities involving relatives, debt, or care. Being called a debtor is more than a change of name: it may bring consequences involving repayment, debt recovery, law, credit, and reputation. Yet a debtor may bear responsibility for repayment while retaining some support from relatives or local mutual aid. Someone called a nonlocal may encounter eligibility, boundaries, trust, and exclusion in certain relations. They may face boundaries concerning materials for school admission or residence, while also gaining trust through work, neighbors, and people from the same hometown. These inconsistencies are not exceptions to the theory. They are structures of consequences that must be preserved.

Position can neither be reduced to a single scale from high to low nor be recast retrospectively as a fixed identity. Analysis must trace back along the process through which a designation formed: who gave it, on

what materials, within which relational field it is operative, which channels and responsibilities it changed, and which differences have not yet been adopted. Only by reconnecting distinction extraction, weight assignment, connection, and handling can position be kept from slipping into another theory of identity.

VIII. Write-Back: How the Results of Positioning Affect the Next Instance of Distinction Extraction

Write-back means preserving the results of current determinations, records, handling, or actions as differences that can be extracted again in the future and may change subsequent judgment, eligibility, risk, evaluation, and action space. Write-back is not simple archiving, much less a doctrine of predetermined fate. It explains how prior handling leaves materials that later participants can face anew.

Two levels must be distinguished here. When earlier handling leaves records or evaluations that are preserved as differences capable of being extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. Only when later participants identify and extract these contents anew, and decide according to subsequent relations, rules, and materials whether to interpret, adopt, or assign weight to them, can the contents of write-back connect again to real consequences. A record's existence does not mean it will necessarily be adopted; its adoption does not mean it cannot be revised.

If a court records someone as untrustworthy, relevant people may later adopt that record when the person borrows money, cooperates with others, travels, spends, or undergoes workplace evaluation. If a workplace records someone as unstable, managers may interpret their conduct through existing impressions when handling leave requests, considering promotion, or assigning tasks. If a child is labeled a problem student, teachers, classmates, and parents may later use the label to explain the child's words and actions in advance. If someone is locally regarded as not keeping their word, neighbors and relatives may also treat past evaluations as points of reference in wedding and funeral exchanges, borrowing, partnerships, and job introductions. The records, comments, and memories in these examples do not themselves read, decide, or punish people. Later participants extract them anew and place them back into new judgments or the handling of eligibility, trust, or responsibility.

The renewed adoption of old records carries risks. A limited handling in a past relational field may be treated by later participants as a conclusion established in advance, occluding new materials, new actions, and changed relations. If old records simply replace fresh checking, the problem is not the existence of records, but participants' treating a limited judgment as a conclusion requiring no examination. Write-back also preserves the possibility of correction. New medical records, materials supplemented later, sustained actions, changed relations, and newly recognized facts may all cause old evaluations to lose their former operative weight. Checking again does not guarantee that the old judgment will be overturned, but it prevents us from writing write-back as irreversible fate.

A person is not understood from scratch in every relation. Past positioning may settle into files, reputation, memories, prejudices, and expectations of oneself. Later participants may in turn extract these sediments and handle them anew according to new relations. Write-back explains how relational fields not only handle the present but may also make present results conditions for future relations.

IX. From Relational Fields to Differentiation Positions

This chapter does not offer a theory of multiple identities. Such a theory can say that a person is a son at home, an employee at work, and a patient in hospital, but this does not yet explain how those designations produce consequences. Relational-field analysis asks which differences are extracted by whom, how they are given operative weight, how they connect to materials, responsibilities, and channels, how they are compressed into designations, and how handling leaves results that can be adopted again. Multiple relations at the same moment need not fit neatly together. Some materials are being adopted, some relations have not yet been articulated, some responsibilities already press on the present, and some support may still appear later. Relational-field analysis must preserve these inconsistencies and incompletions, because they are the concrete conditions that explain why people can or cannot change their circumstances.

A nonlocal worker may simultaneously be a father, debtor, patient, tenant, someone from the same hometown, workplace employee, a child's guardian, and a member of a kinship network. He does not enter these relations one after another in sequence. Continuity of social insurance, rental materials, and the ability to take leave needed for a child's school admission may simultaneously affect work arrangements, income, debt, care, and local support. Illness may in turn connect medical records, payment, leave, reimbursement, and family responsibilities. Participants' handling in different relational fields may intersect and jointly affect whether he can wait, refuse, supply further proof, migrate, or seek help. These ways of handling matters may also be inconsistent: workplace arrangements, family members' care decisions, schools' requirements for materials, and support from local relations need not point toward the same result. No identity designation can flatten all these relations into one. Nor does this analysis treat multiple relations as a list of identities that can be exhaustively compiled once and for all. Every relation must be brought back to the materials actually adopted at the time, rules that can be invoked, responsibilities that must be borne, and consequences already formed or not yet formed. Only then can we distinguish a designation temporarily useful in handling from one mistakenly elevated into the object's entire position.

The scope of a relational field is constrained by participants' purposes and procedural deadlines. Analysts who track only the first materials to appear may miss care, debt, or community relations raised later. Yet including every possible background would lose the event's boundaries. A sounder approach is to make the current point of entry explicit, expand or narrow it as materials change, and retain the reasons for earlier omissions. Different analysts may choose different points of entry into a relational field, but their choices must be open to mutual checking. As long as each makes the question, materials, timing, and omissions explicit, it is possible to compare which scope better explains the consequences. If a scope can be maintained only by excluding counterexamples, it needs to be redefined. A relational field's objective limits come from the event's relations, not an analyst's declaration.

A relational field is not a static container. The submission of supplementary documents, an objection, a revocation, or a new event may each bring different objects of handling into the same position. Once the relational field changes, the original weights and relational chains can serve only as starting points to be checked; they cannot be carried over directly as new conclusions. Relational fields may also nest within one another. Handling a workplace injury simultaneously involves medical care, labor, family, and debt, but analysts may first trace one of these according to their question and then explain at which positions it connects to other relational fields. Nesting does not mean combining all backgrounds into an infinite scene. It means making explicit how different questions meet at concrete nodes.

The analysis of relational fields concludes here. It concerns how differences undergo distinction extraction, weight assignment, connection, compression, positioning, and write-back anew, and how every step preserves

specific participants, materials, rules, responsibilities, and consequences. It cannot recast multiple forms of handling as an identity, an image, or an abstract noun determining everything in advance.

Chapter 11. Differentiation Positions: How Multiple Weights Combine to Form a Person's Actual Position

The low-dimensional position marked out by the class image can become the dominant pull within a differentiation position in some relational fields, but it is not the person's entire differentiation position. A person's actual position results from multiple sets of differentiating units being extracted, assigned weight, and connected within concrete relations. The low-dimensional position discussed here carries real weight: analysts adopting this position can bring labor, wages, debt, housing, risk, and relations of domination into judgment. But this position cannot replace all of a person's relations in advance, nor can it turn family responsibilities, bodily conditions, local relations, institutional materials, and past records into the same thing.

I. A Position Is Not an Identity Badge

A person may simultaneously be called a worker, father, nonlocal, debtor, patient, tenant, someone from the same hometown, or guardian. Each designation captures certain real relations: worker connects to labor, wages, and employment arrangements; father to responsibilities for care and family expectations; nonlocal involves household registration, accent, length of residence, and local recognition; debtor involves money owed, credit, capacity to fulfill obligations, and deadlines. The question is not whether these designations are true or false, but that any one of them can compress only some relations. Nor need the same designation carry the same operative weight in different relational fields. Wage relations may be raised first when someone changes jobs, yet may not suffice to replace medical records and determinations of responsibility in medical handling. When specific participants invoke care responsibilities through the designation "father," this still does not by itself explain who devotes time to care and who bears its costs. Designations also easily compress distinct responsibilities into interchangeable descriptions. Calling someone a father does not automatically answer which materials are missing for a child's school admission, who provides care, or who can help submit supplementary documents. Calling someone a worker does not automatically answer how wages, working hours, workplace injuries, and changes in work enter family arrangements simultaneously. A designation can be an entry point into analysis; it cannot end analysis in advance.

A nonlocal worker living with his child in a city wants a job that pays more and is closer to where they live. Neither "worker" nor "father," taken alone, adequately explains his predicament. Wages affect rent, rent affects the filing of rental records, filing affects the materials for the child's school admission, and continuity of social insurance also affects admission conditions. Debt, support for aging parents, and wedding and funeral exchanges back home also involve income, time, and local reputation in their respective ways. These relations do not appear in turns; they make demands simultaneously within the same choice. An identity badge offers partial identification. Actual position concerns how relations combine in the present: placing designations side by side still cannot directly establish which channels a person has, what responsibilities they must bear, what they can refuse, how long they can wait, or under what conditions they must bear risk. These consequences depend on whether specific participants adopt the relations captured by the designation and connect them to materials, rules, deadlines, and handling. Emphasizing that a position is not an identity badge neither invents another identity nor requires all designations to be abolished. Analysis cannot stop at a static list of roles. It must keep asking who uses which designation in what relational field, which materials and consequences the designation connects to, and which relations it does not include.

Comparison between positions must especially avoid comparing names alone. Two people both called tenants may face different available exits because their contracts, landlords, incomes, care arrangements, and residential materials differ. Two people both called parents may likewise have different capacities to wait because school procedures and support from relatives differ. A differentiation position is formed through the combination of relational consequences, not the replacement of an identity badge.

II. Differentiation Space: Where Differentiation Positions Form

A differentiation position forms within a scope of relations that allows differences to be compared with one another, acquire operative weight, and connect to consequences. This scope is neither a geographical location nor a container detached from reality. Concrete relations, institutional nodes, rules of evaluation, historical indices, and consequences for action jointly open it up. Only when certain differences enter the same judgment can they be compared in weight and connected to eligibility, responsibility, risk, recognition, or exclusion.

Differentiation space is the relational space in which differentiating units can be represented, compared, assigned weight, and positioned. Such a space presupposes that differences have entered the same set of comparative relations. It neither selects differences nor assigns weight on its own. In practice, hospitals, schools, workplaces, families, reviewers, relatives, or other specific participants extract certain differences within the materials, rules, and relations available to them, bringing those differences into comparison.

A differentiation position, in turn, is the position formed for a person, family, organization, or event within a particular differentiation space. Space explains which differences can potentially be handled together; position explains how they are connected at a particular moment and produce actual consequences for the object. The two must not be conflated: the former is not a physical place, and the latter is not a fixed coordinate.

During insurance claims handling at a hospital, medical records, insurance terms, prior medical history, payment records, diagnostic results, and determinations of responsibility may enter judgment together. In screening job applicants, those responsible may read educational qualifications, age, skills, gaps in employment, former workplaces, bodily conditions, and relations through which recommendations are made. In judgments about courtship and marriage, those involved may also weigh income, housing, debt, family responsibilities, local reputation, and capacity for care together. Materials appearing together does not mean they have equal weight; their operative weight still depends on current relations, materials, and consequences. Nor need the same material be adopted in the same way in all relations. Medical records may be regarded as crucial to one claim, yet a change in the conditions of review may alter how they work. When a recommendation relationship is raised, it still matters who recognizes it and what eligibility and consequences it can connect to. Differentiation space presents the relational conditions under which things can currently be handled together, not a static list.

Differentiation space must also be distinguished from latent differentiation space. The former carries relations among differences already extracted in the present, available for comparison, and currently forming positions. The latter involves reserves of differences not yet extracted by the current relational field but potentially adopted anew in the future. Past medical history, old local grievances, school disciplinary sanctions, debts involving relatives, language differences, and past credit records have not disappeared when they have not entered current judgment. When and by whom they are extracted again still depends on later relational fields and materials.

III. Differentiation Position: An Actual Position Formed by a Five-Layer Structure

A differentiation position is not the sum of multiple identities. It is an actual position jointly formed by the dominant pull, connection chains, the constraint domain, lock-in structures, and write-back sedimentation. These five layers constitute an analytical structure for unpacking how a position forms. They are neither five independent entities nor fixed stages that everyone must pass through in sequence. When one layer stands out, the others may still operate at the same time.

The dominant pull identifies the high-weight relation currently most capable of changing consequences. Connection chains trace how it affects responsibilities, materials, eligibility, channels, and evaluations. The constraint domain shows how these relations narrow or adjust the range of possible action. Lock-in structures explain why the costs of change rise once multiple relations support one another. Write-back sedimentation explains how past determinations are preserved as materials that may be adopted again later.

Take a teacher in a county town. "Teacher" is only a designation. At school, he may face curricula, grades, assessments, parents' expectations, and inspections by higher authorities. Within institutional arrangements, whether his post is on the authorized staffing establishment changes stability and the conditions of handling. Back in the family, expectations of providing support, being considerate, stepping forward, and maintaining stability also affect choices. Acquaintance relations, reputation, and exchanges with relatives in local society may enter judgment as well. Together, these relations form a position that cannot be explained by the name of an occupation alone. When materials are not adopted, connections are interrupted, new supportive relations enter, or past evaluations are checked again, a seemingly firm position may change. The five-layer structure merely shows where changes may occur. It guarantees no particular conclusion and cannot presuppose a fixed sequence of change. The effects of the same support in different relational fields must still be checked anew against specific participants, materials, and conditions of handling. Analysis must explain under what conditions each layer is operating, rather than nail people into a structure.

The formation of a position is not driven by the five layers in succession. When the dominant pull connects to more materials or tighter deadlines, the constraint domain may narrow and existing connections may deepen; when one chain is cut, the strength of a lock-in structure may decline. These interactions between layers allow the formation process to be checked layer by layer, but do not constitute a causal staircase in which one step necessarily leads to the next. When someone seems trapped, only by first identifying the dominant pull currently adopted and then tracing the chains it connects to can we judge the range of action and the relations through which it narrows. Lock-in should be discussed only where multiple relations actually interlock. Before past evaluations enter analysis, we must also establish whether they have been preserved and adopted anew. This order prevents a conspicuous phenomenon from being prematurely treated as the entire cause; it does not force experience into a table. A differentiation position is therefore neither a social rank, a list of factors, nor a name for fate. It requires high-weight differences to be placed back within concrete relations: who presents materials, who adopts records, who gives operative weight under which rules, who thereby gains or loses channels, and who bears the consequences. The five-layer structure serves precisely to prevent a designation from replacing these questions.

Nor can a differentiation position make value choices on someone's behalf. Analysis can explain which relations constrain waiting, exit, or what a person can bear; it cannot infer from this which interests the person will necessarily pursue. How people order family, nation, work, faith, and private life must still be identified from their actual actions and statements, not prearranged by a positional model. Where a judgment of position involves a community, the positions of members must also be distinguished from the community as a whole. Members may bear different responsibilities and preserve different memories; they may also exit or dissent. A

community's name cannot eliminate these differences. A differentiation position can explain only how concrete members are pulled by relations; it cannot generate a unified personality for a community.

IV. Dominant Pull: What Is Holding a Person in Place?

A differentiation position often has a dominant pull within it, but dominance does not mean exclusivity. A difference's current prominence usually relates to the intensity of consequences, deadlines, substitutability, the scope of connections, and the depth of write-back. Operative weight forms through specific participants' adoption of materials, setting of conditions, and handling within relations. It is not an attribute differences carry by nature, still less something concepts determine on their own. A child's school admission may become the dominant pull because registration has a deadline, materials may not be substitutable, and schools or relevant institutions may include continuity of social insurance and rental filings in their review. Debt may also become the dominant pull because repayment deadlines involve credit, relatives' evaluations, negotiations within the family, and later cooperation. These differences carry weight precisely because specific participants handle matters on the basis of materials, rules, and existing relations, bringing the differences into visible consequences.

Returning to the nonlocal worker's choice, low wages are an important problem, but not necessarily the only or strongest pull. When the child's school admission, continuity of social insurance, and rental filing all face deadlines, a new job with higher wages may bring greater risk if it interrupts social insurance. Multiple relations are jointly changing the operative weight of income; this does not mean income has lost its importance. Judging the dominant pull requires more than asking what matters most. We must also ask which conditions make it gain weight now, who adopts it, whether other arrangements can substitute for it, and which connections would loosen if its consequences changed. Such questions acknowledge the existence of other differences and the possibility of their gaining weight again, avoiding the error of making current dominance the whole explanation. Counterexamples return judgments of the dominant pull to the current relational field. If the previously most urgent condition is dealt with, or a previously unnoticed responsibility suddenly connects to consequences, the dominant relation may shift and previously downweighted relations may gain weight again. Operative weight indicates only what more directly changes consequences for action under present materials, deadlines, and conditions of handling. It is neither a ranking of how real responsibilities are nor a hierarchy of value. Conflating the two instead occludes how judgment forms and mistakes current dominance for the whole explanation.

V. Connection Chains: How One Pull Brings a Series of Consequences

The dominant pull does not exist in isolation. Once a nonlocal worker considers changing jobs, social-insurance contributions and personal entitlement records, some materials required for the child's school admission, whether the family stays in the city, rental choices, pressure from rent, debt repayment, and support from relatives may all be affected in turn. Which formal materials are affected still depends on local policy, timing, and the specific matter. These relations form connection chains, expanding an apparently single choice into a question of multiple consequences. But a chain does not propagate on its own. Whether a material is required, a record recognized, or an eligibility issue can be remedied depends on specific participants' adoption and handling. The chain may also break at one point. If the new job maintains social insurance, a risk may diminish. If relatives are willing to share care, time pressure may change. If materials are checked again, an existing judgment need not continue as usual.

The same holds for a debtor who has been ill. Bodily conditions may connect to medical expenses, medical expenses to borrowing from relatives, stopping work to interrupted income, interrupted income to debt deadlines, and then to negotiations within the family and judgments of credit. This is not inevitable causation along a single line, but a pathway along which relations may branch, reconnect, or be cut. A list of identities separates relations; connection chains require us to show how they connect. Merely describing the object as "worker, father, debtor" is still insufficient. We must identify which relation, through which materials and rules, brings another relation into consequences. Only then can the process through which a position forms be examined. Consequences that have already formed must be tracked separately from those that might merely occur. The fact that two relations can conceivably connect is insufficient to write them as necessarily connected. Materials, procedures, participants, and conditions of recognition still stand between them, and each condition may change whether the chain can form; each must be checked. Connection chains require us to see the links and acknowledge their limits. Missing materials, differing rules, participants' refusal, or delays may all prevent a relation from passing through a node, or cause it to branch, reconnect, or break along the way.

VI. Constraint Domain: How Differentiation Positions Limit People's Range of Action

A position explains not only how the object is designated but also what ranges of action are currently possible for that person. A nonlocal worker's change of job may alter social-insurance contributions or personal entitlement records, affecting the child's application where local admission rules require the relevant materials. A move may also change procedural conditions if it affects rental or residential materials. Leave, income, rent, and asserting one's rights belong to consequences involving work and markets; the local relations affected by absence from weddings and funerals belong to informal evaluation. The two cannot be combined into the same institutional rule. Different relations narrow these choices to different degrees; this is not abstract freedom or unfreedom. A constraint domain is not a closed container, much less an absolute prohibition. People may still change jobs, move home, take leave, assert their rights, or return to their hometowns. What differs is the waiting, refusal, costs, risks, and conditions for seeking help that each action entails. Describing constraints as leaving no room at all would erase people's actual efforts to find support, supplement materials, negotiate deadlines, or reorganize relations.

The question of returning home to care for one's father reveals this difference. Deductions from pay for taking leave affect rent and debt, while staying in the city may change relatives' judgments of responsibility. This cannot be reduced either to filial duty versus its neglect or to a choice about income. Different responsibilities, materials, and time conditions make simultaneous demands on action. Analysis should show how these demands constrain one another, without passing moral judgment on the person concerned. Constraints are never equal: someone may be able to bear a temporary loss of income but not a break in the continuity of materials. They may refuse a local demand yet face long-term responses within family relations. Differences in the feasibility of waiting, substitutability, and the allocation of responsibility make apparently similar choices difficult in different ways.

Beyond the feasibility of waiting, substitutability, and the allocation of responsibility, the availability of support is another dimension affecting difficulty. Differences in it give constraint domains different forms. Some people can obtain relatives' help, supplement materials, or negotiate deadlines; others lack these conditions. Similar designations therefore need not yield the same range of action. Even when support is obtained, it may change the difficulty of the action concerned if it carries new deadlines or demands for a response. The analysis of differentiation positions seeks precisely to identify the concrete relations from which these differences arise, rather than attribute them to personal qualities.

A differentiation position indicates how action space is constituted through concrete relations. It does not draw conclusions on people's behalf or decide in advance which choice should be accepted. When conditions loosen, support increases, or materials are corrected or supplemented, the constraint domain can widen. When deadlines approach, responsibilities increase, or access to channels is refused, it may narrow again. These differences of degree cannot be omitted.

VII. Conflict: How Pulls in Different Directions Tear at People

The pressure of a differentiation position often comes not only from one relation carrying too much weight, but from multiple high-weight relations making demands in different directions. Ill parents require care, while the workplace requires punctual attendance. After illness, rest is needed, while debt deadlines demand uninterrupted income. A better job is elsewhere, while a child's school admission requires continuity in materials. Conflict occurs between concrete responsibilities, materials, and time conditions, not only within a person's mind. The attendance and ceremonial cash gifts required for local weddings and funerals may also conflict with rent, debt, and spending on children in urban life. Local relations are not false, and urban pressures are not excuses. Once adopted by different participants, both may produce consequences for the person concerned. Arranging the conflict into a neat either-or choice instead occludes why it is difficult for someone to meet both sides' conditions at once.

Institutional materials and the facts of everyday life may also be inconsistent. Someone may have lived in a city for years, with their children, work, and neighborhood relations all local, yet a specific review may still fail to include all these lived relations if the relevant materials are incomplete. This does not mean life outside the materials does not exist. It means the two have not yet been adopted equally, and conflict thereby enters the position. Conflict analysis must preserve the inconsistency itself. The deadlines of different relations need not be synchronized, participants need not interpret the same material alike, and people able to provide support need not appear at the same moment. Only by refusing to flatten these differences can we avoid writing a differentiation position as a chart that automatically supplies answers. Sometimes conflict does not require an immediate, once-and-for-all choice. Instead, it forces the person concerned to delay, compromise, or reallocate responsibilities between different deadlines. These practices also carry consequences and may be evaluated by later participants as irresponsible, lacking stability, or disregarding personal ties and feelings. If later participants incorporate the person's way of handling matters, delays, compromises, or allocation of responsibility into subsequent evaluations, the results of this handling may become materials for the next round of positioning.

VIII. Occlusion: How High-Weight Designations Deprive Other Differences of a Voice

High-weight designations can make explanation more efficient, but may also deprive other differences of the opportunity to be examined independently. "Worker" can capture labor, wages, employment, domination, and risk. If someone treats this designation as the whole explanation, family responsibilities, local reputation, bodily illness and pain, debt structures, and children's school admission may be downweighted. Likewise, "unfilial," "untrustworthy," or "nonlocal" may rapidly organize judgment, but cannot exhaust the object's position. Designations and images neither occlude nor speak on their own, nor do occluded differences actively fall silent. Occlusion forms only when specific participants, institutions, or analysts adopt a designation, ignore some materials, or relegate some relations to a secondary place. The relevant differences consequently lose the opportunity to be raised separately, checked, and assigned weight. Only by stating this can responsibility be placed back with the people actually handling relations.

For example, quickly treating someone who has not repaid on time as "untrustworthy" may help handle credit risk. But if debt following illness, workplace injuries, unpaid wages, and gaps in protection are not examined, judgment may retain only part of the consequences. Calling someone who does not return home "unfilial" may also occlude labor discipline, debt deadlines, bodily conditions, and the pressures of city life. What a designation captures and what it downweights must both be questioned concretely. A designation can still offer partial identification; the point is that it must not overstep its authority. The analysis of differentiation positions does not require designations to be abolished. It does require that no designation end judgment or replace checking materials and relations before differences with substantial consequences have been examined. Once analysts raise downweighted materials and relations again, the understanding of the existing position may change. This is one condition for avoiding dangerous compression. Beyond everyday designations, analysis may also close off the examination of materials too quickly with an image. If analysts retain only the most conspicuous relation and stop asking about downweighted responsibilities, medical history, local exchanges, or institutional conditions, they may reproduce occlusion. Re-examination does not elevate all differences to equal weight. It refuses to let a designation serve as an exemption from the responsibility to compare.

IX. Lock-In: Why Some People Cannot Move

Differentiation positions form lock-in structures, but lock-in is not a natural fate. A nonlocal worker knows the job is poor yet finds it hard to leave. This may be because continuity of social insurance, a child's school admission, rent, debt, and family spending interlock. A debtor who has been ill needs rest but faces interrupted income, repayment deadlines, borrowing from relatives, medical bills, and job arrangements. A teacher in a county town who wants to leave may also be constrained by a post on the authorized staffing establishment, a mortgage, age, family expectations, and local respectability. Lock-in forms when multiple relations, materials, deadlines, responsibilities, and past records support one another during the same period. No single relation, viewed alone, need suffice to keep someone in place. When several relations demand handling simultaneously, the costs of change may rise and existing channels become harder to adjust. Explanations invoking weakness of character, insufficient will, or moral failure once again occlude the conditions through which the position forms.

Lock-in can loosen. New supportive relations, corrected or supplemented materials, adjusted deadlines, release from debt, changes in work arrangements, or renewed checks of past evaluations may release one of the interlocking connections. They may also open an entry point into handling that previously could not be adjusted. They do not guarantee immediate improvement, but show that lock-in should be understood as a relational structure, not a fixed attribute of the object. "Why some people cannot move" should begin as a question about consequences for action: which channels would action cost them, who must bear what costs, which materials will be adopted anew, which support has not yet appeared, and whether existing arrangements can be corrected or replaced. The lock-in structure can then be examined without erasing the conditions for change. Lock-in also varies in strength. Some relations merely tighten simultaneously for a time; others are harder to loosen because of past records, long-term deadlines, and responsibilities involving multiple parties. Calling all of them "unable to move" erases differences. More precisely, we should identify which connections interlock most tightly and where entry points for adjustment have already appeared.

The stability of differentiation positions also has levels. Some pulls operate only within a single procedure; others persist for years through family, work, and local relations; still others are preserved across generations as historical indices. A difference must not be written as an unchangeable underlying entity merely because it

lasts longer. We must examine which carriers still preserve it, which people can still extract it, and whether new relations give it different operative weight.

X. Write-Back Sedimentation: How Past Positioning Becomes New Differentiating Units

A person is not read from scratch every time. Past determinations, records, evaluations, or exchanges may be preserved as materials for the next judgment. A court record classifying someone as untrustworthy may enter later judgments of credit, and a school's evaluation of a "problem student" may affect teachers' understanding of new behavior. Local reputation may be raised again in wedding and funeral exchanges, borrowing, and cooperation; a workplace's impression of "instability" may affect leave, promotion, and task assignments. Write-back sedimentation does not mean that records, files, reputations, or memories punish or decide on their own. Only when specific participants adopt a record anew, judge on its basis, and connect that judgment to consequences can past positioning exert force in the present. This distinction allows analysis to ask who retrieved what materials, whether the conditions under which they formed were checked, and whether supplementation, presenting a defense, or correction was permitted.

Past positioning becomes a differentiating unit for the next judgment, but should not be treated as forever correct. A leave request, an argument, an unpaid debt, or an absence from a wedding or funeral may all be reinterpreted when entering later judgment. Its background, deadlines, allocation of responsibility, and subsequent changes may all affect how it is adopted. Without renewed checking, sedimentation may prematurely fix an old judgment as a new position. Write-back sedimentation explains the temporal dimension of positions without making history continue automatically. Relations, materials, and participants still mediate between preservation and renewed adoption. These mediating steps may deepen an existing position or provide an entry point for correction. Analysis of differentiation positions must therefore track both how sedimentation forms and when it may be reevaluated. Examining write-back sedimentation also requires more than checking whether materials exist. We must examine how they are preserved, when they are retrieved, whether their original background is retained, and whether the person concerned can offer a different account. These conditions determine whether past positioning is mechanically repeated or checked anew and adopted differently.

XI. Positional Displacement: A Differentiation Position Is Not Fate

Differentiation positions have a sedimentary character, but are not fate. Writing position as fixed fate would nail people into an ontologized classification, repeating the very error this chapter seeks to avoid. Positional displacement does not occur because a name suddenly changes, nor does will bring it about from nothing. It occurs after changes in the relational conditions that originally produced consequences: the conditions of distinction extraction, weight structures, relational connections, and write-back mechanisms. Paying off debt may change credit relations. Once household-registration or residential materials are completed, the channels for a child's school admission may also change. Recognition of a workplace injury and the handling of compensation may change the allocation of responsibility. Sustained local exchanges may weaken old evaluations. Acceptance by a new community may also reduce some of the force of existing positioning. These are only possible paths; they do not promise that every change will bring improvement. Personal wishes can prompt action to seek materials, negotiate relations, or obtain support. Wishes themselves, however, cannot replace social-insurance conditions, debt handling, institutional recognition and adoption, divisions of work among relatives, or renewed checks of past records.

Positional displacement should not be written as an inspirational story, nor is it impossible. What must be established is which relations are loosening, which materials have been supplied, which responsibilities have been reallocated, which old evaluations have lost support, and which new relations are beginning to recognize the object. We must also identify whether these changes have actually connected to consequences. Changes need not be synchronized. A position may move only partially and slowly, bringing new risks. A change in one relation need not immediately release the remaining constraints. A new channel may also bring new responsibilities and reviews, causing previously unadopted materials to enter judgment anew. Completing materials may open only an entry point into a procedure; reduced debt may still leave pressures of care and housing; new recognition may not yet have formed in another relation. Nor do the original differences necessarily disappear after displacement. Reduced debt may leave credit records; changed divisions of work within a family may leave new care responsibilities; the reorganization of relations involving national communities or local society may also preserve old memories. Analysis of displacement therefore cannot exaggerate one change of conditions into a complete reversal at a stroke. It must record together the constraints that loosen, those that remain, and those newly generated. The possibility of positional displacement does not guarantee improvement. Its core requirement is that analysts not naturalize an existing position and keep checking whether the conditions that formed it have changed. Displacement must be understood within the reconfiguration of multiple weights; partial changes must not be used to conceal continuing constraints.

XII. From Differentiation Position to Latent Differentiation Space

Differentiation position concerns relations among differences that have already entered comparison, weight assignment, and positioning in the present. Yet a position may still carry differences that have not become apparent. Medical history, ancestral origin, accent, language, old debts, old evaluations, and past relations need not carry high weight in the current relational field, but may be extracted anew under conditions involving insurance, workplace injuries, courtship and marriage, progression to the next level of schooling, borrowing, partnerships, weddings and funerals, or migration. These differences not currently adopted should not be described as a mysterious essence, nor directly treated as known components of the current position. Whether they gain weight depends on whether paths of preservation exist, whether triggering conditions arise, who can present or adopt the relevant materials, and whether they can connect to new consequences. Analysis of differentiation positions must therefore acknowledge the boundaries of current positioning without cramming every possibility that has not yet appeared into present explanation.

This chapter thus preserves a necessary boundary: relations already compared and positioned within the current differentiation space differ from reserves of differences not yet extracted by the current relational field. The former explain how actual positions are formed; the latter indicate that conditions capable of altering a position may still lie beyond it. Neither can replace the other. This boundary also limits the explanatory scope of the chapter. Differences not yet adopted in current relations cannot be treated directly as causes of present consequences, nor can we conclude that they carry no weight simply because they have not become apparent. Differentiation position can explain how a current position forms. For differences not yet apparent, we can only retain the conditions under which they may be extracted anew.

Chapter 12. Latent Differentiation Space: How Differences Not Yet Extracted Are Preserved and Triggered, and How They Change Positions

A person's differentiation position presents only the relations among differences that have already entered comparison, weight assignment, and positioning in the present. Differences not extracted at this moment do not thereby disappear. A medical history someone has left behind, care and disputes still remembered by a family, materials scattered across institutions, and evaluations sustained among local acquaintances may all become matters at issue again in later concrete relations. Latent differentiation space is neither mysticism nor another mysterious space.

What latent differentiation space preserves is a reserve of differences not yet extracted by the current relational field and not yet brought into the current differentiation space. These differences have not yet produced the direct consequences now at hand, but neither are they a blank with no conditions that can be investigated and nothing that can be explained. Whether they become relevant later depends on who preserved the materials, what event raises a demand for them, which people or institutions retrieve and use them, and whether they can connect to concrete consequences.

This distinction does not divide a person into a present part and a mysterious inner part. Differentiation space and differentiation position concern differences already extracted, assigned weight, and brought into positioning in the present. Latent differentiation space concerns a structure of differences that have not yet entered the current chain of consequences but may be extracted anew after conditions change. Only through preservation, triggering, extraction, weight assignment, and connection can latent differences potentially reorganize an existing differentiation position.

Differences in latent differentiation space must first have traceable conditions in reality. Bodily traces, existing records, relational memories, institutional materials, language habits, or local exchanges can show that a difference already had a basis for preservation or connection. Whether the current event triggers it is a separate question: what demands have specific people made, have materials been retrieved, and can the difference connect to eligibility, responsibility, risk, or consequences for action? Real differences not yet apparent, an event's actual triggering of differences, and an analyst's selection of what to trace on the basis of materials are three levels that must not be conflated.

Analysts have no authority to add contents to latent differentiation space. If a factor has never been raised, and no conditions of preservation, relations carrying it, events that might trigger it, or other supporting materials can be found, it cannot be listed on an ad hoc basis as a cause not yet manifested just to maintain the original conclusion. Newly obtained archival records, objections from those concerned, traces of preservation, or materials from the handling of a matter can support the formation of a new judgment; they cannot be retroactively written into the evidence the analyst already possessed. Latent differentiation space retains conditions in reality that can be extracted, not a storeroom for protecting an original explanation.

I. What Has Become Apparent Is Not Everything That Exists

The pressures a person currently faces often make it seem that the few relations now weighing most heavily constitute their entire situation. A worker from elsewhere living in a city with his child may currently be held by the child's school admission, continuity of social insurance, rental registration, wages, and debt. School admission requires continuity of social insurance, social insurance requires stable work, stable work affects income, and income in turn affects rent and debt repayment. Together these relations constitute his differentiation position at this moment. The pulls already apparent seem complete because family members, the workplace, the school, the landlord, creditors, or relevant institutions are currently using them. People arrange work, residence, school admission, and debt repayment on this basis; only then do these differences connect to the immediate restrictions on action.

But this position does not comprise all the differences that can be extracted in his case. An old injury may remain in bodily sensations and scattered medical materials; documents for the child's progression to the next level of schooling are dispersed among social insurance records, rental registration, school records, and proof of residence; past relations concerning land back home may be remembered in different ways by relatives, neighbors, or acquaintances in the village. Not being treated as the most urgent issues in daily life does not mean these differences no longer exist. Materials and memories not yet retrieved have not directly entered this arrangement and must not be flattened together with current high-weight differences onto a single plane.

In analyzing a present situation, therefore, one must neither treat differences not yet apparent as consequences already taking effect nor exclude them from understanding because they have not yet appeared. The questions are which relations are currently shaping a person's position, and which other preserved differences have not yet been extracted by those relations. The former explain the current differentiation position; the latter define the scope to be traced through latent differentiation space.

With this distinction, analysts are less likely to mistake a temporary state for a stable fate. The position currently drawn together by school admission, social insurance, rent, and debt does exert force, but it may be rearranged by a determination of work-related injury, a review for progression to the next level of schooling, or a land dispute. Change occurs when differences previously outside current handling are extracted and connected to consequences; it does not appear from nowhere.

For family members, this distinction has very practical significance. Choosing not to change jobs now in order to stabilize income does not mean that an old injury, school-admission materials, or relations back home have ceased to be relevant. These differences simply have not been brought to the fore by the present arrangements. If different events arise later, differences previously given less weight may require time, money, care, and residence to be rearranged. When this happens and whether consequences can take shape still depend on concrete conditions.

Nor may analysts, simply because they know that latent differences exist, declare the current position impossible to judge. What current relations are already handling, and which consequences have already fallen on whom, can still be traced clearly. Analysts also need to identify differences not yet brought into these acts of handling and the conditions still missing if those differences are to become relevant.

II. Latent Differentiation Space Is Not a Hidden Essence, but a Structure of Differences That Can Be Extracted

Some differences have been retained through bodily conditions, records, relational memories, institutional materials, language habits, or local reputation, and may therefore be used again in later concrete relations. Latent differentiation space presents precisely this structure of extractable differences. It is neither a hidden essence nor a reference to a true self already concealed within a person; still less does it portray family, locality, or community as a deep force that determines everything from behind the scenes.

The same difference does not automatically have the same meaning in different relations. Before a doctor, an old injury may be a bodily condition; at the workplace, it may be used to describe a prior medical history; in a determination of work-related injury, it may become material for judging responsibility; before family members, it may concern rest, care, and income. Different participants retrieve and handle the same materials in light of different questions. These interpretations are not governed from within by some hidden essence.

Records, too, are only one path by which differences are preserved. Someone has kept diagnostic reports, leave forms, or payment receipts; a school retains enrollment and academic records; relatives remember accounts of care and the division of a family household; local acquaintances retain impressions of exchanges. All these may give later participants materials to inquire into and accounts to compare. Yet bodily pain, accents, work habits, and everyday exchanges that have not been entered into an archive may also be raised anew by specific people in subsequent events.

Latent differentiation space is therefore neither a comprehensive archive nor a collection of every possibility. Analysts need to ask whether a difference has a path of preservation, whether what is preserved suffices for identification, whether someone later has the authority or motive to retrieve it, and whether it can gain recognition once retrieved. Without these conditions, a supposedly latent difference cannot simply be written up as an influence about to occur.

Write-back sedimentation and latent differentiation space must not be conflated either. If past breaches of trust, disciplinary sanctions, or evaluations have already entered subsequent everyday judgments, they already form part of the current differentiation position. Only when those materials are temporarily unused in present relations but may be retrieved anew in a new event do they also raise the question of latent differentiation space. These are not two mutually isolated sets of contents, but a distinction between different states of handling the same differences.

III. Preservation: Why Silent Differences Have Not Disappeared

For silent differences to become apparent again later, someone or some concrete relation must first preserve them. A worker from elsewhere may retain an old injury in bodily pain and restricted movement; it may also leave traces in medical consultations, examinations, the application of medicated plasters, leave requests, or what coworkers saw and heard. Ordinarily, no one may have gathered and organized these materials, but they have not disappeared from the reach of later inquiry simply because the person concerned continues moving goods and going to work.

Materials needed for a child's progression to the next level of schooling are usually retained separately by different institutions and family members. Social insurance contributions are recorded through the relevant institutional systems; rental registration is left by the rental relationship; proof of residence, enrollment information, school notices, and report cards each have their own holders. Ordinarily these materials are

scattered formalities and documents. Only when eligibility is checked may the school or relevant reviewers require parents to bring them into a single process of judgment.

Past relations concerning land back home are often maintained through a different kind of relation of preservation. Old land deeds may be kept by family members, accounts given when the household was divided may be remembered by those who took part, and village officials, neighbors, or relatives have their own impressions of who cared for the elderly and who received more land. These accounts are not necessarily consistent, nor do they necessarily have equal efficacy. Precisely for this reason, later disputes involve who can testify, what materials can be used, and which accounts are accepted.

Preservation does not mean something has already entered current judgment. Bodily pain can be endured by the person concerned, documents can sit at home, relatives' memories can go unmentioned for years, and local evaluations may persist only intermittently among acquaintances. Finding a path of preservation does not entitle analysts to write it up as having already determined present eligibility, responsibility, or circumstances.

Nor does preservation guarantee that something can be extracted later. Materials may be lost, memories may contradict one another, holders may be unwilling to provide them, institutions may not recognize them, and people able to explain what happened may be unable to come forward. Whether a latent difference can survive and whether it suffices for use in later relations are two questions requiring separate judgments. Even if materials remain, only part of their contents may be identifiable, or they may be useful only in one kind of handling. Describing preservation as stable efficacy overlooks the differences between those who preserve, how things are kept, and the rules of use. These differences are precisely the preconditions for whether what is preserved can later translate into consequences.

IV. Triggering: What Conditions Give Silent Differences Greater Weight

Silent differences do not gain weight for no reason. Usually, only when a new event raises a question of eligibility, responsibility, risk, resources, trust, or handling do participants have reason to look back for materials not previously used. A worker from elsewhere may ordinarily experience an old injury only as pain. If he is injured again while moving goods, work is interrupted, his workplace demands an explanation, and his family also needs money for medicine and treatment, a determination of work-related injury may then bring his prior medical history into judgments of responsibility.

In determining whether an injury is work-related, the people involved need to ask when the injury occurred, whether it was connected with work, whether there had been similar injuries before, who was present, and what labor the workplace had assigned. The old injury does not act on its own. Only when medical materials, leave records, coworkers' testimony, and the person's own account are brought into the same procedure can they move from previously silent differences into matters open to discussion.

A review for progression to the next level of schooling also changes the relevance of materials. Social insurance records, rental registration, proof of residence, and report cards ordinarily exist separately; they do not necessarily constitute a family's most direct pressure every day. Only when the application deadline approaches, the school begins checking, and a discontinuity appears in one item do parents, schools, and relevant reviewers bring these materials into judgments about eligibility for further schooling and whether the family stays or leaves.

When land back home is to be requisitioned, compensation distributed, a road built, or land holdings readjusted, relatives may again discuss who received what in the past, who cared for the elderly, and who

took which side in a dispute. These past relations are raised anew because of the present distribution of benefits. Whether they gain weight in that distribution still depends on the specific participants, the existing materials, local rules, and how mediation proceeds.

Triggering is only a condition for making a difference relevant again, not a guarantee that the consequences are settled. Material required for submission may gain recognition, or it may fail to change the outcome because the evidence is insufficient, procedural requirements are not met, or other differences carry greater weight. To write triggering as an inevitable reversal of position is to mistake an analysis of conditions for prophecy. Even after the event occurs, those involved may retrieve only some of the materials or understand them differently from one another. Triggering opens the possibility of renewed handling; it does not remove the checking, disputes, and handling that follow.

V. Extraction: Who Is Requiring These Differences to Become Visible

Doctors, workplace managers, those involved in determining work-related injuries, family members, creditors, schoolteachers, reviewers, relatives, and local mediators each face different questions. It is for these reasons that they request, retrieve, ask about, or use particular materials concerning differences. Latent differences are extracted by these concrete actors in relations; they do not surface by themselves. Only by specifying who extracts them can we understand why they become visible at this moment.

The extraction of an old injury makes this especially clear. A doctor asks about prior injuries to judge a bodily condition. A workplace may use this information to argue that the injury is not recent, and participants in a determination of work-related injury may use it to discuss responsibility. Family members, meanwhile, may demand rest, care, or compensation in light of pain and income. When different people retrieve the same old injury, it enters different judgments and cannot be compressed into a single meaning.

Schools use enrollment and academic records to arrange progression to the next level of schooling. Relevant reviewers check household registration, social insurance, and proof of residence to judge eligibility. Whether landlords cooperate with rental registration affects whether parents can submit materials, while information retained by workplaces about social insurance contributions forms part of the employment relationship. Who holds the materials, who presents them, and through what procedure they are used change their subsequent role; the materials do not gain weight on their own.

When past land relations are extracted, relatives may raise care, financial contributions, or old agreements in dividing property. Village officials may ask about earlier accounts during mediation, neighbors may provide what they saw and heard, and courts will handle the matter according to evidentiary and procedural requirements. Local reputation can influence how others regard someone's account, but it cannot replace judgments about materials within a concrete procedure. The efficacy of different relations of handling must not be conflated in the account.

Extraction carries the questions and purposes of specific participants; it must not be understood as the self-manifestation of abstract differences. Analysts need to ask who raised the question, who holds the materials, who can testify, who has authority to decide whether materials can be adopted, and what rules constrain the final handling. Together these steps determine whether a latent difference can move from silence into visibility. Even if the same group of people all see the materials, their responsibilities and available actions differ, so the materials need not acquire the same weight. Distinguishing the extractors, purposes of use, and authority to act prevents multiple relations from being compressed into the simple statement that "a difference was seen."

VI. Weight Assignment and Connection: How Differences Really Gain Weight

A difference's extraction does not mean that it has already changed a position. Only when assigned high weight and connected to consequences does it really gain weight. Someone seeing or asking about an old injury may result only in a medical consultation or a conversation. Only when those involved connect it to consequences such as responsibility for a work-related injury, compensation, life during a work stoppage, debt deadlines, and family income does it exert a stronger pull on the differentiation position.

The same medical material may lead to different results. If the handling confirms that the injury is work-related, the person concerned may gain channels for treatment, rest, or compensation. If the relevant parties determine that it is a pre-existing illness or the person's old injury, the conditions for claiming compensation may be weakened. What changes the position here is how specific people use materials under rules and connect judgments to consequences that can be implemented, not the materials themselves.

The same applies to the continuity of social insurance, rental registration, and proof of residence for the child. Their being seen does not mean the family's staying or leaving is already decided. Only when schools and the relevant review procedures connect them to eligibility for progression to the next level of schooling, schools in the relevant catchment area, living arrangements, freedom to change jobs, or rental costs may the materials acquire higher weight. Different materials also affect one another: incompleteness in one may limit the efficacy of other conditions.

If relatives' mention of past land relations remains mere casual conversation, it need not change anyone's actual position. Only when these relations are used in judgments about compensation distribution, responsibility for elder care, cooperation among relatives, or future wedding and funeral exchanges, and gain recognition from those concerned, can old affairs become pressures in present relations. Even then, other materials, rules, or relations may counteract them.

Weight is not a fixed numerical value naturally carried by materials. It depends on who is handling what question now, which rules permit use, whether the materials are credible, and whether they can connect to eligibility, responsibility, risk, evaluation, handling, or channels. To write "being seen" directly as "determining the result" skips the most important processes of weight assignment and connection.

VII. Reorganization: How Latent Differences Change Differentiation Positions

Only after latent differences have been preserved, triggered, extracted, and connected to consequences can they potentially reorganize a differentiation position already formed. Reorganization can appear on five interrelated but noninterchangeable levels. This does not mean that all prior relations disappear. At the level of the dominant pull, the worker from elsewhere was originally held mainly by his child's school admission, social insurance, rent, and debt. Only after specific people retrieve the old injury in determining whether it is work-related and, on the basis of materials, rules, and judgments of responsibility, connect it to compensation, life during a work stoppage, or income arrangements can bodily condition, the contract, circumstances at the scene, and workplace responsibility temporarily exert a stronger pull.

Connection chains may also be rewritten. Only when medical personnel, the workplace, and relevant procedures separately handle medical records, leave requests, and what was seen and heard at the scene may these materials connect to income, debt, and family care. Which links are actually adopted still depends on those handling them, the materials, and the rules. One cannot assume in advance that every chain will form.

The constraint domain may widen or narrow. When a work-related injury is recognized, the relevant handling of the matter may open channels for medical care, rest, or compensation. When it is not recognized, stoppage of work, debt, family expenses, and pain may jointly compress choices. Lock-in structures may also form, strengthen, or loosen. If debt after illness, the job, medical expenses, loans from relatives, and care arrangements interlock in concrete handling, leaving the existing arrangements becomes more difficult. Only if those involved confirm new channels for treatment, compensation, or support may the previously interlocking restrictions partly loosen. These consequences need not take shape all at once: they may appear first in income arrangements and gradually affect residence, work, and the division of labor within the family.

Write-back sedimentation, in turn, may leave materials available for later retrieval. A determination of work-related injury, a refusal of compensation, an outcome concerning progression to the next level of schooling, a failed attempt to borrow money, or a local dispute may be recorded, remembered, or made into a basis for later evaluations by those concerned. When these contents are already exerting continuing effects in new relations, they become part of the current differentiation position. Only if temporarily unused may they again constitute a later latent differentiation space. There is no fixed moment for this transition: the same outcome of handling may already be operative in some relations while remaining unextracted material in others. One must therefore return to the concrete relational field to judge whether it is actually producing consequences or merely retaining the conditions for later use.

Passing a review for the child's progression to the next level of schooling may reinforce the family's arrangements for remaining in the city. If the review runs into obstacles, social insurance, renting, work, education, and the division of labor between spouses may all be renegotiated. Once a dispute over land back home arises, the city job has not been canceled, but responsibilities among relatives, past relations, and local evaluations may re-enter certain decisions. None of the five layers is an action accomplished by latent differences themselves. Only when specific people, institutions, or procedures extract materials, assign weight, and connect them to consequences can reorganization occur partially, after a delay, or temporarily; other conditions may also counteract it.

VIII. Why Present Explanations Can Misjudge Future Changes

Looking only at high-weight differences already apparent in the present makes it easy to treat a temporarily formed position as a complete one. When explaining through a class image, analysts may first see labor, wages, resources, employment, and risk, yet underestimate the possibility that ethnicity, locality, language, religion, medical history, and past relations will gain weight in a new relational field. This does not deny the partial explanatory power formed through the relevant real differentiating units and the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them. That capacity does not belong to the class image, nor can it turn class theory into an ordinary limited model.

Different explanations bring different differences into the foreground. State-centered explanations often first handle registration, household registration, law, eligibility, and administrative boundaries, while real communities, responsibilities among relatives, local memory, and long-term interaction may recede. Market-centered explanations readily foreground prices, credit, contracts, and purchasing power, while family care, risks after illness, local reputation, and ceremonial cash-gift exchanges may be underestimated. If one starts from the family, blood ties, support for elderly relatives, familial affection, and social standing may in turn occlude labor discipline, institutional eligibility, debt deadlines, and personal boundaries. All these explanations can grasp some present differences, but they cannot treat what has now been extracted as a permanent account of a person's entire position.

Analysis of latent differentiation space needs to bring temporal conditions back into judgment. Differences not currently used need not remain unimportant forever. Yet before there are paths of preservation, triggering events, extractors, and connections to consequences, they cannot be treated in advance as causes already operating. Remaining sensitive to future change does not mean including every possibility in an explanation. It means investigating which differences already have traceable ways of being preserved, what events may make them relevant, who would raise them in those events, and which concrete consequences they might connect to if adopted. Only by following these conditions can future changes be placed back within concrete relational processes for examination, so that judgments neither close themselves off nor expand arbitrarily.

Present explanations must acknowledge the limits of their perspective, but they cannot use those limits as a reason to abandon judgment. Analysts must explain what has been extracted, what has not yet been extracted, and which materials, events, and handlers might force a judgment to be revised. This is no omniscient perspective; it is simply a way for analysts to avoid compressing the present into the whole of reality.

Within these limits, analysts need to distinguish "not yet apparent" from "completely unknown." For the former, at least some traceable relations of preservation can be identified: what kinds of material remain where, who still knows what happened, and what kinds of event may prompt inquiries into them. The latter lacks sufficient grounds and cannot be filled with arbitrary conjectures merely because the theory acknowledges that society contains differences not yet extracted.

If analysts only add to a list of possibilities without explaining the sources of materials, the conditions of events, and the users, they merely enlarge the zone of vagueness without increasing explanatory power. In analyzing latent differentiation space, analysts must accept stricter limits on themselves: they must not treat unpreserved accounts as evidence, procedures not yet carried out as completed acts of handling, or claims someone might raise as already recognized. At the same time, current high-weight differences must not be played down because latent differences exist. Once a child's school admission, income from work, rent, debt, or bodily condition is exerting concrete pressure, it should be analyzed according to how it has entered into consequences. Only when new materials or a new relational field appear must the original judgment face renewed questioning; it must not be declared invalid in advance.

IX. Latent Differentiation Space Does Not Predict Everything

Analyzing latent differentiation space does not mean predicting everything that will happen, nor saying that all differences are equally likely to gain weight. Whether latent differences can gain weight depends on the existence of a path of preservation, a triggering relational field, an actor carrying out distinction extraction, and the possibility of connecting to consequences. The absence of any one of these four conditions may still prevent an existing difference from entering actual judgment.

For example, even if an old injury exists, without medical materials, coworkers' observations, leave records, or accounts of the work site that can explain the injury, the relevant procedures may have difficulty handling it as a recognized difference bearing on responsibility. The pain is not denied. But whether it can connect to compensation, responsibility, or channels for rest remains constrained by materials and rules.

The same applies to past local relations. Someone may remember an earlier division of a household, care, or wedding and funeral exchanges. But if accounts contradict one another, there are no materials, no one is willing to testify, or the institution handling the matter does not adopt the relevant contents, these relations may not enter judgments of reputation, property division, or mediation on a stable basis. Things that once happened cannot simply be equated with differences that can be effectively extracted.

Even a person's long-term care for the elderly, help to relatives, financial contributions, or labor may fail to become qualifying grounds in property division, elder care, or family evaluations because records, recognition, or explanations from key participants are missing. This does not mean the contribution did not exist. It means that preservation, extraction, weight assignment, and connection still separate its existence from its consequences.

Latent differentiation space opposes substituting uncertainty for concrete analysis, but does not oppose uncertainty itself. It is not an all-purpose explanation: latent differences, even when they exist, do not necessarily gain weight. Only by specifying conditions, participants, materials, and consequences one by one can we know which silent differences may be relevant and which are merely empty possibilities conjured up in imagination.

This limit also applies to analysts' own judgments. A difference cannot be placed on the same level as those already assigned high weight in the present merely because it might be useful later. Nor can one presume that material will certainly be submitted and adopted merely because it was once preserved. Analysts should leave room for possibilities, but those possibilities must have conditions that can be checked.

Analysis of latent differentiation space should therefore both retain the possibility of future revision and explain when an inference cannot be drawn. Requiring every judgment about change to return to concrete materials, specific participants, and concrete consequences for examination does not mean making the theory conservative. This examination does not require advance knowledge of every later event. It requires that, when proposing possible changes, one clearly state which existing relation supplies the grounds, which kind of retrievable material supports them, and which necessary conditions have yet to appear. Precisely because some conditions are still absent, analysts must describe possible reorganization separately from reorganization that has already occurred.

X. From Latent Differentiation Space to the Network

The question of latent differentiation space thus comes down to network paths of preservation, transmission, and renewed extraction. Such tracing first requires relations of preservation to be made concrete. Medical history may be retained in bodily conditions and medical materials, but medical records are materials that medical personnel create through diagnosis and treatment, keep, and provide when rules permit; they are not inherently powerful. Past relations may be sustained through relatives' memories and local reputation, but relatives' memories are accounts preserved by different people through exchanges, disputes, care, and recounting; they are not a single unchanging archive. Ceremonial cash-gift exchanges may be preserved by participants or left in relevant records. People may also carry language and ancestral origin into later relations through family forms of address, school life, household registration, surnames, or family narratives.

Analysis of latent differentiation space therefore cannot stop at saying "there are still differences not yet apparent." It must examine who preserves differences and what people can actually find out, distinguishing who holds the materials, whether they can be found, whether they are complete, and who later checks them. Materials and relations do not flow on their own. Someone keeps documents, someone remembers exchanges, someone demands proof, someone provides an account, and someone checks and adopts it under rules. Only through these concrete acts of handling can previously silent differences be brought back into visibility. The stability, retrievability, and degree of recognition of different forms of preservation also lead to different later results.

Transmission, too, is not a line that extends automatically. One must establish what event raises a demand for retrieval, who can present the corresponding contents, and who can make them visible. Parents preparing

materials for their child's progression to the next level of schooling may submit proof to a school. A person involved in the handling of a work-related injury may provide diagnostic reports, leave documents, or an account of the scene according to procedure. Relatives in a land dispute may also bring old land deeds, past accounts, or neighbors' observations into negotiation. Each such introduction requires specific people to act and may be interrupted by insufficient materials, procedural restrictions, or others' lack of cooperation.

After renewed extraction, differences must still undergo identification and use. Which rules assign them weight, what kind of handling adopts which materials, which consequences a difference may involve, and on whom those consequences fall must all be clearly distinguished in concrete handling. Schools, workplaces, those handling medical matters, relatives, and other people concerned do not face the same question or handle the same material under the same rules. Some need only establish a fact, some must judge eligibility, some must allocate responsibility, and some are concerned with how family life can bear the consequences. These different purposes of handling bring the same difference into different relational positions.

Only by putting strict requirements concerning conditions, materials, participants, and actual consequences into practice can differences not yet apparent be understood as a relational structure open to inquiry, rather than some mysterious background. Nor does the analyst face a secret list waiting to be uncovered. Analysis of this kind can remain sensitive to future changes, neither treating the position at hand as a closed conclusion nor portraying the future through imagination detached from conditions. Paths of preservation, transmission, and renewed extraction do allow differences beyond the current position to remain available for possible handling anew, but these paths themselves guarantee no result in advance.

Chapter 13. Nodes: How Differences Are Preserved, Given Definite Form, Extracted, and Passed On

Nodes include more than medical records, records of wedding and funeral exchanges, and archives. Bodies, language, genealogies, school disciplinary sanctions, platform accounts, local reputation, religious rituals, work-injury records, proof of residence, and kinship terms can all perform relay functions through which differences are preserved, certified, extracted, and passed on. This does not mean abstract dots on a network diagram, nor does it mean subsuming every phenomenon under some unified organization. If a person, institution, record, object, bodily trace, or relational position allows a difference to remain in a certain form and gives it a chance to be raised, identified, recognized, or passed on later, it may perform the function of a node within concrete relations.

I. Differences Do Not Preserve Themselves

That some differences have not entered into consequences at present does not mean they have disappeared. A worker has endured a bout of pain after a lower-back injury; someone has been absent from a wedding or funeral; an exchange between relatives has not been clearly explained. If these matters can still be raised later, saying only that "someone remembers" cannot explain this. Memory is only one form of preservation; bodily traces, medical records, receipts, past relations, and local reputation also leave different kinds of evidence. For a difference to exert an effect again in the future, it must first be preserved at some node.

But being preserved does not mean having already taken effect. Bodily pain can remain in the person's sensations, medical personnel can enter diagnoses and expenses into medical records, and relatives may remember an exchange at a wedding or funeral. Whether these differences can later enter judgments concerning borrowing money, leave requests, compensation, care, or courtship and marriage still depends on who raises them, who recognizes them, and the relational conditions at the time.

Preservation begins when specific people and procedures leave certain experiences, materials, or traces where they can be accessed again later, rather than depositing them in a static warehouse. If preserved differences are to enter later relations, someone must also continue to keep and interpret them, or bring them up when needed. Without these concrete relational processes, traces may exist yet still be unable to enter later judgments about eligibility, responsibilities, or mutual aid.

Different forms of preservation lead to different ways of raising differences later; how differences are preserved also affects what can be asked about them afterward. Bodily traces can remind a person of continuing pain without necessarily explaining how the injury occurred. A diagnostic certificate can explain a particular examination and judgment without necessarily covering care, interrupted income, and pressure from relatives. Relatives' memories can retain everyday exchanges, yet their emphases may vary with the narrator. Preservation therefore comprises a series of actions through which experiences, borne by different carriers, acquire conditions under which they can still be accessed later.

II. What Is a Node?

A node is a social relay position at which differentiating units can be preserved, given definite form, and filtered, their extraction can be authorized, and they can be passed on.

A node is first of all a social relay position, not the equivalent of an actor with clear boundaries and a unified will. The node granularity used in an analysis must be determined by the research question, actual acts of handling, differences in authority, and the need to trace responsibility. If the question is simply whether material can move from a school into another educational procedure, the school can provisionally be treated as a broadly defined node. If the question turns to who refuses the supplementation of materials, who can correct records, or who has authority to certify them, the analysis must break the node down into specific staff, rules, materials, and procedural positions.

Readers must also be able to check the actual choice of node granularity against the materials. Analysts should explain why they initially treat a particular institution as a broadly defined node, and which question of causation or responsibility leads them to break it down into personnel, rules, materials, authority, and procedures. If different ways of breaking it down lead to different judgments about consequences, the coarser node cannot be treated as the sole natural unit. Differences between levels should be retained, and the reasons for stopping further subdivision explained.

Nor can nodes be subdivided without limit. If an internal division of labor does not change how materials are extracted, passed on, judged, or connected to consequences, and does not affect authority or responsibility, further subdivision may add no explanatory power. Conversely, whenever different positions within the same institution have different authority over information, capacities for review, scopes of implementation, or responsibilities for correction, merging them into a single point will occlude causal linkage. Where subdivision stops must be determined by actual differences within the event, not by organizational names or the analyst's preferences.

People can perform node functions within relations. Relatives remember who borrowed money without repaying it; teachers record disciplinary sanctions or comments under school rules; village elders preserve past relations through wedding and funeral exchanges. Memory, standing, rules, and relational positions together enable differences to remain; individuals do not act out of nothing. Families, schools, hospitals, workplaces, courts, local police stations, neighborhoods, villages, and clans can likewise become nodes. These are not entities of the same kind: some handle materials through formal procedures, some preserve relations through long-term exchanges, and some accommodate several practices at once. Calling them all nodes means that they can allow differences to remain within relations, be identified, and possibly proceed into consequences, while specific staff within institutions handle materials and relations according to their responsibilities.

IOUs, contracts, records of wedding and funeral exchanges, household registration booklets, medical records, disciplinary notices, award certificates, chat logs, genealogies, stone inscriptions, and land deeds can likewise carry node functions. Documents, databases, accounts, and objects allow materials to be preserved, formatted, and retrieved later, but they are not acting subjects that can judge, authorize, refuse, or bear responsibility on their own. They carry differences already written down, registered, kept, or repeatedly used by people, and provide a form when someone retrieves them through the relevant authority or relations. Where causation and responsibility are involved, analysis must still identify who creates the records, who sets or enforces the rules, who has authority to access information, and who passes it on and handles it. Only by using the concept of the node in this way can analysis retain the organizational dimension at a general level without mistaking an organization, database, or document for a unified acting subject.

The relational field determines which differences are currently extracted, assigned weight, and connected; nodes concern the forms in which these differences are preserved, who may raise them under what authority or relations, and whether they can be passed on. The two must not be conflated. Bodies can retain injury, pain,

and limitations on action; language can maintain differences through repeated forms of address; records and objects can carry relations already written into them. Yet when these carriers are seen, how they are interpreted, and whether they suffice to connect to consequences must still be traced back to the people, rules, and relations through which they are used. People can remember, raise matters, and interpret; documents and objects only carry traces already inscribed in them.

Thus, treating the node as a relay position does not merge people, institutions, language, and objects into one kind of actor; it serves to trace how differences are relayed. The name of a node merely marks a relay position that needs to be investigated. It cannot replace a concrete account of recorders, custodians, procedures, materials, and participants in relations. Only by separating these elements can we avoid mistaking functional shorthand for action by the node itself.

III. What Nodes Preserve Is Not Materials, but Conditions for Consequences

A medical record lists a name, a medical condition, examinations, medication, and expenses. Viewed only on paper, it looks like a piece of material; in leave requests, reimbursement, determinations of work-related injury, family care, and the allocation of expenses, however, people raise the bodily differences it contains as grounds for judgment. What it leaves is a condition that may later enter judgments within relations, rather than the sheet of paper itself. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges work in the same way. The names and amounts are more than sums of money: they may also allow people to ask later who came, who did not, who gave more, who gave less, and who should give a gift in return. The record reaches no conclusion on anyone's behalf, but provides a form through which specific participants in relations can interpret past exchanges again.

Household registration, residence permits, social insurance records, and rental registration turn part of the facts of lived experience into materials available for judgments of eligibility. An IOU, in turn, fixes part of a debt relation as evidence that relatives, mediators, or court personnel can examine. The consequences to which different forms of preservation can connect are not the same. What nodes preserve is differentiating units that can change future judgments within relations, not static materials.

Preservation does not guarantee that something will exert an effect again in the future. The material may not be raised at all; once raised, it may not be recognized; or it may be effective only within a particular relation. Preserving a difference merely leaves conditions for its possible entry into later judgments; it does not predetermine the result. The conditions retained through preservation may also weaken, be occluded, or fail to connect to a procedure because the material is incomplete. Whether the difference can continue to exert an effect depends on whether the later relational field needs it and whether the people concerned can raise and recognize it. To judge whether material performs a node function, one cannot ask only whether it exists; one must also ask who created it, where it is kept, who can access it, and in what relations it will be invoked. The same medical record, IOU, or other record may remain silent in one relational field and become an important basis for judgment in another.

Conditions for consequences are not consequences themselves. They are only a traceable basis on which later judgments may become possible. The same experience may also leave bodily traces, formal records, and memories within relations at the same time. These cannot replace one another, but may supplement one another on different occasions. Those who later grant recognition must still judge according to the materials, authority, and relations at that time.

IV. Giving Definite Form and Filtering: Reshaping the Forms of Recognition

Preservation never transfers reality unchanged into a record. When a worker says their lower back hurts, this is first a bodily sensation: when it began, where it hurts, whether an old injury has flared up, and what goods they have carried. These sensations do not automatically become social materials. Through consultation, examination, diagnosis, medication, and billing procedures, medical personnel turn part of them into entries in medical records, examination results, diagnostic labels, treatment records, and expense receipts.

This handling gives pain a form that can be retrieved later. Workplace staff, insurance personnel, staff determining work-related injury, court personnel, or family members may raise different questions on this basis within their respective procedures and relations. Giving definite form does not mean that the original sensations were unreal; it means that the form available for their later recognition has changed. Yet preserving some parts also excludes others. A hospital's records of diagnoses, examinations, medication, and expenses may not record who requested leave to stay at the bedside, who borrowed money to pay the bills, or who lost work opportunities because of caregiving. Medical records may bring pain into institutional judgment, but pressure from family care need not thereby acquire the same position. This also affects how rebuttals can be made: what has not been written down often requires other witnesses, supplementary materials, or explanation through other relations. Categories already recorded may also be reviewed, corrected, or set alongside other records.

The same applies to wedding and funeral exchanges. The occasion may involve hardship, embarrassment, silence, late arrivals, gifts sent through others, and explanations afterward. If a recorder writes down names and amounts, complex exchanges are compressed into a portion that can be entered in accounts, compared, and used to pursue reciprocation. The record is not false, but it cannot preserve the full thickness of the occasion. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges usually record attendance and amounts, but may not preserve why someone could not afford a gift, could not attend, or could only send a gift through someone else. The consequences of filtering also change with relations. Accounts of hardships not explained in the record may still be supplemented through concrete explanations.

Household registration and residence materials are also formed through concrete processes of registration, verification, and safekeeping. Someone has lived in a city for a long time, is known to neighbors, has children attending school, and has stable work. When these facts of life enter institutional judgments, they often have to pass through forms such as household registration, residence permits, rental registration, social insurance contributions, or supporting materials. Institutional personnel's recognition of these forms under rules does not amount to recognition of life in its entirety.

The same holds in other institutional settings. School staff record grades, attendance, sanctions, and comments under rules, yet may not be able to record all of a student's fear, family hardship, exclusion by peers, and silence. When courts handle contracts, evidence, amounts, deadlines, and responsibilities, they too may be unable to incorporate emotional debts, shame, and long-term mutual aid into the same form.

Filtering is more than technical deletion. Who records, under what categories, which materials are retained, and what standards of proof are used all affect who will later recognize differences, how they will do so, and what consequences the differences can enter. Recording personnel, institutional procedures, classification rules, and interpretive authority within relations jointly determine which differences can remain and which experiences will lack a place in future judgments. Giving definite form also makes experiences comparable: names, times, amounts, diagnostic labels, categories, and requirements of proof allow experiences otherwise difficult to set alongside one another to be compared within a procedure, while also downweighting the parts that cannot be entered in these formats. Giving definite form makes it possible to raise differences, but does

not mean fully reproducing experiences as records. It enables later comparison while leaving room for supplementation, explanation, or dispute. It concerns the forms of recognition, rather than a final verdict on reality.

A node is not a neutral place of preservation. It both preserves social facts and changes the forms in which social facts can be recognized. Filtering produces unequal conditions of recognition. The fact that something is excluded does not mean it never happened; it is harder to identify in subsequent procedures and may be difficult to bring into a form that can later be recognized. Loss of a voice refers to insufficient conditions for recognition, not to facts never having occurred, still less to their being erased from reality. For example, sons and daughters who have provided long-term care for elders without leaving documents, witnesses, or recognition within the family may struggle to raise that care when family property is divided. Workers who have worked with injuries over a long period without medical records, coworkers' testimony, or work-injury materials may also struggle to bring bodily differences into compensation judgments. Pressure from care that medical records do not record may still be remembered among family members; conversely, categories that have been recorded may be questioned, supplemented, or understood anew. What is retained at different places of preservation can be mutually supplementary, but can also conflict.

V. Institutions and Relations: Formal and Informal Nodes

While a worker is moving goods, their lower-back injury worsens. The worker endures it for several days, then goes to the hospital because of the pain. Through consultation, examination, diagnosis, and billing, medical personnel enter part of this bodily experience into medical records and the system. It is the records left by treatment that make it possible for different people later to raise these materials under their respective procedures. Workplace staff may use the diagnostic certificate as a basis for leave requests or job assignments, while personnel involved in insurance relations may use the medical history for risk judgments. Staff determining work-related injury may address questions of responsibility using medical records, records of old injuries, accounts of the scene, and witness materials together. Family members may discuss care and how to share the burden on the basis of expenses and treatment records. These acts of handling are not one and the same judgment, nor do they necessarily lead to the same consequence.

Hospitals, schools, courts, local police stations, neighborhoods, workplaces, and state registration systems can perform formal node functions because their personnel, rules, procedures, and documents can convert certain facts of life into forms that institutions can handle. Once grades, sanctions, judgments, attendance, proof of residence, and public security records enter these procedures, they are usually easier to raise in matters of progression to the next level of schooling, compensation, punishment, welfare, job assignments, and judgments of eligibility.

But formal forms are not inherently more truthful. A worker saying they are in pain does not mean the relevant procedure will necessarily recognize a work-related injury. Someone who has lived in a city for many years may still be unable to enter channels for school admission, medical care, or welfare if their materials are incomplete. Formal nodes handle only differences that rules can identify; they do not encompass all the facts of life. Their efficacy comes from traceable duties and procedures and still requires personnel to operate them, interpret rules, and verify materials. Whether materials are complete and how procedures work both change the outcome of recognition. Traceability and reproducibility make formal materials easier to use across relations between strangers, but do not thereby negate the reality of experiences outside procedures, nor can they guarantee that every item of formal material suffices to determine a result.

Outside formal procedures, differences also continue to be retained and recalled. Wedding and funeral exchanges are often not one-off events. Who came, who was absent, who sent a gift through someone else, and who still showed up despite hardship may be remembered by family members, relatives, and neighbors, or written into records of exchanges. Years later, when borrowing, partnership, courtship and marriage, or elder care are at issue, people may raise these past relations again and interpret them differently. Relatives' memories of care, household division, borrowing, weddings, and funerals may not enter formal archives, yet may be raised again in family allocations, mediation, and everyday cooperation. Neighborhood reputation does not preserve itself or judge on its own either. It continues through people's recounting, confirmation, questioning, and circulation of accounts over repeated exchanges, affecting whether others are willing to lend money, enter a partnership, or introduce a prospective spouse. Even requests for help, quarrels, rumors, screenshots, and public statements in group chats may be retained, forwarded, or brought up again by group members. Whether they are effective depends on who preserves them, who raises them, who believes them, and what relations recognize them, not on any inherent evidential force in the records themselves.

Informal nodes need not pass through institutional procedures to produce consequences, but neither are they necessarily truthful or effective. In societies of acquaintances, local communities, and everyday cooperation, they may command strong recognition; they may also be questioned, forgotten, or rejected by formal procedures. The same memory of a relation may elicit opposite judgments among different participants. Whether it can enter into consequences depends on which concrete people raise it, on what occasion, whether anyone responds, and how past relations affect trust. Informal preservation may retain processes of interaction, care, personal bonds, and past explanations that official forms could not accommodate. That is its advantage. Its limits are equally clear: memories may be dispersed, reputation may be disputed, and accounts may carry unequal efficacy depending on relational position. It must not be romanticized as truth untainted by institutions, nor dismissed as ineffective because it lacks a formal format.

VI. Objects and Documents as Relay Carriers

Objects and documents are often seen as passive materials, yet they can carry differences already inscribed in them and leave relay positions for later retrieval. An IOU fixes the amount, relation, and agreement involved in a loan as evidence. Only when someone brings it before relatives or submits it to a court can it become part of later judgment. A contract is concluded by participants, and specific clauses set out responsibilities, rights, times for performance, and the consequences of breach. A contract is not text that enforces accountability by itself. Only when parties, mediators, institutional staff, or court personnel invoke it according to procedure can a relation enter handling in a particular form. Medical records retain diagnoses and the course of treatment; records of wedding and funeral exchanges retain attendance, absence, and ceremonial cash-gift amounts. They can make it easier for later participants to raise past differences, but cannot replace interpretation, recognition, and judgments about consequences.

Household registration booklets, residence permits, social insurance records, and rental registration fix some of people's relations to places, institutions, and eligibility. Genealogies, stone inscriptions, land deeds, and place names may also retain relations across generations and community memory. Objects and documents carry differences; they are not acting subjects capable of judging, preserving, authorizing, or passing things on by themselves. Through them, specific people can also extend the traceability of relations. A loan, an episode of diagnosis and treatment, or an instance of attendance might otherwise become difficult to raise again once the event has ended. Through writing, safekeeping, and repeated use, part of it can be brought into new settings later. Documents and objects can be preserved, copied, carried, and displayed. Only through such uses do specific people carry differences beyond the time and place of the original event and connect

them to new relations and procedures. These uses carry forward differences that have already been handled; objects and documents do not interpret or decide on people's behalf.

VII. Authority to Extract Differences at Nodes: Who Can Make the Past Take Effect Again?

Preserving differences does not mean that anyone can retrieve them at any time. Consider medical records kept by a medical institution. Different people raise relevant contents for purposes of treatment, insurance, leave requests, compensation, or care, under their respective authority and within the corresponding procedures and relations. Who may access which materials, who is qualified to cite them, and who can bring them into judgment are distinct questions. Likewise, even if records of wedding and funeral exchanges are kept within a family or clan, this does not mean everyone can bring them out at will. Raising them while preparing a wedding or funeral may serve to arrange exchanges; raising them when borrowing money may serve to judge relations; raising them when dividing property may turn the issue into one of weighing past contributions and shortfalls. Whose account can be heard still depends on family and local relations and the specific conditions of recognition at that time.

Relevant personnel may retrieve records of school disciplinary sanctions when evaluating candidates for honors, considering progression to the next level of schooling, arranging transfers between schools, or meeting with parents. Memories among relatives may also be raised anew when property is divided, elder care arranged, or money borrowed. These cases show that authority, procedures, relational position, and interpretive authority always stand between the existence of material or memory and its gaining recognition. The power of nodes therefore lies not only in preserving differences, but also in determining just who can make differences take effect again.

Saying that nodes determine who can make differences take effect is, in essence, functional shorthand. In fact, institutions that keep materials, staff who retrieve documents under their authority, family members who can raise past relations, and personnel qualified to recognize or refuse materials jointly produce an uneven distribution of authority to extract differences. Preservation and authorization to extract must be clearly separated: a preserved difference is not one that everyone has authority to raise, still less one guaranteed recognition once raised. This uneven authority to extract differences also means that the past is not equally available to everyone in reality. Even when they know the past facts, people who lack channels for safekeeping, standing to provide proof, or relational support may struggle to make those facts part of public judgment.

Authority to extract differences is also constrained by rules of custody, privacy restrictions, family authority, institutional duties, and requirements of proof. Knowing about a difference does not automatically entitle someone to disclose or invoke it; being able to raise it does not mean being able to decide its meaning. Only by distinguishing each step—accessing materials, retrieving them, presenting them publicly, and bringing them into judgment—and distinguishing who bears the consequences can we avoid compressing preservation, retrieval, recognition, and consequences into a single automatic process. Different procedures allocate these steps to different people. Memories that seem easier to raise within family relations may require other forms of proof in formal procedures.

VIII. The Recasting of the Same Difference at Different Nodes

The same difference may be given different meanings when it enters different nodes. At a hospital, medical personnel handle a medical history as material for treatment. In some matters of insurance, leave requests, or job assignments, if specific rules permit or require it, that history may be examined alongside other materials. Within a family, it may be connected to care and the allocation of expenses; in courtship and marriage, it may be interpreted as a future risk. Both the authority to extract differences and the consequences vary from node to node.

Similarly, an old debt may mean a demand for repayment to a creditor, an evaluation of reliability within kin relations, material concerning responsibility in court proceedings, or reputation in local exchanges. An accent may bring closeness among people from the same home region, be marked as a risk in an exclusionary environment, become a difference mocked at school, or carry belonging within a national community. The meaning of a difference does not change on its own. Different institutional personnel, participants in relations, classification rules, and recognition procedures each extract different parts of a difference and connect them to different consequences. Nor is the meaning of a preserved difference fixed: which node it enters, who raises it, and on what grounds all affect the direction of consequences.

Different forms of preservation may also conflict. Pain not entered into medical records may be difficult for staff determining work-related injury to recognize on that basis. Relatives may remember care, yet if legal materials are insufficient, that care may struggle to acquire the same efficacy when property is divided. Local reputation may retain an absence without retaining its reason, and the person's explanation may be downweighted. What is called strength or weakness is not the result of nodes themselves contending with one another or adjudicating. Personnel, institutions, rules, and recognition relations in the current relational field give certain forms of preservation greater efficacy. In institutional procedures, medical records, contracts, household registration, judgments, and school enrollment records are usually more readily recognized. In societies of acquaintances, relatives' past relations, records of wedding and funeral exchanges, and local reputation may also affect borrowing, courtship and marriage, cooperation, and the division of elder-care responsibilities.

Formal and informal forms are not inherently more or less truthful than one another. Whether a form of preservation acquires efficacy depends on who handles it in the current relational field, what the rules recognize, what participants believe, and whether it can corroborate and be corroborated by other materials. Formal materials may not be valued among acquaintances, while informal memories may be supplemented and heard under particular circumstances. When recognition relations change, the efficacy of the same form of preservation changes too. Recognition on one occasion cannot justify the conclusion that it is effective everywhere, still less can nonrecognition on one occasion be understood to mean that the difference can never be raised again. Giving the same difference new definite forms at different nodes may produce tensions in its consequences: medical records may emphasize diagnosis, family discussion care, workplace arrangements job assignments, and local reputation reliability. Different participants handle differences according to different relational requirements; this is not simply a repetition of the same fact. Analyzing differences in relaying by setting them side by side is not equivalent to tracing a complete relational chain.

IX. Node Failure: How Differences That Are Not Preserved Lose Their Voice

Nodes can preserve differences, and missing links in preservation also produce consequences. A worker who has worked with an injury for a long time but has no medical records, witnesses, or work-injury materials may struggle to raise bodily differences in compensation procedures. The worker felt pain, endured it, and kept working; these facts have not disappeared, but lack a stable form through which to enter institutional recognition. Likewise, sons and daughters who have provided long-term care for elders without records or recognition from family members may struggle to explain their contributions when property is divided. People from elsewhere who have lived in a city for years but have incomplete materials may still face eligibility barriers to school admission, medical care, and welfare. Help given to relatives that no one remembers may also be difficult to turn into credit within relations when borrowing later. Differences not preserved at a node first of all lack a basis on which they can be preserved, retrieved, or raised, and can very easily lose their voice in future judgments.

Yet having a form of preservation does not guarantee efficacy. Nodes not recognized by the current relational field may likewise leave differences without a voice. Relatives remembering care does not mean court personnel will recognize it in the same way; patients saying they are in pain does not mean their workplace will recognize a work-related injury; neighbors knowing about long-term residence does not mean school procedures will recognize eligibility for admission; records of wedding and funeral exchanges preserving interactions does not mean institutions will recognize rights on that basis. Node failure may also arise from a mismatch between a form of preservation and current requirements: material has been retained but does not meet a procedure's format; witnesses exist but do not appear when needed; family members know about an experience but lack a sufficient relational position to secure a hearing for it.

These two situations must not be conflated as the same kind of loss of voice. If no form has been left that can be accessed later, the problem is a lack of a basis for preservation, retrieval, or presentation. If a form exists but cannot connect to current conditions of recognition, the material may fail to meet procedural requirements, or the person raising it may lack the authority or relational position needed to secure a hearing. Although both make it temporarily difficult for differences to produce consequences, a failure of recognition may arise either from the failure to preserve a difference or from preserved forms, authority, or relations failing to connect to current judgments.

Loss of a voice must not be understood to mean that something never happened, still less described as permanent ineffectiveness. It means that at a certain time, within a particular relation and set of conditions of recognition, a difference failed to enter into consequences in a sufficient form. When conditions change, materials are supplemented, witnesses appear, or relations are reorganized, differences previously difficult to raise may still be seen again. Remedying loss of voice therefore cannot rely on indiscriminately entering all experiences into a single kind of record. It must address separately the conditions for preservation, form, and obtaining a hearing, examining what materials, testimony, explanations of relations, or procedural supplements can give previously downweighted differences another chance to be heard.

X. From Nodes to Relational Chains

Nodes preserve differences, but cannot keep them in their original places forever. Workplace personnel may use bodily differences in medical records to arrange leave, while personnel involved in insurance relations may use them as risk materials. Household registration materials may be raised in different procedures at schools and hospitals. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges may be reinterpreted in borrowing or courtship and marriage. Once a difference retained at one node is brought into another, subsequent participants handle it anew in light of new relations, rules, and materials.

When a lower-back injury moves from medical records into leave arrangements, then into attendance, performance, income, debts, or relatives' evaluations, the difference no longer remains only at the hospital. When wedding and funeral exchanges move from records into judgments about borrowing, then into credit and family evaluations, new relational consequences also occur. Nodes are starting points for preservation and extraction, not containers that complete subsequent processes in advance. Someone carrying materials, memories, or traces from one node to another does not automatically constitute a complete relational chain. It means, first, that differences have left their original place of preservation and entered a new setting for handling.

Chapter 14. Relational Chains: How Differences Are Recast, Branch, Flow Back, and Produce Consequences between Nodes

I. Relational Chains Are Not Personal Connections

Nodes can preserve, give definite form to, and filter differentiating units, authorize their extraction, and pass them on; they also leave materials for subsequent handling. Differences do not remain inside a single node forever: medical records do not stay only in hospitals, records of wedding and funeral exchanges do not stay only within a single wedding or funeral, household registration materials do not stay only in registration systems, IOUs do not stay only within a single loan, and school disciplinary sanctions do not stay only in school files. The people concerned bring them into new settings for handling according to procedures and authority, and recipients reinterpret them according to the rules and standards of recognition there. Relational chains unfold from this. A network is not a matter of who knows whom.

Two people knowing each other does not necessarily form a relational chain, nor does one person's contact with another mean that differences have already entered a traceable path of handling. A relational chain is a social path formed when differentiating units undergo traceable extraction, passing-on, recasting, recognition, refusal, weight assignment, or handling between distinguishable processing positions; it may take the form of continuation, cutoff, redirection, delay, maintenance, or failure. This means that whenever differences undergo such handling between distinguishable processing positions through specific people and procedures, they can enter relational-chain analysis. Reinterpretation, renewed weight assignment, and connection to new consequences are possible subsequent forms, not fixed prerequisites for a relational chain to form.

To judge whether a relation forms a chain, therefore, one cannot simply count contacts or ask whether the two parties know each other well. If a worker's lower-back injury remains only in the body, it has not yet constituted a relational chain. Once it is entered in medical records, submitted to the workplace in a leave request, converted into attendance records, and brought to bear on performance evaluations, and then goes on to affect household income and debt pressures, this bodily difference unfolds into a concrete path across different processing positions. The same holds for a cash gift at a wedding or funeral: if it remains only at the occasion of exchange, it has not formed a chain. If it is entered in records of wedding and funeral exchanges, later extracted as a basis for judgments about borrowing, and those judgments in turn enter evaluations of credit, further affecting courtship and marriage, partnerships, eldercare, and local respectability, the path of handling extends from there. The questions to pursue are: which difference was retained, which material was taken out of its original setting, who treated it as a basis for judgment in what procedure, and whether that judgment actually changed later arrangements.

Relational chains rest on nodes: without nodes preserving differences, there can be no stable passing-on. Without medical records, a lower-back injury can hardly enter workplace leave arrangements or a determination of work-related injury; without records of wedding and funeral exchanges, those exchanges can hardly be accurately retrieved many years later. Preservation, the giving of definite form, filtering, and authorization to extract at nodes are still undertaken by hospital personnel, workplace managers, family members, record keepers, and institutional procedures. Relational chains trace when material already processed is taken elsewhere, and whether those handling it there have authority to include it in their judgments. Moving material from one place to another is not simple transmission or transfer unchanged: it is

reinterpreted at every node it passes through. Different nodes receiving the same material may also retain only the part that their procedures can recognize.

A relational chain is not a fixed thing. Its continuity comes from traceable processes of handling, not from a naturally inevitable impetus. Each link must be traced back to specific recipients, available materials, rules, authority, and standards of recognition. If any one is missing, differences may not be able to continue entering into consequences; relations do not naturally extend through contact alone. When the next processing position does not recognize the material, the chain can be said to be cut off there; when that position changes its interpretation, the chain may change direction.

Differences also branch as they move. The same difference may simultaneously enter a workplace, a family, a court, insurance relations, kinship relations, and local reputation, forming multiple paths of consequences. Relational chains also recirculate: after leaving the person concerned and passing through several nodes, differences eventually return to him and change his differentiation position. The results of a chain's operation also settle into new records, new reputations, and new evaluations, becoming material for later extraction. A relational chain consists of differences producing consequences along connections, not of the connections themselves. The steps in the definition do not line up neatly: some materials are preserved for a long time, while others are refused as soon as they are extracted; some transfers bring new weight assignment, while others leave only records that have yet to take effect. If these differences in conditions are omitted, relational chains will be mistaken for production lines without resistance.

II. How a Lower-Back Injury Leaves the Hospital Node

After injuring his lower back, a worker goes to a hospital. At the hospital node, this bodily difference is given definite form in medical records, examination results, diagnostic labels, treatment records, and billing documents. At this point it remains primarily a matter of the body, treatment, and costs. Later, he may submit a medical certificate to his workplace to request leave. Workplace personnel judge whether to approve it, how to calculate its duration, and whether it affects job assignments on the basis of the employment contract, lawfully established rules, and specific materials. Medical records entering a workplace do not automatically produce a uniform decision on leave.

Once leave enters attendance records, the lower-back injury is recast again. The attendance sheet records neither the degree of pain nor who provides care at home; it records only whether the worker reported for duty, how many days he was absent, and whether the formalities were complete. The injury thus comes to appear in the form of absence, days of leave, and a work post left unfilled.

When attendance records pass into performance evaluation, the lower-back injury may be recast further as a problem of stability, cooperation, or labor efficiency, turning the original bodily difference into an evaluation of labor. Performance is rated poorly, bonuses shrink, the job becomes insecure, and income falls accordingly. At this stage, the injury's effects have already moved beyond the hospital and fallen on everyday expenses such as rent, spending on children, debt repayments, and the household budget.

When reduced income enters the network of debts and kinship relations, relatives may call him unreliable if repayment slows. Under the pressure of daily living, his wife may worry about the next rent payment, his parents may feel that he cannot send money home, and creditors may also begin pressing him. The bodily difference moves along the relational chain in this way, gradually turning into an evaluation of labor, an income problem, and judgments by relatives.

This process is not simply a straight line. The same medical-record material may be brought into several nodes at once and read anew: in insurance relations, it may serve as evidence of medical history and a basis for risk assessment; in a determination of work-related injury, it is used to judge responsibility; in court review, as a basis for examination; in family care, it involves who stays at the bedside, who pays, and who shoulders the housework; in relatives' evaluations, it may be described as a "serious injury," or taken to mean that he is "in poor health" or "a burden on the family."

Once the medical records are handed over, workplace managers, leave procedures, and attendance sheets each handle only what their respective systems can record and judge; they do not automatically reconstruct the person's pain and family circumstances. Only by separating medical records, leave formalities, attendance classifications, and performance evaluations can we discern how specific acts of handling at each step allow the lower-back injury to affect income, care, and relatives' evaluations. Material being taken out of the hospital does not mean that every subsequent setting will recognize the same interpretation. The lower-back injury case shows that the body, documents, and evaluations belong to different levels: a diagnostic label can support a leave request without necessarily being sufficient to determine whether an injury is work-related; attendance results can affect performance ratings without necessarily explaining the person's capacity for labor. Judgments at each point have their limits; only when linked do they constitute a traceable relational path.

III. How Cash Gifts Leave Weddings and Funerals

Wedding and funeral exchanges likewise form relational chains. When a household holds a funeral, relatives and neighbors arrive in succession, and cash gifts are entered in the exchange records. Many differences are also present that the records cannot accommodate: who came early to keep vigil, who had no money but helped with the work, who sent a gift through someone else, who was absent, and who left hurriedly after arriving. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges mainly retain names and amounts, giving definite form to a certain relation of closeness or distance and allowing exchanges to be compared and reciprocal returns to be sought. Yet they do not preserve the full details of the occasion.

Several years later, when a household needs to borrow money, records of wedding and funeral exchanges are brought out again, and the exchange leaves the wedding or funeral to enter judgments about borrowing. Others consider whether both parties attended each other's events, the amounts of their cash gifts, whether gifts were reciprocated afterward, and whether they can be relied on when something happens. Here the cash gift is no longer merely a matter of rites and customs, but becomes a basis for assessing credit and closeness or distance. When judgments about borrowing enter credit evaluations, if a person has repeatedly failed to attend, give gifts, or reciprocate them, local society may recast him as someone who "does not reciprocate," "cannot be relied on," or "does not understand social obligations." By contrast, those who regularly turn up, give gifts, and help may be seen as reliable even when they contribute little money. Credit evaluations subsequently enter partnerships, courtship and marriage, eldercare, and local respectability: who is willing to partner with him, who is willing to introduce their child to his family, who is willing to step forward when the elderly need care, and whether local society allows him to retain his social standing may all be affected by these old records. As a cash-gift exchange moves along a relational chain, it gradually turns into credit, respectability, and eligibility for mutual aid.

This path, too, does not advance along a single line. Cash gifts do not remain only at weddings and funerals; they branch through local society into multiple relational chains. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges can simultaneously enter borrowing, partnerships, courtship and marriage, eldercare, lineage evaluations, and

local social standing. They serve as a basis for credit in borrowing and partnerships, concern family evaluations in courtship and marriage, concern responsibility in eldercare arrangements, concern knowing the rules in lineage evaluations, and, in matters of local social standing, are expressed in whether exchanges have been maintained.

When the records are brought out, borrowers, relatives, matchmakers, and local evaluators do not necessarily reach the same judgment, because they focus on different things. Some value the amount, others whether a person showed up, and still others consider the actual difficulties at the time. Precisely because handlers and grounds of judgment differ, cash gifts may be assigned different weights on different occasions. The original records provide material that can be drawn upon; they neither complete a credit judgment in advance for anyone nor naturally converge into a single verdict on character. Preserving differences of judgment among distinct subjects both avoids reducing local evaluation to a single will and leaves those concerned room to explain difficulties, add facts, or bring about changes in relations.

IV. Recasting, Amplification, and Distortion

What matters in a relational chain is not only transmission: every transmission is also accompanied by recasting. Differences do not enter new nodes unchanged. Each receiving node has its own conditions of reception, rules of interpretation, and standards of recognition, and reorganizes material and meaning according to its own rules, just as household registration materials entering a school must be processed under admission eligibility rules. Take the same bodily difference: at a hospital, a lower-back injury is a treatment problem; entering the workplace through the leave system, it is recast as a leave problem; processed by attendance standards, it becomes a matter of reporting for duty; in performance evaluation, it is organized into an evaluation of labor; connected to household income, it becomes pressure on daily living; connected further to debts and relatives' evaluations, it concerns credit, responsibility, and ability.

The meaning of cash gifts changes across positions in the same way. At weddings and funerals, a gift is a matter of rites and customs and showing up; entered in records of wedding and funeral exchanges, it becomes a name and an amount; entering borrowing relations through judgments of credit and closeness or distance, it becomes a credit judgment; entering courtship and marriage, it becomes a family evaluation; entering eldercare, it becomes responsibility and exchange; in local society, it becomes respectability. Differences are handled as different things at different positions because nodes continually recast them according to their own conditions of reception and standards of recognition, rather than simply carrying them unchanged.

This is not simple misunderstanding. Much recasting is the normal way institutions and relations handle things: workplaces must enter leave in attendance records, schools must enter materials in eligibility reviews, and local society also enters wedding and funeral exchanges into credit and respectability. But recasting changes the direction of differences, allowing a treatment problem to become an evaluation of labor, an exchange involving rites and customs to become a credit judgment, a fact of residence to become admission eligibility, and a debt to become an evaluation of character. Receiving nodes rewrite original differences as matters of leave, attendance, eligibility, credit, or responsibility according to their own material formats, processing rules, and thresholds of recognition. Recasting is therefore not arbitrary renaming, nor may it be described as an irreversible transformation in one direction: it can be challenged, supplemented, or corrected. The consequences brought by a new name still depend on who adopts it, to what extent, and whether other materials change the judgment.

When handlers at different nodes rename the same difference, they often also select what remains visible. These handlers are constrained by material formats, institutional rules, and conditions of judgment: leave

formalities concern duration and proof; attendance concerns reporting for duty; performance concerns arrangements; household budgets concern income and expenditure. Every selection may downweight other contents. Relational chains do not only amplify differences; they also downweight them. Pain becomes nothing but absence in an attendance sheet. Someone may be in too much pain to sleep or walk and fear losing his job, yet none of this necessarily enters attendance records, which record only whether he reported for duty. Difficulties at weddings and funerals are also downweighted in records of those exchanges. Someone may have been absent for lack of money, illness, or being tied down by work; the exchange records retain only a blank or an amount.

Relational chains amplify the consequences of differences. A period of leave initially means only a few days away from work, but once entered in the attendance sheet it may affect performance ratings. Performance then affects income, income bears on debt, and debt enters quarrels between spouses and relatives' evaluations. When relatives' evaluations enter local reputation, the initial difference is no longer just a few days of leave: it has become a question of whether a person is stable, can earn money, is reliable, or burdens the family. An absence from a wedding or funeral may be amplified along a similar path. At the time, the person simply did not come; entered in records of wedding and funeral exchanges, it becomes a blank. In judgments about borrowing, it is understood as a failure to reciprocate; entering local reputation, it becomes unreliability. Later, it may also affect evaluations of the family in courtship and marriage and assessments of the risks of cooperation in partnerships.

At the same time, relational chains also distort differences: a blank may be interpreted as indifference, an old injury as laziness, a small cash gift as disregard for personal bonds, a period of leave as instability, and an instance of silence as an unwillingness to accept something.

Amplification, downweighting, and distortion all arise from specific ways of recording and limits on interpretation. An attendance sheet records only absence; it does not itself occlude pain. A wedding and funeral ledger records only names and amounts; it does not itself judge someone indifferent. Analysis must bring material formats, personnel's judgments, and institutional rules into view together, distinguishing what the material retains, what handlers extract, and what meaning evaluators assign. Only then can it avoid misrepresenting the limitations of records as inevitable harm inflicted by an abstract chain acting on its own. What has been downweighted does not necessarily disappear forever. Care by family members, testimony by fellow workers, supplementary medical records, explanations of exchanges, or new records may allow previously uncounted circumstances to enter judgment again. But such re-entry still requires specific channels; it cannot be described as differences regaining force on their own.

V. Branching: How One Difference Enters Multiple Chains

A difference often moves not along a single line but branches at multiple nodes. Branching occurs when different handlers can draw on the same material or related records. This shows an increase in processing positions, not automatic expansion by the difference itself. Different destinations may appear simultaneously or remain merely possible; multiple chains alongside one another do not mean that they lead to the same conclusion, or that every one will be followed to completion. Whether a difference enters consequence settings such as insurance, courts, family care, or local evaluation still depends on specific conditions such as authority, evidence, applications, and recognition.

After leaving the hospital node, a medical record may enter not only workplace leave arrangements but also insurance claims, determinations of work-related injury, court review, family care, and relatives' evaluations. Sent to the workplace, it concerns leave approval and job assignments; entering insurance relations, it

concerns risk assessment and the determination of compensation; determinations of work-related injury address the attribution of responsibility, while court review may involve damages. Back within the family, it connects to the concrete division of care work and the bearing of costs. Relatives may use it to judge whether they need to help or to assess whether the person still has the capacity to work.

Similar branching also occurs with cash-gift records and household registration materials. A cash-gift record enters not only borrowing but may also enter partnerships, courtship and marriage, eldercare, lineage evaluations, and local social standing. In partnerships it is credit; in courtship and marriage, family evaluation; in eldercare, responsibility and exchange; in lineage evaluations, rules; in local respectability, social standing. Household registration materials likewise branch and can enter domains such as children's school enrollment, medical care, renting, employment, welfare, and recognition in the city. A problem with one piece of material may simultaneously affect a child's school, whether the family stays or leaves, job stability, and relatives' evaluations. Branching means that a relational chain is no longer a single line: the same difference is separately extracted at multiple nodes, forming multiple chains of consequences.

Branching shows that differences can enter multiple consequence settings, while cutoff shows that not all these settings will recognize them. The paths that branch off may affect one another. Spending on family care, for example, may affect debt arrangements, while debt materials may in turn be used by relatives or local evaluators to judge reliability. Such influence across chains still requires actual passing-on and use; a possible association cannot simply be written as causation that has already occurred.

VI. Cutoff and Redirection: Why Differences Sometimes Fail to Get Through

Relational chains are not naturally unobstructed. Whether differences can continue to be transmitted depends on whether the next node recognizes them and how it interprets them. Cutoff is not an exception but one of the normal mechanisms of relational chains. If the next node does not recognize a difference, the chain is cut off; if it rewrites the difference, the chain changes direction. Cutoff and redirection show especially clearly that consequences are not inevitable. Workplaces, insurers, courts, relatives, or local evaluators may all fail to recognize a difference because the materials are insufficient, the rules are not met, or interpretations differ.

In concrete handling, if the workplace does not recognize the medical records, the leave chain may be cut off. The workplace may say that the medical certificate does not meet requirements, or that the condition does not warrant such a long leave. The lower-back injury has then entered the hospital node but failed to enter the workplace node smoothly. If the workplace records leave as unauthorized absence, the chain does not simply break but changes direction: the lower-back injury no longer enters the chain of legitimate leave, but a chain of discipline and punishment. Likewise, if an old injury is not recognized within insurance relations, the claims chain is cut off; if fellow workers do not testify, the chain of responsibility for work-related injury may also be cut off.

If no one consults the records of wedding and funeral exchanges, local reputation may temporarily have no effect. If an absence was neither remembered nor interpreted as a breach of propriety, it will not enter borrowing, courtship and marriage, or partnerships. If an influential elder does not accept an interpretation, the cash-gift chain may change direction: what could have been explained as difficulty may be called coldness; what could have been explained as sending a gift through someone else may be described as failure to attend. If an IOU cannot prove a debt, the debt chain may break; if no one recognizes relatives' memories, past relations may also fail to be passed on.

Even if material continues to circulate, new naming brings differences into another set of judgments and forms of handling rather than simply extending the original route. Analysis of cutoff and redirection must

therefore explain the procedural and material conditions under which refusal, supplementary documentation, changes to records, and reevaluation each occur. Cutoff does not necessarily mean a difference has no consequences at all. After a procedure rejects certain materials, they may still be raised again within the family, among relatives, or in another institutional procedure; others stop temporarily because no one preserves or recognizes them. Analysis should distinguish nonrecognition at one point from failure to take effect in every setting, avoiding the expansion of a local judgment into an overall conclusion.

VII. Recirculation in the Reverse Direction: How Chains Change Differentiation Positions

Relational chains do not spread outward without limit: they flow back to the object and change its differentiation position. Later, specific handlers draw anew on results left by earlier handling at different nodes, along with records of attendance, evaluations, debts, reputation, or family memories. This process constitutes recirculation; it is not the chain returning to the object on its own. Changes in differentiation position are products of relational handling, not the automatic manifestation of an object's inherent identity.

Take the lower-back injury. It moves from medical records into the workplace, attendance, performance, income, debts, and relatives' evaluations, then finally returns to the worker and changes his range of action: whether he can continue working, take leave, repay his debts, or maintain respectability before relatives will all be affected. At the same time, this also changes his lock-in structure. Bodily pain, falling income, demands for debt repayment, household expenses, and workplace evaluations lock into one another, making it harder for him to leave his present circumstances.

This recirculation also changes future distinction extraction. When the workplace next considers him, it may remember his leave; when relatives next evaluate him, they may remember his borrowing and repayments; when the family next discusses spending, it may also remember the fall in income caused by this lower-back injury.

Similar recirculation also occurs in cash-gift and household registration chains. A wedding or funeral exchange moves from records of such exchanges into borrowing, credit, courtship and marriage, eldercare, and local respectability, then finally returns to the family's position in local society. Whether borrowing is easy for the family in the future, whether the children's courtship and marriage prospects are favorably regarded, and whether anyone steps forward to care for the elderly will all be affected. The household registration chain moves from household registration, residence permits, social insurance, and rental registration into children's school enrollment; enrollment outcomes bear on whether the family stays or leaves; whether it stays or leaves bears on job stability and rental pressures; and the chain finally returns to the family's differentiation position in the city.

The constraints brought by recirculation are not unchangeable fixed labels. New diagnoses, income arrangements, care support, or explanations may change how later people use old records. Preserving this possibility of revision neither denies existing consequences nor locks the object into the position formed by a single instance of handling.

VIII. How Formal and Informal Chains Connect to One Another

Formal and informal relational chains are not separate; they often connect to one another. A person is neither simply processed by institutions nor simply evaluated by a society of acquaintances, but often moves between the two kinds of chain. This constitutes the complexity of social position.

The connection between formal and informal relational chains appears in the circulation of materials across different domains. At more formal nodes, medical records are handled through insurance procedures and a claim is denied; the denial connects to arguments within the family, the arguments to evaluations among relatives, and those evaluations spread into local reputation. In this way, the bodily difference originally handled by hospitals and insurers flows into informal social evaluation. Circulation in this direction also appears in other relations. After an IOU is submitted to a court and a formal judgment results, the debt, having undergone institutional and documentary handling, is reinterpreted by local society as a matter of credit and character. Household registration materials are submitted to a school, and institutional eligibility affects a child's enrollment outcome. That outcome both prompts relatives' evaluations of the family's ability to remain in the city and bears on the family's own decision to stay or leave.

A path can also enter formal procedures from informal nodes, then return to informal relations. Records of wedding and funeral exchanges are used as a basis for borrowing. After lending and borrowing have occurred, a dispute over the performance of obligations, repayment, or the attribution of responsibility may enter court proceedings. The outcome of the court's judgment returns to local reputation, becoming material through which people evaluate credit and character.

Formal and informal chains are not inherently more or less truthful than one another; they differ in rules, authority, and ways of tracing what happened. Formal procedures can leave documents, deadlines, and forms of responsibility; within informal relations, family members, relatives, or local evaluators may also preserve materials concerning care, exchanges, and reputation. As the two connect, they may supplement one another or conflict.

Connections between formal and informal chains must be traced to specific people, materials, and procedures. Family members, relatives, or local evaluators can reinterpret documents, judgments, medical records, and eligibility reviews; family memories, exchange records, and reputation may also be brought into formal procedures. When these connect to one another, one must still ask which person, which material, and which procedure changed the consequences. Neither side can be presumed to be the sole source of true explanation.

IX. Sedimentation: How a Chain Becomes New Material at Nodes

A relational chain is not a one-time flow. Its results settle and become materials for subsequent relational judgments and starting points for the next relational chain.

Attendance records may be retained after an employee takes leave. Later they will be extracted as a basis for performance evaluations, and may also be retrieved when a job reassignment is under consideration. After a court judgment, a record classifying someone as untrustworthy may remain; this material will subsequently enter credit judgments, judgments about cooperation, and local evaluations.

Within families and local society, a denial of insurance compensation may leave a history of relations within the family: who paid for treatment, who did not, who said what, and who bore the work of care will all enter family memory. An absence from a cash-gift exchange may leave a local reputation that will reappear later in borrowing, courtship and marriage, eldercare, or partnerships. An argument in a chat may leave screenshots and group evaluations, which will be brought out again later as materials for judging a person to be reliable or unreliable, and to fit or not fit in with the group.

Records, evaluations, reputation, screenshots, and memories left by a chain can preserve differences that have not yet re-entered current handling. They are not latent differentiation space itself, but materials of difference that may be extracted, assigned weight, and connected anew in the future. Sedimentation does not leave

abstract traces detached from people: there is a distance between the preservation of records and their renewed use. Material may be properly preserved yet go unused for a long time, or become relevant again in a new conflict, application, care arrangement, or evaluation.

Whether material is extracted anew in the future depends on who preserves it, who can access it, and in what event it is deemed relevant. Preservation does not guarantee renewed use. Without new people to extract it, new circumstances, and new judgments, the material may also remain silent.

When a new relational field emerges, those who preserve the materials, the subjects undertaking distinction extraction, and handlers with the relevant authority must still judge whether the materials are relevant, whether they suffice to support subsequent handling, and whether they can reconnect to specific consequences. Preservation of the materials does not replace these necessary judgments and procedures. Consequences may continue because later people still extract and handle these materials through the relevant procedures, not because the materials themselves keep acting.

X. From Relational Chains to the Network

A single relational chain cannot encompass all the processes of handling occurring simultaneously in reality. Paths such as lower-back injury chains, debt chains, cash-gift chains, and household registration chains may connect through specific materials, handlers, and consequences. When the same record is extracted in different places, it may also be directed toward different judgments and arrangements. These intersections prompt analysts to expand the scope of tracing and examine how different materials, positions, and settings of handling implicate one another. This does not, however, define the network here, nor does it yet elaborate how multiple chains jointly reorganize social positions.

The intersection of relational chains also requires addressing failures to take up what is passed on. Material may be brought to the next node without being read; after being read, it may still not be adopted because of authority, format, or deadlines. Sometimes recipients recognize the material but connect it to another kind of consequence. Analysts cannot merely record that material has been passed on; they must also explain whether the transfer accomplished renewed extraction, interpretation, and weight assignment.

When multiple chains intersect, their consequences may amplify one another or cancel one another out. The simultaneous tightening of an unpaid-wage chain and a family-care chain will further reduce the capacity to wait; if a local-support chain connects, it may temporarily provide a loan or testimony. Intersection does not mean that all relations share the same responsibility. The carriers, timing, and actual consequences of each chain must still be traced.

Stable relations across events must be explained through repeated relaying rather than abstract names. If the same kinds of materials are preserved, extracted, and put into effect from similar positions across multiple events, a relatively stable judgment about relations can be proposed. Once a new event shows that relaying has changed direction or ceased to work, the macro-level conclusion must be narrowed. Relational chains provide paths that can be repeatedly checked against materials, not causal lines that remain forever unchanged.

The boundaries of a relational chain also depend on the research question. An inquiry into how a wage payment enters household debt can be brought to a close at the corresponding positions of payment, borrowing, and taking up what is passed on. If the question turns to long-term local trust, another set of materials and another time span are needed. Bringing the inquiry to a close is not arbitrary cutoff: it means

explaining which stretch of the path is currently sufficient to answer the question and for which subsequent relations materials have yet to be obtained.

Chapter 15. Networks: How Multiple Relational Chains Jointly Process Differences and Reorganize Positions

I. A Network Is Neither Personal Connections nor a Diagram

A differentiation network is a structure for processing differences in which multiple differences, different nodes, different weights, and multiple relational paths jointly form, change, or maintain positions and consequences within a concrete relational field. Intersection, branching, mutual weight assignment, mutual cutoff, and write-back may all occur within it. Nodes preserve differences, give them definite form, filter them, authorize their extraction, pass them on, or put them into effect. Relational chains, by contrast, are paths that analysts extract from the operation of differentiation networks to trace how a difference is extracted, passed on, recast, recognized, refused, assigned weight, and transmitted, how it branches, is cut off, and flows back, and how it produces consequences. The concept of the network is used here to trace how multiple such paths intersect; nodes, relational chains, and networks must still belong to different levels.

A network is not a stack of relational chains. It is a structure for processing differences in which multiple relational chains, as they intersect, rewrite one another's weights, interlink positions, and produce structural consequences.

Knowing someone or making contact only provides an opportunity for certain materials, information, or requests to be passed on. It does not tell us who has authority to draw on them, who will recognize them, or whether using them will change income, eligibility, evaluations, or care arrangements. Two people may know each other well without any existing material being brought into a procedure. The same medical record brought to a workplace may also remain confined to one instance of leave without connecting to attendance, performance, or household expenditure. Treating contact itself as a network skips the crucial steps through which differences are concretely handled.

If a network is understood in advance as a diagram, the handling that lines on the diagram cannot show will be overlooked. A static diagram can show connections between certain positions, and families, workplaces, schools, and exchanges among relatives can also be marked on it. Yet the lines alone cannot tell us whether medical records are adopted, whether supplementary materials are accepted, or whether existing records change judgments about lending and borrowing. A network can be identified only in the concrete processes through which differences are preserved, extracted, passed on, and connected. Without such handling, the lines are merely conditions for possible contact.

The interlinking of positions is not a matter of adding up identities such as worker, wife, child, parent, and creditor. What needs to be examined is who extracts differences pertaining to different objects, through which materials, and under what rules and at what relational positions those differences are connected. The same identity designation may enter different consequences under different income arrangements, divisions of care work, material conditions, and records of exchange.

Medical records, attendance records, eligibility forms, exchange records, and oral evaluations may all preserve differences or give them definite form. A node is therefore neither an abstract dot nor simply a particular person. Managers, reviewers, family members, and relatives handle these differences according to their available materials, procedures, and responsibilities. What the network traces is precisely the intersection of multiple relational chains at different nodes; it does not add another subject capable of acting on its own.

II. How Multiple Chains Operate Simultaneously

A single relational chain can trace how a difference passes through nodes and enters consequences, but it is still insufficient to explain the interrelations among multiple differences within the same relational field. A worker's lower-back injury forms one path through medical records, leave, attendance, performance, and income; wedding and funeral exchanges form another through records, borrowing, courtship and marriage, eldercare, and local evaluation. Only when the two paths actually meet in the same family or local circumstances does analysis need to trace further how they affect one another within the real differentiation network. A differentiation network is not assembled afterward from several pre-existing, independent relational chains. A lower-back injury, debts, children's school enrollment, renting, social insurance, and relatives' evaluations can simultaneously affect a family's position; cash gifts, borrowing, courtship and marriage, eldercare, lineage evaluations, and local reputation may also jointly affect a household's position. These differences and their consequences cannot be added up according to identity labels. Only through handling at concrete nodes and in relational chains does the interlinking of positions form.

After a nonlocal worker injures his lower back, workplace managers can use the medical records for leave, attendance, and job assignments, while attendance and performance may in turn affect income. Once income falls, rent, living expenses, old debts, and spending on children all become urgent at the same time. Creditors, relatives, and family members also make different judgments based on repayments, borrowing, sending money, and care. These problems are handled through multiple chains operating in parallel within the same family circumstances, rather than appearing one after another in a queue. Children's school enrollment may also involve continuity of social insurance, rental registration, proof of residence, and school materials. Unstable work, changes in renting, or incomplete materials do not necessarily change whether the family stays or leaves, but may confront teachers, eligibility reviewers, family members, and relatives with different conditions of judgment.

Parallel operation refers first to overlap in the timing of handling; at any given step, a necessary causal link may not yet have formed. After a worker is injured, family members may face medical expenses first, or deal simultaneously with medical expenses, rent, spending on children, and time for care. Workplace personnel may examine leave, shift coverage, job assignments, attendance, and performance at the same time. Relatives may know only about borrowing or sending money, or may evaluate reliability through exchanges involving borrowing, remittances, and care for the elderly. Even when these processes occur during the same period, one must still examine whether the workplace adopts the medical records, whether attendance changes income, and whether income actually affects repayments and material conditions before judging which chains have actually connected.

Problems with school enrollment materials cannot simply be reduced to consequences of unstable work either. Continuity of social insurance, rental registration, proof of residence, and school materials each have their own conditions for examination, supplementation, or recognition. Although a fall in income may make it harder for family members to meet certain expenses, teachers or eligibility reviewers still make their respective judgments according to materials and procedures. These processes need not develop in the same direction, yet may affect one another during the same period through income, records, eligibility, or evaluations, bringing originally separate problems jointly into the family's position.

The parallel operation of multiple chains provides a scope for tracing; it cannot directly replace concrete identification of materials, procedures, and those who undertake the handling. Being raised simultaneously must be distinguished from actually being connected. Family members may discuss medical expenses, rent, and spending on children together when arranging expenditures without necessarily making each a basis for

the next judgment. Workplace personnel may see medical records and attendance at the same time yet still handle the matter under only one of the relevant rules. Only by preserving this distinction can we see where network intersection has formed and where there is still only a possible connection.

When multiple chains exist alongside one another, each can have different starting points and consequences. If medical records are used only in medical care, an IOU is raised only in a private loan, and enrollment materials are examined only in an eligibility review, with no shared processing relation among them, these are still merely several chains existing simultaneously. Only when changes in income, gaps in materials, or existing evaluations are brought by the same people concerned into arrangements for household spending, lending and borrowing, school enrollment, or care do connections, intensification, and offsetting effects appear.

The same set of chains may even operate in opposite directions. Medical records can secure recognition of leave without necessarily lowering performance ratings; relatives' assistance may temporarily ease debts without changing workplace job assignments; supplementary materials may maintain enrollment eligibility without eliminating rent pressures. Changes in position during parallel operation therefore often differ in timing and in the parts affected: some chains produce actual consequences earlier, while others remain only conditions that may be drawn upon; some processes return to family arrangements, while others remain within institutional procedures.

III. Nodes of Intersection: Where Networks Form

Household income can become a position at which multiple relational chains intersect, where consequences arise or handling takes place: a lower-back injury appears here as falling income through work arrangements, debt as repayment pressure, and children's school enrollment as implications for renting, materials, and educational spending. Relatives may in turn assess family responsibilities on this basis. But income itself does not preserve, extract, or process differences. Those who actually undertake extraction, calculation, evaluation, use, and passing-on are family members, workplace personnel, creditors, and relatives, along with the corresponding records, rules, and procedures.

A node of intersection need not be a single location. It may be an entry point for materials, an eligibility procedure, a fixed institutional position, or a relational position at which family members must make arrangements together. When family members arrange spending and care around income, reviewers process eligibility materials, or relatives and local evaluators use existing records in their exchanges, previously scattered differences may enter the same processing relation. If the same income, material, or evaluation simultaneously affects borrowing, school enrollment, care, work arrangements, or local cooperation, analysis must trace concretely at the network level how the people concerned, according to their materials, rules, and relational positions, connect the consequences of multiple chains to one another.

Workplaces, schools, relatives' evaluations, and local reputation can therefore all become points of intersection, but they must not be treated as autonomous entities controlling consequences on their own. The workplace here is a setting where managers process materials under rules for attendance, performance, social insurance, and job assignments. A school likewise does not admit or exclude on its own, but is a concrete relation in which teachers or eligibility reviewers make determinations according to existing enrollment materials and conditions. Relatives and acquaintances decide whether to lend money, help, or keep their distance according to exchanges, care, and evaluations of responsibility. Only by distinguishing specific handlers, the materials used, and the corresponding procedures can we see how intersection actually forms.

When multiple relational chains exist simultaneously, analysis can further trace whether they intersect, connect, intensify, offset one another, or undergo write-back, and how these operations change concrete consequences. Medical records, IOUs, household registration materials, school files, workplace attendance records, relatives' memories, and local reputation can connect different chains to the same consequence setting only when the people concerned draw on, recognize, refuse, or pass them on according to their rules, authority, and procedures. The same material can be handled differently at different positions: medical records document injury in medical recording, provide grounds for whether someone may leave work when requesting workplace leave, and are used by family members and creditors as conditions of judgment in arrangements for income, debts, or care. Only when different people draw on the material anew under different rules and at different relational positions do the chains go beyond standing alongside one another and potentially connect, constrain one another, or provide conditions for one another within the same consequence setting.

A small number of personnel, procedures, eligibility conditions, or entry points for materials may sometimes become bottlenecks at these positions, simultaneously affecting whether multiple chains can connect. Whether a medical record can enter leave arrangements, whether supplementary proof can enter an eligibility procedure, and whether relatives adopt a record of exchanges as a basis for judging lending and borrowing may all limit the availability of multiple paths. A particular step becomes a bottleneck because conditions for connection are concentrated there, not because an institutional name is inherently important. Yet the appearance of multiple chains at the same position does not necessarily mean they have intersected. Household income, school materials, or relatives' evaluations may be raised at the same time; if the people concerned do not bring the outcome of one process into another judgment, the chains may still stop separately. Intersection requires an identifiable connection: a difference already processed becomes a condition, constraint, or available resource for another process.

Intersection can also produce constraints rather than amplification in one direction. Recognition of supplementary proof, for example, may reduce pressures previously produced jointly by leave, attendance, and eligibility materials; nonacceptance of material may prevent an existing arrangement on another chain from continuing. Analysis of differentiation networks does not set a threshold based on the number of relations or fixed minimum conditions. One important form of operation that can be traced is how multiple relational chains change one another's weights, availability, or direction of consequences through concrete handling. Yet the network's scope must still be determined by actual intersection. Relations that have neither been brought into joint handling nor changed the conditions of other chains cannot count as core parts of this network simply through proximity, even if they exist in the same family or locality. This restriction preserves boundaries for network analysis without drawing every coexisting relation into the same explanation.

IV. Reordering of Weights: Why Differences Suddenly Become Weightier

The reordering of weights often begins with apparently local handling. Viewed alone, a period of leave may mean only a few days away from work, and its consequences may be limited. But if managers connect it to job assignments, attendance, performance, wages, and social insurance records, and family members then adjust debts, renting, spending on children, and care in light of changes in income, the difference is used repeatedly at multiple processing positions. Its growing weight does not lie in leave itself acquiring some fixed meaning, but in the consequences to which different people connect it. The same holds for absence from a cash-gift exchange or a gap in household registration materials. Whether the people concerned recognize or refuse it, supply supplementary proof, or evaluate on that basis affects its weight in different relations.

Whether these differences appear serious in certain relational fields depends on whether they connect to consequence settings such as attendance, income, eligibility, lending and borrowing, care, or local evaluation. This is not because they inherently possess equal force, nor does it mean that differences grow on their own or that the network assigns weight by itself. Multiple low-weight differences entering these consequence settings at points of intersection may produce high-weight consequences after specific people extract them and assign them weight according to materials, rules, and relational positions. Several originally lighter differences may also intensify one another: medical records call for leave, leave involves attendance, changes in income make debts and spending harder to arrange, and existing evaluations concerning lending and borrowing or by relatives may be raised again. Each link must still be handled by specific people according to materials and rules. Only by considering these processes together can we explain why weightier consequences occur. "Many" cannot be directly equated with necessarily "weighty."

At the same time, if another chain can provide alternative proof, materials that can gain recognition, adjustable arrangements, or obtainable resources, an originally weightier difference may be downweighted. The original connection may then cease to intensify the consequences and even cut off some of them. Recognition and refusal by different people, whether different materials can corroborate one another, and whether alternative resources exist keep weight variable. Weight is neither moral standing nor a fixed judgment on a person or an inevitable result. It describes the intensity with which a difference enters real consequences in the current relational field, an intensity that changes with the concrete conditions of handling.

V. The Interlinking of Positions: How One Person's Differences Affect Others

A lower-back injury does not remain with the worker alone. Care relations allow one person's bodily difference to enter another person's work and time arrangements, but the interlinking of positions does not mean that everyone bears the same consequences, nor can each person's consequences be made into the same thing. Whether the wife takes leave to provide care, works more, or adjusts spending on the children depends on the family's division of labor and available resources. Whether parents provide support, whether creditors grant more time, and how workplace personnel arrange job assignments and shift coverage all change the actual positions of those concerned. The child faces materials, residence, and educational arrangements. These people occupy different relational positions; the materials they can use, the rules they are subject to, and the responsibilities they bear differ. The interlinking of positions forms gradually through relations of care, work, debt, eligibility, and evaluation.

Debts, eligibility, and evaluations likewise interlink different people's positions, unfolding according to their respective rules. Whether creditors grant more time depends on exchanges, available information, and judgments within lending and borrowing relations; whether workplace personnel adjust job assignments depends on leave, attendance, and work arrangements; whether relatives help depends on existing exchanges, care, and evaluations of responsibility. Changes in social insurance or residence can affect a child's application and school arrangements only when local enrollment rules include the relevant materials in the review. Obstacles to the child's enrollment may in turn affect the parents' work choices, housing, and whether the family stays or leaves. Absence from a cash-gift exchange may affect the family's chances of borrowing, the children's courtship and marriage, eldercare, and local evaluations. These processes may be affected simultaneously by the same event, yet each has its own materials, procedures, and responsibilities; they cannot be compressed into a single shared consequence.

A differentiation position refers precisely to the actual position formed after the people concerned extract differences pertaining to different objects in a concrete relational field, assign weight according to materials and rules, and connect the results of these processes through relational chains. It is not the accumulation of identity designations such as worker, wife, parent, child, and creditor, still less a fixed fate into which anyone falls upon being injured. When relational positions change, materials are processed anew, or a relational chain is cut off, each person's differentiation position may adjust accordingly.

VI. Local Spread: How an Event Passes through Multiple Nodes

Local differences do not spread throughout the entire domain; their transmission advances step by step through specific nodes, materials, and relational chains. A worker's lower-back injury can move from hospital medical records into workplace leave and job arrangements, then through attendance and performance into income. Yet each step depends on specific people drawing on materials and handling them at the corresponding relational positions and under the relevant conditions of recognition. If medical records are not brought into leave procedures, or the handling of leave does not change job assignments, attendance, and income, the injury's consequences may remain within medical treatment and family care. Even if income changes, one must still examine whether creditors adjust their judgments of repayment accordingly and whether relatives raise reliability anew in their exchanges before differences can continue into chains of lending and borrowing, debt, relatives' evaluations of responsibility, and local reputation. The path must be confirmed stretch by stretch; naming an event cannot stand in for the occurrence of all its consequences.

Other relational paths display the same step-by-step advance. A gap in household registration materials may move from enrollment materials into renting, social insurance, job stability, and whether the family stays or leaves; absence from a cash-gift exchange may pass through records of wedding and funeral exchanges into borrowing, courtship and marriage, eldercare, and lineage evaluations. Along these paths, every connection depends on whether usable records exist, whether those concerned have authority to handle them, whether the consequence setting recognizes the material, and whether the person involved can obtain alternative proof or support. If supplementary proof is recognized, enrollment materials may cease to affect renting and work arrangements; if an existing record is not used, it may not enter new local evaluations. Materials not being extracted, procedures not granting recognition, personnel refusing to pass materials on, or another chain providing an alternative path may all stop the spread somewhere, change its direction, or produce only limited consequences. If someone refuses to pass materials on or lacks authority, the chain will stop at a node.

Local spread therefore describes conditional paths whose scope and boundaries may also change. Reducing spread to "everything affects everything else" would conceal which people actually handled what, which materials really passed through which node, and at what relational position a determination was made. Network analysis requires each concrete condition for connection to be specified, retaining the mechanisms through which spread may stop or change direction and consequences remain limited. This avoids misrepresenting conditional paths as structures extending without limit.

VII. Structural Lock-In: How Multiple Chains Interlock

When multiple relational chains repeatedly connect, making different processing positions constrain one another, structural lock-in may form within the relational field. A fall in the worker's income may worsen debt; debt pressure lowers relatives' evaluations of reliability; lower evaluations may make borrowing harder, further increasing pressure on household spending. In another set of relations, children's school enrollment involves continuity of social insurance, which in turn involves job stability, leave, the body, and the division of care work; renting may also interlock with these. When these steps of handling interlock within a concrete relational field, dealing with one chain alone is often insufficient to change the overall position.

Structural lock-in describes the structural consequences of multiple relational chains mutually restricting one another's conditions through concrete handling. It differs from oppression through a single relation and is not an irresistible fate in which the network actively imprisons the object. In the examples above, when changes in income make repayment arrangements difficult, creditors and relatives may judge anew within their respective relations. If such judgments restrict new lending and borrowing or support, family members have less room to handle spending and care. These consequences form lock-in only when the people concerned actually bring an earlier process into a later one. Thus, if we address only one leave request, one attempt to borrow, or one gap in materials without examining how it connects with income, care, eligibility, and evaluations, the original pressure may reappear elsewhere.

But lock-in is not unchangeable. Whether it can loosen depends on whether specific people recognize new proof, whether they adjust arrangements, and whether relational resources can be connected. Whether the workplace recognizes leave, fellow workers are willing to explain how the injury occurred, the school accepts supplementary materials, and relatives are willing to help all affect whether chains are cut off, redirected, or reconnected. Specifically, if these parties grant recognition, step forward to explain, or accept supplementary documents, or if relatives actually help with care or the family obtains usable resources, a chain may be cut off, redirected, or temporarily eased. Solving one problem alone is sometimes insufficient; that does not mean every adjustment is ineffective.

In analysis, structural lock-in must be distinguished from temporary difficulties and pressure from a single chain. A short-term expense, an instance of leave that was not carried forward, or material that can be corrected or supplemented does not necessarily make multiple chains interlock. Only when multiple relational chains repeatedly connect and make different processing positions constrain one another is lock-in needed to describe this conditional structural consequence.

VIII. Networks May Also Provide Room for Adjustment

Relatives may contribute money, accompany someone to medical appointments, or look after children; neighbors may also take children to and from places, cook, or care for the elderly. These concrete actions perform different functions and may provide time for care or ease immediate expenses, but money from relatives does not necessarily change the workplace's handling of attendance. Even after family members accept help with care, they must still redistribute time and responsibilities within the family.

People from the same hometown may introduce job opportunities, acquaintances may mediate debts and coordinate temporary repayment arrangements, and someone may prevent work or living arrangements from being immediately interrupted. These actions can open new paths of handling within previously strained chains. Yet after debt has been temporarily deferred, lending, borrowing, and repayment relations have not disappeared; they must still be faced within the concrete relational field.

In matters of eligibility and proof, teachers, community personnel, or landlords may help provide supplementary proof when the necessary material conditions exist; fellow workers may explain the worksite and how the injury occurred. Help from teachers or landlords in supplementing materials may maintain a particular eligibility without eliminating debt and care pressures. Fellow workers' accounts of the injury may add materials for subsequent handling, but whether the people concerned recognize them according to the rules must still be examined. Even when supplementary documents are accepted here, the materials may be examined again in another procedure.

Room for adjustment is therefore neither a sentimental narrative nor the network rescuing the object on its own. Whether it arises depends on specific people, materials, authority, conditions of recognition, and relational resources. Help does not occur naturally or guarantee a change in the outcome. Whether particular people have resources and are willing to take responsibility within existing exchanges, evaluations of responsibility, or what they can afford; whether the relevant materials can be completed; whether institutional personnel have authority to recognize them; and the fact that procedures may still have their own timing and requirements after the materials are completed all limit the scope for adjustment.

Changes of this kind often reach only part of the situation. Their effects enter only the chains to which they actually connect, allowing some original paths to be redirected, temporarily deferred, or reconnected. New paths likewise require handling within concrete relational fields; a single instance of assistance cannot be abstracted into a permanent solution. Identifying these conditions and subsequent requirements does not deny the help. Describing a local change as complete relief would instead erase the conditions for adjustment.

IX. Network Write-Back: What Remains after Intersection

Write-back occurs when the results of current determinations, recording, handling, or actions are preserved as differences that can be extracted again in the future. After multiple relational chains intersect in handling within a concrete relational field, their results may leave specific materials at nodes: a lower-back injury may leave medical records, leave records, performance evaluations, borrowing records, and relatives' evaluations; a dispute over enrollment materials may leave impressions at the school, rental records, social insurance records, and parent evaluations; absence from a cash-gift exchange may also leave records of wedding and funeral exchanges, local reputation, and judgments made later in lending and borrowing or courtship and marriage. These materials are formed by specific people through recording, evaluation, eligibility procedures, preservation, and subsequent use. They are not subjects acting on their own, nor are they latent differentiation space itself.

Latent differentiation space refers to a structure of differences that have not yet been extracted by the current relational field or entered current differentiation space, but already have paths of preservation and thus may be extracted anew in future relational fields. Materials are the concrete carriers left after differences have been preserved and given definite form through people, procedures, or relations. Whether later people can find and use them remains limited by authority, rules, and relational positions. Latent differentiation space is not the collection of these materials. A record can provide one path for future use without being latent differentiation space itself, and it does not trigger consequences on its own.

A leave record may remain in existing files for a long time, and a record of absence from a cash-gift exchange may not have re-entered judgments about lending and borrowing or courtship and marriage. Preserving materials through recording merely leaves conditions for future differentiation. Material not yet used is not equivalent to real consequences already produced. Material at nodes is not a mysterious container holding differences, and there is no guarantee that it will take effect automatically in later handling. Whether

preserved records are raised again because of new events, eligibility reviews, lending and borrowing relations, family disputes, or local evaluations, or remain unused for a long time, depends on subsequent relational fields and relational conditions.

When subsequent events, subsequent relational fields, or later steps of handling within the same continuing relational field arise, future managers, teachers, relatives, creditors, or others concerned must still judge, according to their authority, rules, materials, and relational positions, whether to draw on the materials, how to reposition or interpret them, and whether to connect them to new relational chains. Whether managers consult leave and performance records again, teachers or reviewers retrieve enrollment materials again, or relatives and creditors bring out existing evaluations in their exchanges all depends on how specific people later handle matters at the corresponding positions. Only when the people concerned extract the materials anew and reconnect them to rules, eligibility, responsibility, or evaluative relations may differences re-enter handling. Whether new consequences form still depends on the subjects undertaking distinction extraction, weights, and modes of connection. Preservation leaves conditions; extraction and weight assignment are later handling.

The same record may also be interpreted differently at different relational positions. Family members may use it as a basis for dividing care work, workplace personnel examine its relation to job assignments according to procedures, and relatives form another evaluation in their exchanges. Network write-back traces precisely how repeated preservation, extraction, interpretation, and connection leave conditions for later differentiation positions, rather than some fixed meaning inherent in the material itself.

X. From Networks to Communities

Networks can explain how multiple relational chains intersect, leave sediments, and interlink social positions, but this structure is not yet a community. Long-term local exchanges, school records, or lineage narratives can allow certain differences to be used anew in later relations, extending the network's influence on specific positions. Yet such conditions of continuing preservation and use remain insufficient to complete a theoretical account of community.

The intersection, reordering, and write-back of multiple relational chains reveal how differences are transmitted between different nodes and affect the positions of the parties involved. But this interlinking does not automatically produce belonging or turn those within it into a naturally unified group. The retention of records, exchanges, or evaluations shows only that they may still become conditions for distinction extraction later. It does not yet explain who is recognized, who is required to bear responsibility, or how lasting boundaries are maintained. The concept of the network cannot directly substitute for an examination of the mechanisms through which lasting recognition, boundaries, belonging, protection, exclusion, punishment, and social memory form; these must be investigated separately.

Drawing this boundary strictly serves to avoid theoretical misjudgments in two directions at once. On the one hand, long-term exchanges, repeated evaluations, or the preservation of materials cannot be treated directly as shared belonging. On the other, the fact that the relevant handling has not yet constituted a community cannot justify denying that these network processes have actually interlinked the positions and consequences of the parties involved. This chapter addresses only the mechanisms and limits of the latter.

Chapter 16. Community: How Long-Running Differentiation Networks Form Boundaries, Recognition, and Social Memory

I. Community: A Boundary-Structured Memory Order

A community is a boundary-structured memory order formed through a long-running social differentiation network's repeated preservation, extraction, interpretation, weight assignment, recognition, exclusion, protection, punishment, and handing down of differences. Long-term handling of differences leaves sedimented judgments about inside and outside that later people can draw on; this definition does not establish community as a separate actor.

A real community is neither identity registration nor a membership list, still less something derived from an abstract classification. It is a boundary order jointly formed by long-term interaction, preservation of memory, mutual recognition, exclusionary boundaries, protective obligations, punishment mechanisms, and the bearing of consequences. Even if two people are placed near one another by the same class image, they do not thereby have relations of mutual trust, mutual assistance, shared memory, or bearing consequences for one another. A roster can record names and a classification can mark positions, but neither can by itself show which exchanges will be remembered, which responsibilities people will be called to account for, or who will take someone in when they are in difficulty or push them out.

Viewed through concrete exchanges, a community can neither be treated as a container for a group of people nor as some pre-existing spirit. It is an order that gradually forms through specific people, materials, rules, rituals, and exchanges. It contains belonging as well as refusal, care as well as humiliation; it cannot be defined by beginning with a warm-hearted image.

Research by Andreas Wimmer and by Michèle Lamont and Virág Molnár examines ethnic and community boundaries as processes of continual formation, maintenance, and change. These works provide only closely related points of contact concerning boundary mechanisms; they do not define the status of community as a reality in this book.

Nodes, relational chains, networks, and communities occupy different levels of processing differences and cannot replace one another. Materials such as medical records, IOUs, household registration, evaluations, genealogies, local reputation, and wedding and funeral exchanges first make it possible for certain differences to remain preserved. Relatives, schools, workplaces, neighbors, and local exchanges allow these materials to be passed on, supplemented, occluded, or interrupted. Only when multiple chains intersect within the circumstances of the same family, place of residence, or locality do they constitute the network's joint processing of differences, allowing differences to affect income, eligibility, evaluations, care, or residential positions at the same time. The network explains how differences cross and flow, and focuses on how multiple chains intersect. Yet the intersection of multiple chains still cannot answer who is regarded as one of the community's own, whose past is worth explaining, or whose difficulties others will take up and help them through. Community explains how these flows sediment over time into boundaries, obligations, eligibility, reputation, and memory, and focuses on how these intersections are recorded, who interprets them, and how they change the next judgment.

For a network to become a community, this handling cannot affect only one event; it will also be invoked anew by later people. This requires the network to preserve differences over time, extract them repeatedly, form interpretive authority, produce recognition and boundaries, and pass the results of handling into the next round of judgments, gradually establishing more stable judgments about obligations, eligibility, reputation, and inside and outside. Without this continuity, even densely intersecting nodes and relational chains may be only temporary cooperation, short-term contact, or exchanges unrelated to one another.

Therefore, the long-term operation of a network does not necessarily mean that a community has already formed. Knowing one another for a long time, maintaining frequent contact, or helping one another once are only possible materials, not proof that a community has formed. Amid dense everyday contact, people may rent in the same place for years, see one another daily, shop for groceries, and work together, yet when children’s school enrollment, borrowing money, courtship and marriage, or a crisis arrives, they may still be treated merely as people temporarily present. People who repeatedly meet at the same construction site, school, or neighborhood, and even know one another's names, may likewise never establish a relation of jointly bearing consequences. At decisive moments no one may step forward to explain their circumstances, take up their difficulties and help them through, or bring past events into the judgment. Conversely, some exchanges may be infrequent, but if responsibilities, records, rituals, and evaluations can be reactivated when needed, they may still constitute a stronger community connection. The point is not how many times people have contact, but whether differences are handled over time as boundaries, responsibilities, and memory.

Personal connections and organizations likewise cannot be equated directly with community. Personal connections can serve as channels of exchange, but may be only paths through which information, requests, or resources are passed on. They need neither preserve who once bore responsibility nor establish who has authority to explain past events. An organization may have positions, rules, and rosters and may arrange work, but a community's boundary is not determined by a form alone. An organization may not form one and the same boundary in members' care, wedding and funeral relations, trust, humiliation, and long-term memory. In care, lending and borrowing, wedding and funeral exchanges, evaluations, conflict, and crisis, people will continue to reconfirm who has the standing to speak, who should bear responsibility, and who may be forgiven. Community always refers to the order that these materials and relations sediment over time, rather than to any form of contact or organization in itself.

Community appears after certain differences have been repeatedly preserved and extracted anew: who stepped forward at a wedding or funeral, who cared for children after an illness, who borrowed money and did not repay it, who said what in a conflict, and who has the standing to explain past events. Once these matters no longer remain only in the present but enter subsequent judgments, they gradually turn exchanges into memory marked by boundaries. Older people in the locality, relatives, neighbors, teachers, landlords, community personnel, and workplace personnel do not always handle these materials in the same way. Community is not a single voice. Someone may explain why a person unable to attend after an illness was absent; someone else may only repeat the absence itself. Someone may be willing to allow an explanation in an excluded student's case; someone else may retain only the disciplinary evaluation. Community is precisely the result of these forms of handling continually intersecting.

II. How Communities Selectively Preserve Differences

The preservation of everyday exchanges is accompanied by selection from the outset; it does not preserve the entire process in full. Wedding and funeral exchanges may leave names and amounts without necessarily leaving the cause of someone's illness-related absence. Local reputation may remember whether a debt was repaid without retaining the difficulties a family faced at the time. This gap between results and background also appears in school life: grades, disciplinary measures, teachers' comments, and parent impressions each preserve different parts. A violation may enter the file while the earlier bullying that led to it is not fully written down. Once a student is called a problem student, long-term exclusion, family hardship, or relations with classmates have often already been omitted.

What allows particular differences to remain available for later extraction is the existence of many different carriers. Household registration, rental materials, IOUs, community certificates, and workplace records, together with genealogies, wedding and funeral rituals, experiences of care, and local reputation, keep some matters visible while allowing others gradually to lose their voice; none of these is the whole history in a neutral form. Selective preservation does not occur only in written records. Older people's memories of past events, retellings among relatives, teachers' impressions of students, and neighbors' evaluations of a household will all fix certain emphases through repeated telling. In this process, who is heard and whose account is treated as reliable also affects which differences can remain.

The preservation of a difference does not mean that it has been judged good or bad. It first means that someone may raise it again in a future event. When analyzing these processes of preservation, we must ask who preserved it, where it was preserved, when it can be used, and in what relations it will gain weight. A preserved difference may also be strengthened or offset by other differences across different materials. An absence from a wedding or funeral may be treated in relatives' memories as a breach of etiquette, yet receive another explanation once medical records or experiences of care are brought forward. A community certificate may support the fact of residence but cannot change an existing reputation on its own. Materials do not naturally line up into one complete narrative; they must be joined, compared, and assigned weight within concrete relations.

Selective preservation leaves behind materials, but also changes the conditions of future judgment. A person for whom more has been preserved is not necessarily more powerful as a result. Sometimes the opposite is true: because negative records, rumors, or fixed evaluations are easier to extract, that person has fewer opportunities for a new explanation in later events. Conversely, a person for whom no materials of care, labor, or hardship that could gain recognition were preserved may appear, when protection is needed, never to have contributed. No shared life can preserve every part of what happened. What must be prevented is mistaking the fragments that remain for the whole person, or treating what was not preserved as something that never happened. The selectivity of memory provides material for judgment while also creating the conditions for loss of voice and labeling.

III. How Communities Repeatedly Extract Differences

The power of a community does not lie in a single unified subject remembering the past, but in past materials being able to enter new judgments. In everyday experience, when money is borrowed, people will again discuss repayment, who stepped forward, and care; in courtship and marriage, family reputation and past relations may be raised; when property is divided, past contributions, past obligations left unfulfilled, and companionship will be reassessed. School enrollment, renting, work, and eldercare have the same structure. Household registration, social insurance, residence materials, school evaluations, or care records may normally rest at different nodes. Once there is a need to apply for eligibility, request help, or handle a conflict, they may be brought into a new relational chain.

Repeated extraction also makes the same event show different effects in different relational fields. An absence from a wedding or funeral may be only a small unexplained matter among relatives in ordinary times, yet be raised again when money is borrowed, ties are formed through marriage, or property is divided. A school document may normally rest in a file, yet affect a student's position only when they advance to the next level of schooling, transfer schools, or appeal a disciplinary measure. Crisis especially changes the density of extraction: existing materials are assigned different weights in a triggering relational field. This does not mean that the difference suddenly comes into existence. An accent, place of ancestral origin, religion, kinship relation, past words or conduct, or family narrative may receive little attention in ordinary times but be brought to the foreground again amid conflict and insecurity.

Extraction does not happen automatically, nor do materials produce consequences by themselves. Someone raises a past event; someone preserves or refuses to pass on some material; someone adopts one interpretation or downweights another. Thus the same record of exchanges may become a reason for refusal, or, once the difficulties after an illness are understood, no longer be treated as evidence of a breach of trust. It is the fact that specific people retrieve, interpret, adopt, or refuse it within concrete relations that makes a difference re-enter consequences. Because each extraction involves specific people and materials, a community's memory cannot be understood as a warehouse. It is composed of records, local reputation, rituals, evaluations, narratives, and concrete judgments. Each renewed extraction may change whether someone can borrow money, obtain an explanation, maintain cooperation, or remain within the boundary.

The process of extraction also changes memory itself. When someone raises a past event, another person may add the background of illness, poverty, care, or conflict at the time. Someone may repeat only the result, while someone else preserves the reason. Someone may be willing to let the person being evaluated explain, while someone else treats an existing label as the conclusion. What remains later is therefore not the past in its original form, but material that has passed through new narration, argument, omission, and the assignment of weight. The long-term character of a community does not mean that memory never changes. It means that such changes continue to leave traces in subsequent judgments.

When accounts given by different materials do not agree, who can make their interpretation heard becomes especially important. An IOU may record an amount, while a neighbor can explain the difficulties after an illness. A disciplinary record may write down a violation, while a teacher or classmate may explain the exclusion that preceded it. Household registration or rental materials may mark an eligibility status, while people who share everyday life may offer another form of testimony. A community is not a unified subject that preserves only one orderly version of the past; its boundaries form among different positions of preservation and interpretation. Through different extractions and interpretations, community memory may keep responsibility from being easily erased, but it may also leave some people unable for a long time to escape an evaluation once compressed. Handling cannot emphasize only remembering or only forgetting. It

must ask which differences remain where, who can extract them, who can change their meaning, and how these choices bear on recognition, protection, exclusion, and punishment.

IV. Interpretive Authority: Who Can Explain What These Differences Mean

Preserved differences do not explain their own meaning. The same absence from a cash-gift exchange may be described as a failure to observe the rules, or as the result of illness and poverty. The same failure to repay a loan may be treated as a breach of trust, or placed back within the difficulties after an illness. The difference lies in whose account is recognized as sufficient to affect judgment. In concrete community life, elders, parents, teachers, clan heads, workplace leaders, local evaluators, community personnel, religious authorities, and people able to narrate past events may possess greater interpretive authority in different relations. This power is embedded in age, position held, kinship position, control of materials, and the degree of trust accorded to them; it does not float abstractly above the community.

If a teacher says that a student was excluded over a long period, the meaning of a disciplinary measure may change. If an elder says that a household truly faced difficulties at the time, the consequences of its absence from a wedding or funeral may be reduced. Conversely, if only the account that “the materials are incomplete” remains, the fact of long-term shared life may lose its place.

Interpretive authority can also always be contested. The memories, records, and experiences held by different people are not identical. Who is allowed to narrate and whose materials are adopted affects the direction in which recognition, exclusion, protection, and punishment extend. Community is therefore not a homogeneous group but an order carrying unequal positions of interpretation. Differences in interpretive authority also determine whether materials are preserved in full. Someone able to explain the reason may prevent an absence from being fixed as a breach of trust; someone without a position from which to explain may, despite long-term contributions, leave behind only a result that is easy to misread.

V. Recognition: Who Is Treated as One of the Community’s Own

Recognition must be understood together with responsibility. A person is treated as one of the community's own not merely because they live nearby, share a surname, or are in the same place, but because, across repeated exchanges, they are regarded as someone who will respond to requests, undertake care, explain past events, or remain willing to maintain certain obligations even when a relation breaks down. Whether they show up at weddings or funerals, repay borrowed money on time, provide care when someone is ill, take advantage in ordinary times, or are willing to bear responsibility at a decisive moment will be preserved by different people and materials and later affect how that person is named. Conversely, if a person bears responsibilities over a long period but lacks materials, interpretive authority, or a recognized position, their contributions may not be counted in shared memory. Community recognition is a stratified result of long-term processing of differences. It involves emotion, but also visibility, records, and power. It is neither a natural identity nor an all-or-nothing condition. Belonging cannot be reduced to identity labels and is not predetermined by identity.

Writing recognition as a single unified switch would erase differences among relational chains and conceal how boundaries move through concrete events. Complete, partial, temporary, conditional, and absent recognition do not form a neat sequence. Complete recognition means that a person is treated more steadily as a member: people are willing to hear what they say, someone is willing to take up their difficulties and help them through, and even a small mistake may be accompanied by someone offering its background and reasons. Within an existing boundary, that person has more positions offering room for adjustment. This does

not mean that there is no boundary. Those who are recognized cannot necessarily always control interpretation, and even stable members may contest whose past is credible, who should be responsible, and who may be forgiven. A community's boundary therefore does more than divide people into two sides; it also distributes opportunities to speak, provide proof, seek help, and obtain room for adjustment.

Recognition supplied by different relational chains may not agree. A person may be accepted in everyday neighborhood life yet restricted in school eligibility; they may be needed at work yet remain suspect in courtship and marriage or lending and borrowing. This partial recognition is common in situations such as families of nonlocal workers. People may work, rent housing, consume goods, and interact with neighbors in everyday life, while recognition may still remain incomplete with regard to their children's school enrollment, welfare, community resources, or eligibility for long-term residence.

Recognition also moves with concrete circumstances and time limits. Temporary recognition appears in a particular instance of cooperation or labor, or a crisis: someone is accepted because they are needed at that moment, can receive temporary support in a crisis, and then returns to a marginal position when the event ends. Conditional recognition loosens with the payment of social insurance, rental arrangements, fulfillment of workplace requirements, or local exchanges. When the condition is interrupted, the earlier acceptance may not continue.

Shared living, labor, care, or exchanges may already have existed for a long time. Nonrecognition does not mean that a person is not present at all, nor is it simply nonexistence. But at key nodes, if materials are incomplete or not accepted, contributions are not explained, a person lacks interpretive authority, interpretive authority is not in their hands, or a key node does not adopt their account, these facts cannot be converted into eligibility or protection, and the person remains outside the boundary. Belonging forms through concrete processing of differences; it cannot be reduced to identity labels and is not predetermined by identity. Even so, a marginal member may gain a partial position through long-term care, shared labor, another person's explanation, or new records.

VI. Boundaries: How Communities Distinguish Inside and Outside

A community's boundary forms repeatedly when differences are extracted, interpreted, and assigned weight. It is the judgment, in actual events, of which relations count as dependable and which responsibilities ought to be borne. It is neither a static boundary nor a line on a map nor an identity label. When money is borrowed, who can borrow, who may receive more time, and who must repay at once will redraw distinctions of closeness and distance. In courtship and marriage, a family's past relations, experiences of care, and reputation may be reassessed. When property is divided, who cared for an elderly person and who appeared only when money was distributed will also affect who has the standing to speak.

Boundaries in school enrollment and residence cannot be described simply as the city or institutional arrangements acting on their own. Who prepares the materials, who issues the proof, whether a rental relation is recognized, and which people witness everyday life place a person in different positions of possible entry or exclusion. The conditional character of boundaries also appears in the fact that different people occupy different positions. A family may already be partly accepted in renting, labor, and neighborhood exchanges, yet remain excluded from school enrollment, welfare, or long-term eligibility. A person may receive care among relatives yet find it difficult to enter cooperative relations because of old debts or local reputation. Multiple relational chains give partly inconsistent results in different events; inside and outside are not one total state fixed once and for all.

On ordinary days, when people work, shop for groceries, and attend school together, differences may temporarily carry little weight. Once a crisis, conflict, resource shortage, or moment requiring a judgment of responsibility arrives, old materials and evaluations are raised again. A boundary can therefore loosen or harden, depending on how relations, rules, and the relational field connect differences to consequences.

Boundaries are also repeatedly maintained or changed through concrete practice. Someone willing to explain a past event, supplement materials, or mediate on another's behalf may allow a person whose standing was previously reduced to regain a position from which to speak. Someone who insists on using only an existing label and refuses a new explanation may make the boundary harder to loosen. There is no boundary that moves on its own apart from practice; there are only the continuing effects of people, records, rules, and relational positions. The distinction between inside and outside forms in concrete events and cannot be written as a fixed cultural character or natural identity. Boundaries are extracted and confirmed anew in concrete relational fields of lending and borrowing, courtship and marriage, property division, school enrollment, residence, and crisis, and each confirmation may leave materials available for the next use.

VII. Protection and Room for Adjustment

When discussing protection, we must still return to specific people and relational positions; it cannot be written as natural benevolence. Protection is neither a favor bestowed by an abstract community nor a mysterious collective warmth. It consists in certain nodes and relational chains opening paths for adjustment for those who are recognized, and in support being taken up and sustained at concrete positions. Relatives lending money, neighbors looking after children, teachers reminding someone to supplement materials, and landlords cooperating with rental registration are all specific people, in relational positions, keeping a path from being cut off. As these actions provide care, they also show which people are regarded as worth continuing to support.

In everyday exchanges, the care provided by the relatives and neighbors described above, together with acquaintances helping to find transportation, older people explaining someone's circumstances, and mediators reducing the weight of a negative local reputation, will keep paths of care, work, or evaluation in operation when they might otherwise be interrupted. In city life, the cooperation of the teachers and landlords described above, community personnel issuing certificates, workplace personnel paying social insurance contributions consistently, people from the same hometown introducing jobs, and neighbors helping take children to and from places may likewise prevent school enrollment, renting, or work from being cut off.

Protection at school likewise has conditions. A teacher may provide an explanation for one instance of lateness, classmates may accept someone who has been excluded, and parents may provide care for one another. These things may reduce the consequences of discipline or isolation, but who can obtain such explanations and assistance still depends on existing recognition, materials, and relational positions.

Room for adjustment does not cancel a boundary. It shows precisely that certain people are still regarded as people who can be won back, helped, and kept within relations. Protection may reduce harm and may also confirm who qualifies for protection. When care, proof, or mediation is open only to a small number of recognized people, the paths that could have allowed adjustment also become a way of distinguishing inside and outside. We must therefore ask at the same time who provides assistance, for whom it is provided, and whether those refused still have a relational position from which to offer an explanation.

VIII. Exclusion and Punishment

Exclusion and punishment likewise cannot be understood as an abstract collective acting on its own; they must be brought back to concrete practice. Refusing a loan, refusing courtship or marriage, refusing cooperation, and passing on a negative local reputation are often jointly produced by concrete judgments, past records, everyday evaluations, and key events. A local evaluator refusing to lend again, a relative raising an old debt in a judgment about courtship or marriage, and people involved in cooperation who are no longer willing to introduce someone to a job are all ways of connecting a past difference to an immediate decision. Evaluations such as “does not follow the rules,” “unreliable,” “does not seem like one of our own,” “from outside,” “does not understand proper etiquette,” or “not one of our own” compress conduct at weddings and funerals, lending and borrowing, care, past words and actions, or kinship relations into labels that can be extracted repeatedly. A person called such names faces differences compressed in this way taking effect repeatedly across multiple relations. Once a label is fixed in local reputation, evaluations, or retellings, it may travel more easily than the full course of events.

Being refused, humiliated, fixed in place by rumor, or excluded also leaves new materials. Later people may use these results again as reasons to say that someone is unreliable or that a household is not worth associating with. A single act of handling then writes back into later relations. This is why punishment can continue; it is not because community, as a single subject, is holding a grudge on its own.

Exclusion does not necessarily mean a complete break. Someone may be refused on one relational chain yet still receive help on another. Someone may be temporarily accepted yet remain excluded at a key point of eligibility. This inconsistency is precisely the result of a differentiation position being handled differently in different relations.

Exclusion and punishment are not necessarily carried out through public refusal alone. A request that is no longer answered, an explanation that is omitted, or material that is not passed on may each gradually deprive someone of opportunities for cooperation, care, or being understood.

IX. Shared Memory: What Communities Remember and What They Forget

Shared memory is not a complete history. It is material for judgment jointly formed by selective memory and selective forgetting. It includes preserved absences from weddings and funerals, care, betrayal, and stepping forward in a crisis, as well as reasons, prior circumstances, and internal harms that were not fully preserved. A locality may remember that a household did not attend a wedding or funeral while forgetting the difficulties after an illness at the time. A school may remember that a student was disciplined while downplaying the process through which the student was excluded. People may remember suffering together while being unwilling to revisit internal inequality. Forgetting is not a blank; it changes subsequent responsibility and evaluation.

When reasons gradually lose their place and only the result remains available for extraction, an absence from a cash-gift exchange is easily compressed into a failure to observe the rules, an unpaid loan into unreliability, and an accent into being an outsider. Identity and evaluation therefore appear natural while in fact bearing the traces of selective handling.

The transmission of memory is not a copy of the original. Accounts by elders, retellings by relatives, arrangements within rituals, wording in records, and teachers' evaluations may all strengthen, soften, or recast certain differences as they are passed on. The diachronic character of a community is built on this continual retelling rather than on complete preservation. Later narrators may follow an existing account or supply

reasons that had been omitted. Transmission can therefore fix a label or allow the past to be understood differently. The key is not whether memory is consistent, but which differences can be brought into new judgments.

X. Community Boundaries That Harden in Crisis

A crisis does not create a boundary out of nothing. It makes differences already present in language, household registration, family narratives, local reputation, kinship relations, and historical memory easier to extract and connect to protection or exclusion. As conflict, an environment of hostility toward outsiders, or insecurity intensifies, accents, places of ancestral origin, surnames, religion, background, place names, and past words and actions that carried little weight in ordinary times may be assigned greater weight. People who worked, studied, traded, or exchanged with one another will be distinguished anew in judgment as people regarded as close, suspect, or reliable, or as outsiders.

A crisis therefore cannot be written as an autonomous actor. It provides a triggering relational field but does not replace the specific handlers and relations. What makes a boundary harden is the concrete handling involved: which people retell past events, which materials are raised, which rules are interpreted more strictly, and which paths of protection are closed. Nor can the hardening of boundaries be presented as inevitable or irreversible. Someone may be excluded during a crisis and later be partly accepted again through care, explanation, shared labor, or new relations. Change depends on which differences continue to be preserved, who reinterprets them, and which paths can be connected again.

XI. What Is Identity within a Community?

Identity is a compressed expression produced after community members, recorders, interpreters, and relevant procedures have handled differences over time. It is not the whole person; still less can a community be reduced to a collection of identities. Names such as local person, nonlocal person, one of our own, problem student, reliable relative, and untrustworthy person appear to be stable designations. In fact, behind them are differences that have been preserved, passed on, interpreted, and assigned weight. Belonging likewise cannot be obtained by adding several identity labels together. Unless we ask which nodes, records, and relational chains a label has passed through, the name will conceal the process by which it actually formed. In concrete settings, being local may involve household registration, place of ancestral origin, accent, kinship relations, wedding and funeral exchanges, and local recognition. Being nonlocal may involve renting, social insurance, work, school materials, and urban eligibility. These differences need not take effect at the same time and do not have the same weight in every relational field.

Similar compression appears in other designations. The designation “problem student” may encompass grades, disciplinary measures, teachers' evaluations, relations with classmates, family circumstances, and past events. “Reliable relative” may encompass borrowing money, repaying it, caring for elders, showing up at weddings and funerals, and actions at decisive moments. The designation itself compresses long chains into a formulation that is easier to invoke.

Identity compression has power precisely because it can stand in for a lengthy explanation. The phrase “outsider household” may combine renting, accent, materials, work, kinship relations, and past evaluations into one short designation. The phrase “reliable relative” may likewise compress care, stepping forward, repayment, and shared experience. This compression makes judgment faster, but it also easily leads to differences from different sources, times, and relations being treated as the same thing.

Compression does not mean falsity. It points to processes of handling that really occurred. The problem is that once a designation is treated as an essence, it conceals that the process can still change. Someone called a problem student may be understood differently through a new explanation from a teacher, new relations with classmates, or support from family. Someone regarded as an outsider may also gain partial recognition through long-term life together, bearing responsibility, and obtaining testimony from others. The mutability of identity comes from the mutability of the handling process, not from the designation changing by itself.

Identity can therefore serve only as a starting point of analysis, not the endpoint of explanation. Analysis of identity cannot stop at whether a particular word should be used. It must first ask which differences make it up, at which nodes they are preserved, through which relational chains they pass, who interprets them, and in what events they are extracted. Further examination must also establish when and by whom the word was spoken, which materials support it, which experiences did not enter it, what positional consequences it produces in lending and borrowing, school enrollment, courtship and marriage, cooperation, or care, and which forms of recognition, protection, exclusion, or responsibility it makes possible. Only then can we avoid mistaking a collection of identities for the community itself.

XII. Conclusion of Volume IV: From Nodes to Community

The thread of Volume IV is not that society possesses many relations. It is how differences leave the individual and enter relational structures in which they can be preserved, passed on, jointly processed, and remembered over time. Nodes leave materials behind; relational chains move them; networks bring multiple chains into intersection; and community allows certain results of handling to enter the next round of boundary judgments. This progression does not elevate community into a final reconciliation. When differences are preserved over time, reinterpreted, and extracted repeatedly, they may form care, responsibility, and room for adjustment, but they may also form exclusion, humiliation, and labels that are difficult to loosen.

Social memory takes root in medical records, IOUs, household registration, evaluations, local reputation, rituals, accounts by relatives, and everyday care. It is not an abstract background detached from life; it is embodied in the relational positions of who can obtain materials, who can explain reasons, and whose interpretation is believed. The formation and change of community depend on which differences are left behind, who can explain their meaning, which people receive continued support or are excluded, and how boundaries loosen or harden in different relational fields. As a product of long-term processing of differences, community is a thread of mechanisms defined by preservation, extraction, interpretation, weight assignment, protection, exclusion, and identity compression. It cannot be equated with a declaration of solidarity, a list of names, personal connections, or a warm-hearted image.

In the dimension of time, differences are first left behind, then passed on and interpreted through relations, and extracted again in a decisive event, thereby affecting recognition, responsibility, protection, punishment, and positions inside and outside. Specific people, records, rituals, evaluations, and relational positions carry old differences into new recognition and refusal, allowing identity compression, demands for responsibility, and distinctions between inside and outside to continue. After long-term operation, they establish a boundary-structured memory order of community.

This order does not gather everyone into the same container. Someone may be only partly accepted, someone's position will be explained anew, and someone else is excluded again; the boundary remains conditional. Judging a community therefore cannot stop at an existing name, a single act of acceptance, or a single refusal. It must examine how these positions are preserved, questioned, supplemented, and changed in later exchanges. Once concrete relations, materials, and practices are returned to the process of judgment,

changes in belonging, responsibility, and boundaries will not be mistaken for a fixed essence of the person. The same name may also bring different consequences in different relations and relational fields.

Chapter 17. Institutionalization: How Differences Are Formatted, Judged, and Connected to Consequences That Can Be Put into Effect

The processing involved in institutionalization cannot be separated from specific people, materials, rules, and procedures. Household registration, social insurance, rental registration, medical records, labor contracts, IOUs, and application forms, together with the people and procedures involved in submission, review, supplementation and correction, determination, and implementation, connect previously scattered differences in life to processing chains within which they can be extracted repeatedly. These chains have a concrete sequence: someone submits materials; someone preserves and checks them; someone, acting under authorization, requests additional documents or explanations; someone makes a determination under a procedure; and finally schools, workplaces, courts, communities, or administrative stages connect the results to corresponding arrangements. School enrollment, work-related injuries, assistance, debt recovery, and loans each require different materials to be extracted at different times. Materials do not have the same operative weight in concrete events. Whether materials corroborate one another, whether applicants can supplement them, how handlers explain their reasons, and whether opportunities for review or complaint exist all affect whether a relational chain continues, pauses, or opens up again.

A child's school enrollment, recognition of a worker's injury as work-related, or debt recovery does not stop at facts that have already occurred in life. The materials different institutions require, the formats they recognize, and the people entitled to make judgments determine which differences can enter processing and which remain outside its scope for the time being. The same matter may also be treated as different problems at different processing stages: residence can become enrollment materials, an injury can become medical records and responsibility for a work-related injury, and a loan can become evidence and an application for enforcement. On the basis of material requirements, rules, and procedures, handlers determine which parts of life can be verified, interpreted, and connected to consequences in the current event. Life itself has not disappeared in these transformations.

I. Institutional Nodes and the Process of Institutionalization

Institutions are concretely distributed across nodes that carry, pass on, and process differences; they cannot be treated as scenery standing outside social activity. Household registers, medical records, contracts, attendance records, rental registrations, community certificates, IOUs, and written judgments are not kept in the same place or by the same people. Institutional nodes are precisely the places where these positions of preservation, handlers, and rules are connected. Schools, hospitals, workplaces, courts, communities, and administrative departments are not the same kind of node. They differ in how they preserve and check materials, in the procedures they can initiate, and in the consequences to which they can connect.

A child reaching school age does not mean that any school can allocate a place directly on the basis of age. School personnel examine enrollment materials and handle student registration, household registration, and admission quotas. Depending on local admission policy, the year, and the category of admission, some of the materials concerning household registration, proof of residence, social insurance, rental registration, student registration, and available places may have to be checked by the relevant personnel within the prescribed time. The facts of the parents' work and residence are thereby brought into the same processing chain.

Other forms of processing likewise depend on the division of work among specific nodes. Workplaces preserve attendance records; court personnel handling debts encounter evidence, judgments, and enforcement applications; community personnel issue or do not issue certificates. A worker's pain after an injury is real, but processing a work-related injury also requires medical personnel to handle medical records, diagnoses, and materials concerning the injury. Medical personnel, workplace personnel, appraisal personnel, and administrative handlers must separately confirm medical records, labor relations, the time and place of the injury, testimony, and the conditions for appraisal. Whether the different nodes connect affects subsequent arrangements for responsibility, compensation, and recuperation.

School admissions and student registration, determination of work-related injury, and civil litigation and enforcement in mainland China belong to different procedures. Relevant personnel receive, examine, or preserve the corresponding materials only within their respective responsibilities and authority. The Compulsory Education Law and the Measures for the Administration of Student Registration in Primary and Secondary Schools concern enrollment and student registration; the Measures for the Determination of Work-Related Injuries concern work-related injuries; and the Civil Procedure Law concerns debt evidence and enforcement. Each source establishes only the corresponding procedure; it does not establish that the materials are kept by the same institution.

Understanding institutions as a system of nodes does not mean that nodes act on their own. Every act of registration, verification, explanation, review, or implementation requires specific people to handle matters under authorization, material requirements, and procedural conditions. Even within the same institution, there may be different departments, different opinions, and differing scope for supplementation and correction. After materials are preserved, handlers must still identify their form, time, who or what they concern, and their use according to the rules. Schools, hospitals, workplaces, courts, communities, administrative departments, and appraisal bodies do not draw on materials in the same way. Their respective scopes of authorization also mean that the same material may be assigned different meanings at different nodes. Tracing these concrete positions shows how differences are passed on and avoids treating institutions as an autonomous force detached from people and materials.

Institutionalization is the process in which differences in life are preserved and formatted by institutional nodes, undergo rule-governed extraction, authorized interpretation, weight assignment through eligibility, exclusion through thresholds, and procedural determination, and are connected to consequences that can be put into effect and to institutional write-back. This process first places residence, labor, injury, borrowing, care, or hardship in life onto materials that can be preserved. Household registers, student files, medical records, social insurance records, contracts, attendance sheets, IOUs, written judgments, and community certificates are all concrete positions that carry differences, rather than the facts of life themselves.

Preservation, formatting, extraction, interpretation, eligibility, thresholds, determination, implementation, and write-back each occupy an irreplaceable place. Preservation allows materials to remain for later use; formatting determines the shape in which materials are identified; extraction occurs in a particular event; interpretation is limited by authorization and evidence; eligibility and thresholds concern, respectively, the opening and cutoff of channels; and determination and implementation decide whether processing can enter actual arrangements. Keeping them separate makes it possible to see which link changed the consequences.

Institutionalization does not mean covering life with rules. After materials are preserved, they must still fit the occasion of use; after they meet the format, authorized personnel must still explain them under the rules; and after a determination is formed, whether it can connect to school places, assistance, compensation, penalties, or enforcement remains to be seen. Only after differences in life undergo formatting, authorized

interpretation, weight assignment through eligibility, and procedural determination do they connect to consequences that can be put into effect. The chain of institutionalization is neither a one-way straight line nor a fate fixed as soon as something is registered. Registration may open an eligibility channel, while a gap in materials may halt an application. Supplementation and correction, investigation, arbitration, review, appeal, or reconsideration may subject an earlier judgment to renewed examination against materials and rules. This is a process of continual connection across multiple nodes that may also reopen.

II. The Formation of Procedural Material and Segmentation through Formatting

Before facts of life enter institutional processing, they often have to be written, substantiated, or recorded as materials that can be submitted. Long-term residence, continuous work, bodily pain, family hardship, and acquaintances' knowledge do not automatically enter school, hospital, court, or assistance procedures in the same way. A family has lived in a city for years, with the parents working locally and the child growing up there; these experiences can be real. Yet when the family applies for school enrollment, depending on local admission policy, the year, and the category of admission, some materials concerning household registration, residence, social insurance, rental registration, or existing student registration may be checked together. Review personnel usually need this information to process the application under existing requirements.

Materials form at particular times. Rent, work, injury, borrowing, and care may occur continuously in life. Parents preserve rental information; workplaces retain attendance records; hospitals create medical records; coworkers provide testimony; community personnel issue statements about residence or hardship. These materials may not be complete when the facts of life occur, yet existing records are often required only when an enrollment, work-injury, assistance, or litigation event arrives. Whether those concerned can retrieve, supplement, or explain materials later affects whether their lived experience can enter a procedure. But materials arriving later do not erase the facts of residence, labor, injury, or debt that already existed. Materials supplied afterward do not rewrite life as it has already happened, but they may change whether handlers can verify, compare, and make determinations about the relevant differences.

Institutionalization begins with the formation of procedural material. Residence becomes rental registration, proof of residence, and community materials; poverty becomes proof of income, information on household members and property status, and applications for assistance; schooling becomes student registration, grades, disciplinary measures, transfer records, and eligibility for progression to the next level of schooling.

Labor and injury each have their own material carriers in institutional processing. Labor becomes labor contracts, social insurance records, attendance sheets, and wage-payment records; injury becomes medical records, diagnoses, examination reports, and appraisal materials. After a worker is injured, medical records and diagnoses can preserve the condition of the injury. Labor contracts, attendance records, the time of injury, the workplace location, coworkers' testimony, and appraisal materials may separately carry the labor relation, the circumstances at the scene, and the determination of responsibility. The absence of any one of them does not mean that the injury never happened.

In debt processing, debt must be rendered as procedural material. Acquaintances knowing that a loan occurred may not be sufficient for court proceedings to move directly into enforcement. IOUs, transfer records, chat logs, witness testimony, materials for filing suit, judgments, and enforcement applications are extracted and examined at different procedural stages.

The Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China provides for documentary evidence, electronic data, witness testimony, and other evidence, and for their examination, as well as for the general prerequisites and measures of enforcement. The evidentiary weight of chat logs or transfer records in an individual case

must still be examined in conjunction with that case. Judicial interpretations concerning labor disputes are not used to establish ordinary debt relations.

The formation of procedural material does not mean that facts of life are preserved unchanged. Institutions segment facts of life into formats that can be registered, verified, compared, and judged. Registration forms, certificates, medical records, applications, and files all require particular fields, times, subjects, addresses, numbers, or attachments. Only then can reviewers confirm who provided the materials, when they were formed, and whether they corroborate one another, and bring different applications into the same procedure for verification and comparison.

A format makes materials comparable while also drawing the boundaries of comparison. Rental registration can record an address, a term, and the registered relation, yet may not present the full course of a family's long-term shared life. Medical records can present a diagnosis and the condition of an injury, yet may not fully present work arrangements, workplace responsibility, and pressures at the time of injury. A format is not wholly a distortion, nor is the content preserved through it the whole of life. Its necessity and its selectivity jointly constitute the conditions of institutional processing; neither can be concealed.

Formatting segments reality. It makes some differences clear while leaving others without a voice. Family relations, a landlord's attitude, pressures on coworkers, difficulties after illness, and local evaluations may not enter fields on a form with equal fullness. Situations in which a landlord is unwilling to cooperate, community personnel do not issue proof, coworkers are afraid to testify, a borrower cannot repay because of illness or unpaid wages, or a student experiences exclusion before being disciplined may affect circumstances in life. Yet these situations may not fit the fields that a particular form can immediately record and verify. Not having been formatted does not mean that they never happened.

III. Rule-Governed Extraction and Authorized Interpretation

Handlers do not extract all materials under the rules every day with the same intensity. A family ordinarily rents housing, works, shops for groceries, and pays water and electricity bills; these facts can continue to exist. When school enrollment arrives, whether the family can connect to the school's processing chain still depends on whether the materials required by the rules have been preserved, submitted, and recognized in time. Depending on local admission policy, the year, and the category of admission, some materials concerning household registration, rental registration, residence, social insurance, or existing student registration may be checked together.

Different events open different windows onto materials. Once the determination of a work-related injury begins, medical records, materials concerning the labor relation, attendance records, proof concerning the scene, testimony, or appraisal information enter the processing chain under the relevant procedures. A court needs a judgment, an enforcement application, and leads on property to proceed to enforcement. An application for assistance requires information on income, household members, and property status, together with community certificates. Loan processing may extract records of real property, credit history, income, marital status, and debt. What institutions recognize is not all differences, but differences extracted through prescribed materials on prescribed occasions. When a difference gains weight depends on the event, the time when materials are submitted, the handlers' responsibilities, and procedural requirements, rather than on a particular material naturally dominating all of life.

Rule-governed extraction does not pass a total judgment on what is true or false in life; it only defines which materials can be processed at that moment within a particular procedure. Differences that are not extracted do not thereby disappear, nor do the materials extracted amount to reality in full.

The same material serves different uses on different occasions. Medical records preserve diagnoses in a hospital, but in a work-injury event they must also be checked alongside labor relations, materials concerning the scene, and appraisal conditions. Proof of income may bear on family hardship in an assistance application, while in loan processing it may be placed within another set of eligibility criteria. The current event, rules, handlers' responsibilities, and subsequent procedures jointly delimit the meaning of materials; the document itself cannot determine it once and for all.

Materials do not arrange consequences on their own, and institutions are not materials speaking for themselves. Only when medical records, contracts, community certificates, IOUs, and rental registrations are placed within concrete review or determination procedures, and authorized subjects interpret and explain their meaning under the rules, can they possibly connect to eligibility, responsibility, or enforcement. Specifically, school personnel interpret enrollment materials; medical personnel interpret medical records; appraisal personnel interpret injury and disability and their connection to work; workplace personnel explain attendance and labor relations; judges and relevant court personnel examine evidence; and community and administrative personnel handle residence, hardship, and eligibility conditions. These responsibilities are not distributed equally.

Community personnel may understand the same material concerning long-term residence as proof of stable residence, while school reviewers may still regard it as incomplete. The same medical records can preserve an injury, while workplace and appraisal personnel may differ in how they explain its connection to work. The difference lies not only in the content of materials, but also in positions of authorization and procedural standards.

People authorized to interpret materials are also limited by their responsibilities. School personnel cannot replace judges in handling debt evidence; court personnel cannot replace medical and appraisal personnel in forming judgments about injuries; and community personnel's statements about residence or hardship cannot unconditionally replace materials required by other procedures. This division of work produces unequal interpretive authority, while also showing that no single subject can fully determine the entire meaning of facts of life solely through its own opinion. A division of authorized responsibilities does not mean that interpretation can proceed arbitrarily. Institutions differ in the materials they can process, the determinations they can make, and the procedures they must follow. When different accounts conflict, only the submission of supplementary documents, investigation, arbitration, review, appeal, reconsideration, and complaints can bring the dispute back to materials and reasons, preventing interpretive authority from being miswritten as unlimited subjective opinion. Authorized interpretation makes institutionalization more than a matter of materials: whoever has interpretive authority can affect eligibility, thresholds, and the consequences put into effect. The use of these legal sources is confined to the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and materials to which they expressly apply.

IV. Weight Assignment through Eligibility and Exclusion through Thresholds

Differences that have been preserved, extracted, interpreted, and judged may become eligibility to enter a particular channel. Household registration, proof of residence, continuity of social insurance, educational credentials, medical records, judgments, real property, and proof of income can each open the corresponding entrance only under particular rules and procedures. Eligibility is not the automatic manifestation of a natural right. It is a channel opened after institutions recognize certain differences.

Eligibility channels often require multiple kinds of material to hold together. When a child applies for school enrollment, depending on local admission policy, the year, and the category of admission, some of the

following may enter review: age, household registration, residence, social insurance, rental registration, parental materials, and available school places. In applications for the minimum subsistence guarantee, by contrast, household members living together, income, property, and the household's economic circumstances are checked under the rules governing that guarantee. Different bodies handle the two procedures under different rules; they do not constitute one and the same list of materials. In concrete review, no link can be assumed in advance to be necessarily sufficient; a child's enrollment is not determined by age alone. The intersection of these conditions shows that eligibility is a conditional arrangement within a particular channel, not the natural effect of a single piece of proof, nor a total judgment on a person's entire life or value.

Processing a work-related injury likewise does not guarantee compensation as soon as medical records appear. Only after the injury, medical records, a contract, proof concerning the scene, coworkers' testimony, appraisal conclusions, and an administrative determination are connected may a channel for recuperation, compensation, and confirmation of responsibility form. Weight assignment through eligibility is conditional. Complete materials, consistent explanations, and procedural continuation may open a channel; supplementation and correction of materials, renewed investigation, or review may also change the direction of earlier handling. It does not fix a person's position permanently.

The other side of an eligibility channel is a threshold. When materials are incomplete, records interrupted, subjects mismatched, formats wrong, proof insufficient, or recognition refused, differences already present in life may be unable to enter the corresponding procedure, and the chain of consequences then stops at a node. A threshold is not a wall outside institutions. It is a cutoff formed when differences have not been preserved, extracted, and recognized in the institutional format.

When a threshold appears, we must ask where the break occurs. Has rental registration not been completed? Has a community certificate not been issued? Has the workplace refused to recognize the labor relation? Have attendance records and materials from the scene not been preserved? Or has the application not been received within the prescribed procedure? Describing all of these as an abstract wall obscures specific responsibility and wrongly reduces difficulties in life to a single problem of the applicant as an individual.

A family of nonlocal workers has lived in a city for years; the parents work, the child lives there, and the neighbors know about them. These may all be real circumstances. If the rental has not been registered and school reviewers can process matters only through prescribed materials, the enrollment chain may halt at the material node; this does not mean that lived experience is denied. A worker really was injured at work, and medical records can explain the bodily harm. If the workplace denies the labor relation, attendance records are incomplete, and materials from the scene are lacking, medical records may not be sufficient on their own to connect to responsibility for a work-related injury. This shows that different materials carry different links.

A threshold is not an immovable conclusion. Only by clarifying the point of cutoff can we identify whether there is subsequent room for completing a missing filing, supplementary checks, investigation, arbitration, or a new explanation. Completing rental registration, checking social insurance records further, supplementing testimony, investigating the scene, or confirming the labor relation through arbitration may give a previously broken relational chain another opportunity to continue. Whether it continues still depends on specific materials, authorization, and procedures.

V. Procedural Determination: How Institutions Allow Supplementation and Correction, Dispute, and Room for Adjustment

Procedures connect materials, interpretation, eligibility, and consequences. Application, review, supplementation and correction, investigation, appraisal, hearing, judgment, enforcement, reconsideration, and complaint are not formalities appended to a determination from the outside, but concrete paths through which handlers re-examine materials and reasons. They determine whether differences can be supplemented and corrected, reinterpreted, recognized, or excluded again. Procedures turn disputes into steps that can be handled and also constrain arbitrary changes of conclusion. Supplementation and correction involve submitting specified additional materials under the corresponding procedure; investigation involves rechecking the scene or testimony within the relevant authority. Labor arbitration, renewed appraisal or review of work capacity, appeals in litigation, administrative reconsideration, and other complaints belong to different procedures. Each has its own handlers, deadlines, grounds, and legal effects; they do not constitute one interchangeable set of remedies.

The relevant legal frameworks are the Measures for the Administration of Work-Capacity Appraisal, the Labor Dispute Mediation and Arbitration Law, the Civil Procedure Law's provisions on appeals and enforcement, and the Administrative Reconsideration Law's provisions on acceptance, examination, and decision.

Within concrete procedures, retrieval of student registration materials, supplementary checks of social insurance, reissuance of community certificates, investigation of materials from the scene, supplementation of coworkers' testimony, and review of appraisal conclusions each show positions in which procedures leave room for adjustment. Rental registration can be completed later, labor relations can be confirmed through arbitration, and court proceedings allow supplementary evidence, appeals, or new leads on property. In assistance applications, proof of income and household-member materials can also be supplemented and corrected, while community investigations may explain hardship anew. These paths make it possible for differences that were not adequately handled before to re-enter determination, preserving an opportunity for reinterpretation.

Yet the existence of room for adjustment does not guarantee that every application will change the conclusion, nor that any difficulty in life can immediately rewrite an existing result. When supplementation and correction fail, a reconsideration request is not upheld, or an appraisal does not support a connection to work, the earlier cutoff may remain in effect. Conditionality is precisely an important part of procedural determination: it means neither that conclusions may be reversed at will nor that a channel is closed forever after a single refusal.

VI. Consequences Put into Effect: Why Institutions Are Harder than Local Reputation

Community members can spread word about people's reputations, relatives can say that someone does not keep their word, and specific people in local society can refuse to lend money. These consequences are important. Kinship, neighborhood, and local relations depend on long-term exchanges, memory, recognition, and responsibility, and affect borrowing, testimony, care, local recognition, and family evaluations. Yet the consequences of local reputation usually depend on ongoing exchanges, memory, and concrete relations. Even when local reputation exists within community relations, it cannot directly freeze assets, pursue recovery, or cancel eligibility.

Institutional consequences and the consequences of local reputation may affect a family at the same time. Local reputation may affect whether neighbors are willing to testify, relatives are willing to provide support, or others are willing to lend money. School enrollment, work-injury processing, assistance, court enforcement, and administrative processing may connect determinations to school places, compensation, accounts, files, and eligibility arrangements. The two may affect each other, but they cannot be treated as the same mechanism merely because both produce consequences. The consequences of local reputation and institutional consequences rely on different carriers. Institutional consequences depend on materials, authorization, accounts, files, judgments, and actual implementation within schools, workplaces, courts, and administrative procedures. Local proof can sometimes enter an application, but community reputation does not thereby automatically replace procedural determination. Only by distinguishing the two can we preserve the weight of community consequences and the hardness of institutional consequences.

The strength of institutionalization lies in its ability not only to judge differences but also to form consequences under concrete procedures. Approval or refusal of school enrollment may change a child's educational path. A determination of work-related injury affects work-injury benefits and subsequent handling; whether the injury is recognized affects compensation, recuperation, responsibility, and income. Once a court judgment enters enforcement, it may connect to freezing assets, recovery, or restrictions on consumption. Confirmation or nonconfirmation of eligibility for the minimum subsistence guarantee or medical assistance may change a family's channels for obtaining the corresponding support. Assistance, loans, and administrative processing likewise change a family's concrete channels. Each of these consequences has its own statutory conditions; they cannot be merged into one general form of processing.

Consequences that can be put into effect must still be brought back to specific people, accounts, files, schools, workplaces, courts, and administrative procedures. Forms do not punish on their own, and records do not change life on their own. Only when handlers, acting under authorization, connect determinations to the corresponding arrangements do consequences actually occur.

VII. Institutional Write-Back: How an Act of Processing Becomes a New Difference

The results of institutional processing do not necessarily disappear when an event ends. Write-back forms when institutional personnel or procedures preserve processing results as institutional differences that can be extracted again in the future. Only when specific people or procedures retrieve, interpret, or assign weight to those differences anew in subsequent judgments does the content of write-back take effect again.

After an application, determination, refusal, supplementation and correction, penalty, or enforcement has concluded, application materials, statements of missing material, determination results, judgments, penalty records, and interruptions in social insurance may all be preserved at nodes from which they can still be extracted later. A failed enrollment application may leave material gaps and application records; failure to obtain recognition of a work-related injury may leave administrative results, workplace explanations, and materials concerning the dispute; court enforcement may leave judgments, enforcement records, and traces relating to credit. Handlers may extract these materials again in school transfers, job searches, loans, assistance, litigation, or mediation.

Materials left by write-back can be extracted anew and take effect again in later events, later relational fields, or later processing stages within the same continuing relational field. The content of write-back is not limited to unfavorable records. A filing successfully completed later, testimony accepted after supplementation, an explanation formed through renewed investigation, or a conclusion changed after review may also become material for later use. What nodes preserve are differences available for renewed extraction left by particular

processing results, not eternally fixed identities or conclusions that continue automatically. New events can change the conditions under which materials are extracted. In actual processing, the operative weight of materials at that moment may change through supplementary materials, renewed investigation, or interpretation under different procedures, while the procedures themselves may also permit supplementary materials, renewed investigation, or challenges to an earlier interpretation. Write-back therefore should not be written as the past automatically governing the present.

Write-back explains the continuity of institutional processing while also preserving the conditions for reinterpretation. Old records do not necessarily determine a person's fate. Family, local, and community relations beyond those records may still affect subsequent processing.

VIII. Institutionalization and Differentiation Positions

Institutionalization does not mean applying external rules to a person. In concrete institutional processing, whether someone is eligible to apply, whether they can provide proof, whether they are registered, whether they are penalized, whether they are subject to enforcement, and whether they can enter a channel all change that person's actual position in the social network and differentiation position in the current relational field through eligibility, thresholds, procedures, and consequences put into effect. Materials that are recognized or not recognized are not abstract labels. They affect whether people can enter school, obtain compensation, apply for assistance, pursue recovery, or maintain residential arrangements.

The same child may enter different educational paths depending on whether household registration, social insurance, proof of residence, rental registration, and school materials are recognized. The same worker may face different arrangements for recuperation, compensation, responsibility, and income depending on whether the labor relation is confirmed. These consequences of institutional processing for positions also appear in debt relations: the same debtor will occupy different positions of credit and action depending on whether the case enters court enforcement or remains a dispute among acquaintances. The difference lies not in a name itself, but in whether materials, interpretation, procedures, and implementation connect them to actual consequences.

Changes in differentiation positions can be seen in individuals and also travel along relational chains to families and localities, unfolding among concrete people. Recognition of a child's enrollment materials may stabilize the parents' work and residential arrangements; blocked enrollment may affect the parents' work, renting, and whether the family stays or leaves. Confirmation of responsibility for a work-related injury may change recuperation, income, debt, and kinship support; failure to obtain recognition of a work-related injury may affect family income, debt, workplace relations, and kinship support.

If a debt enters enforcement arrangements, the creditor, guarantors, relatives, and local reputation may all be affected. These consequences must all be observed by following relational chains back to concrete materials and procedures. They are not driven by abstract concepts acting on their own, nor should they be reduced to abstract positions moving of their own accord.

IX. From Institutionalization toward Class-Image Formation

Institutionalization is not the endpoint. Labor contracts, social insurance records, wages, jobs, housing, debt, educational credentials, and enrollment eligibility are different materials in concrete processing, yet may affect one another through long-term relations of work, residence, education, and domination. Unstable work may interrupt social insurance, and interrupted social insurance may affect a child's enrollment and urban eligibility. Falling income affects rent, debt, and household expenditure, while unstable housing also affects educational paths and community recognition. What must be traced here is how concrete differences connect across different nodes and relational chains.

Labor, property, income, housing, education, debt, and relations of domination exert a strong pull in certain events precisely because contracts, wages, social insurance, housing, educational credentials, enrollment eligibility, and debt records are preserved, extracted, compared, and connected to consequences over time. When institutionalized differences are connected to these relations over the long term, certain high-weight differences are compressed into coarser images within particular relational fields, and the question of class-image generation arises. What institutionalization can explain is how these differences are preserved and carried forward into consequences, rather than compressing multiple chains into a single path in advance.

This conclusion does not equate institutionalization with class-image formation, nor does it treat a class image as an explanation already completed. Labor, housing, education, debt, family, local reputation, and community relations must not therefore be reduced to the same thing. Labor contracts, social insurance, wages, housing, debt, educational credentials, and enrollment eligibility each have different sources, different handlers, and different consequences. Family care, local reputation, and community recognition still operate within their respective relational chains as well. Only by preserving these differences can we avoid prematurely compressing multiple chains into a single image. To understand concrete differentiation positions, we must still unpack the compressed labor, property, income, housing, debt, education, and relations of domination back into concrete materials, handlers, procedures, families, urban eligibility, schools, local reputation, and community networks.

Chapter 18. Class-Image Formation: How High-Weight Differentiating Units Are Brutally Projected into Class Images

I. Strictly Speaking, Class Does Not Exist at All

Once differences in life enter institutions, they are preserved as materials, segmented into formats, handed to people authorized to make determinations, and connected to consequences that can be put into effect. Household registration, social insurance, rental registration, labor contracts, medical records, wage transaction records, student files, and court enforcement records all preserve differences and make some of them regain weight later. If these preserved differences remain connected over time to labor, property, income, housing, education, debt, and relations of domination, they make certain circumstances bear heavy consequences over the long term.

Strictly speaking, class does not exist at all. Wages, property, employment relations, debt, housing, risk, and relations of domination all really exist, and they are often very weighty. How much a person earns, whether their work is stable, whether their labor relation is recognized, whether they own real property, whether they rent, when debts fall due, whether their child can enter school, whether their social insurance is continuous, whether they can recuperate after illness, who can arrange other people's time, and who can push risk onto others: these are all real and weighty differences. What does not exist is a “class” as what society fundamentally is.

Society is not laid out in advance by total images such as class. In a concrete event, what must actually be traced is which differences are preserved, extracted, assigned weight, connected, and brought into consequences. Differentiating units have a basis in reality, but they are not new underlying particles of society. Labor relations, sources of income, possession of property, housing conditions, debt deadlines, the bearing of risk, the capacity to wait, the width of available exits, concrete differences within relations of domination, institutional eligibility, family fallback support, household registration, accent, medical history, local relations, kinship responsibilities, national memory, and community recognition form traceable social consequences only when they are extracted, connected, and written back within concrete relational fields.

Class theory extracts a set of high-weight differentiating units from differences that have remained connected and gained weight together over time in reality. It casts them onto axes of economic relations, labor, property, and domination, compressing, projecting, and naming them to form a class image. The differences extracted and projected onto the same axis do not thereby lose their respective origins and consequences. The importance of labor, property, income, housing, education, debt, and relations of domination is beyond question.

The danger arises when class theory treats the result of projection as an entity and the compressed image as an underlying reality, causing the image to be mistaken for what society fundamentally is. In this reifying inversion, a person's complex position in the social differentiation network is rewritten as a single low-dimensional position. People are simultaneously situated within labor, family, household registration, locality, language, the body, debt, education, ethnicity, religion, institutional materials, and community memory. Yet class theory may cram all these differences onto axes of economic relations, labor, property, and domination, then say, “This is who you are.”

Rejecting class does not mean denying the wage, property, and housing differences and debt pressures people already bear, still less denying that employment, risk shifting, and relations of domination constrict their choices severely. What is rejected is the assumption of a pre-existing social entity behind these relations, as if people were born into a natural group and their subsequent wages, medical histories, household registration, and family responsibilities were merely its manifestations. The actual order is exactly the reverse: differences are first preserved, recognized, amplified, or downweighted within concrete relations; only then does class theory select a set of them and supply a unified image.

Differentiating units must not be mistaken for another kind of underlying atom either. A differentiating unit is not something with a fixed weight apart from its relational field. The same material, debt, or housing situation changes eligibility, risk, and available exits only when connected to concrete nodes and relational chains. Arranging differentiating units anew into an eternal foundational table would merely create another plane alongside the class plane.

II. What Is Brutal Projection?

Brutal projection is not ordinary compression. Social analysis certainly requires compression: without it, reality cannot be discussed, remembered, or compared. Every concept extracts some differences from countless details and places them within intelligible relations. Compression itself is not the problem. Yet after extracting a few axes, class theory elevates a low-dimensional image into society itself.

These operations are interconnected. Class theory first selects axes such as economic relations, labor, property, income, and domination, examining wages, employment, assets, housing, debt, and who dominates whom. These axes do carry considerable weight, but they are not everything. Meanwhile, household registration, locality, language, medical history, family responsibilities, national memory, religious relations, community recognition, institutional materials, and historical indices of kinship are pushed into the background. They have not disappeared; they have lost their own explanatory standing within the class image. Once a few axes have been selected, other differences find it harder to retain independent explanatory power.

Continuous differences are then cut into coarse categories by designations of different kinds. “Worker” and “boss” primarily point to employment, jobs, and relations of domination; “landlord” and “tenant” primarily point to property, leases, and control over residence; “debtor” primarily points to creditor–debtor relations, deadlines, credit, and responsibility; “the bottom stratum” and “the middle class” primarily belong to the naming of strata. These designations can serve limited analysis for particular purposes, but they are not the same kind of classification, nor do they automatically form groups, communities, or class entities of the same nature. Designations make identification faster while cutting differences into coarser categories. Once group labels are fixed, an individual's continuous differentiation position is more readily seen as an already constituted group position.

Class theory then inverts the order, treating the result of projection as an entity, as if classes existed first and people subsequently entered them, or an underlying group entity came first and concrete differences afterward. Reifying inversion makes this way of dividing things seem self-evident. The truly dangerous change follows: household registration, gender, national memory, and local relations are permitted to appear only as subordinate explanations within the total class image. Class theory thus makes other real differences conform to this total image's mode of display. Only when class theory requires other differences to submit to the total image does the center of explanation truly shift from relations to the image.

Ordinary compression leaves a path back to verification: people can still ask which differences were not extracted, which relations gave them weight, and when the original explanation needs adjustment. Brutal projection closes that path. It does not treat downweighted household registration, medical history, family responsibilities, or local relations as realities that might correct the image; it requires them only to confirm the existing image. Differences that could have supplied counterexamples thus become footnotes beneath the total image.

III. The Appeal of the Class Image and the Cost of Compressing Multiple Chains

The class image appears to be something real because the set of differences behind it often gains weight together, is repeatedly connected, and becomes linked to heavy consequences, not because a real class underlying society is at work. Class theory does extract labor relations, sources of income, possession of property, housing stability, debt pressure, educational opportunities, buffers against risk, the ability to exit, and relations of domination, and projects them onto a single plane.

If these differences go unseen, many heavy pressures are rewritten as personal failures. Low wages are attributed to inadequate ability, and being unable to find suitable work after unemployment to a lack of effort; debt after illness is attributed to a failure to plan, and incomplete school-enrollment materials to parents not caring enough; failure to assert one's rights after a work injury is attributed to not knowing how to fight for them, and an inability to pay rent to careless spending. These explanations sometimes grasp a little of the truth, yet can all too easily bypass harder relations. Through the aspects of people’s circumstances presented by the class image, people recognize much suffering as the result of differences connected over time, rather than isolated events. But the grounds of explanation lie in real differentiating units and their processing; explanatory power does not belong to the image.

A person cannot wait because rent is due next week, wages have not yet been paid, their child must submit materials, demands for debt repayment have already arrived, and their parents are still waiting for money for medicine. Someone with savings can take time to find work after losing a job; someone without savings quickly enters a countdown.

A person does not dare to resign because, in circumstances where social-insurance materials are required locally for the relevant admission year and category, work supplies not only wages but also a connection to social insurance. Social insurance connects to the child's enrollment materials, and enrollment connects to whether the family can remain in the city. Resigning is more than changing jobs: it loosens a whole series of connected materials and eligibility conditions at once. People who own housing, have support from relatives, and hold stable eligibility can bear uncertainty; for people who rent, owe debts, and cannot let their social insurance lapse, a single change may bring cascading consequences.

In concrete arrangements connecting sick leave, attendance, performance, income, and living expenses, people return to work before they have recovered because sick leave affects attendance, attendance affects performance, performance affects income, and income affects debt and rent. The body needs rest, but debt and household expenditure require them to recover their capacity to work immediately. Some people can start again after a failure; others fall into debt, come to be regarded as untrustworthy, become caught in family quarrels, and face relatives’ evaluations after failing once. These circumstances cannot be explained by character alone.

The capacity to wait may come from savings, stable housing, relatives who can provide temporary help, social insurance that can remain uninterrupted, or a work relation still recognized by institutions. It is not an abstract psychological quality. Nor can the width of available exits be summed up by saying that someone has

“better conditions.” Some people can change jobs, wait to recover from illness, or supplement materials; for others, an interruption in wages brings rent, debt, and care responsibilities pressing in at once. The capacity for trial and error is likewise provided or taken away by these relations.

These differences often occur together. Extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression of real differentiating units form partial explanatory power. As a low-dimensional output, the class image can present the weighty relations extracted; this constitutes its explanatory appeal. Yet this partial explanatory power comes from real differences and their processing. It cannot prove the existence of a class entity, nor does it mean that a class underlying society is arranging them. From the outset, class theory's basic structure belongs to Model C: total-image subsumption. Treating it as an ordinary limited model on this account would overlook the problem that it elevates a partial selection into the whole of society and requires other relations to retreat into subordinate positions.

The problem with class theory is not that it extracts labor, income, property, housing, debt, and relations of domination. These differences must be seen. The danger is that, after projecting them into a low-dimensional image, class theory uses that image to explain all of society. People with similarly low incomes are not necessarily in the same circumstances. Someone with local household registration, a kinship network, and stable rental relations does not occupy the same position as a tenant from elsewhere who has no support from relatives and whose child's enrollment materials remain incomplete. Their incomes and labor positions may be similar, but household registration, urban eligibility, kinship networks, rental registration, school materials, and local recognition place them in different differentiation positions.

Similar incomes indicate proximity along one axis only. They do not guarantee the same capacity to wait, institutional eligibility, or family buffers. The same wage may connect to entirely different consequences for a person with local household registration, stable rental arrangements, and kinship support than for someone with incomplete materials, an uncooperative landlord, and heavy care responsibilities. Naming both together certainly makes identification easier, but it conceals the nodes that separate their circumstances.

Being workers likewise does not mean being in the same circumstances. Statistical classifications can exist, as can similar economic pressures. But classifications and similar positions do not automatically generate a natural community, unified interests, unified consciousness, unified responsibility, a unified capacity for action, or a historical mission.

The class image appears weighty because real, weighty differences repeatedly gain weight together in concrete relational fields, after which class theory projects them onto a plane of economic relations, labor, property, and domination. But these differences do not always connect in the same way. The factory, school enrollment, courtship and marriage, and debt after illness are not four interchangeable backgrounds. Each extracts different materials, qualifications, and relations. In the factory, labor discipline, wages, jobs, and attendance may carry great weight; in enrollment, household registration, social insurance, rental registration, and student-registration materials may carry great weight; in courtship and marriage, real property, debt, family responsibilities, local reputation, and bodily condition may carry great weight; in debt after illness, savings, medical insurance, loans from relatives, lost work time, labor contracts, and bodily recovery gain weight together.

Class theory compresses differences that originally passed through different nodes and relational chains into the same plane, making them look like a single kind of position. These differences then lose independent explanatory standing. If every circumstance is called class, pressures of labor and resources are seen, but household registration, locality, ethnicity, gender, medical history, kinship responsibilities, community

memory, and institutional materials can readily lose their explanatory standing. Class is not an entity, and the low-dimensional position marked by a class image is not the entirety of a person's differentiation position.

IV. How Labor Relations Affect Chains of Everyday Life

A nonlocal worker's circumstances cannot be explained by the level of wages alone. What work they do at the workplace, whether their contract continues, whether social-insurance contributions are paid, whether they can take leave, and when they receive their wages all connect with housing, children, parents, and bodily condition. Labor relations are not the sole source of other relations, but may connect previously separate pressures to one person's everyday arrangements.

How work affects chains of everyday life depends on how these institutional relations intersect in concrete circumstances. If local admission rules list social insurance among enrollment materials, an interruption in social insurance may cause problems with a child's enrollment materials. Residence requires verification and registration, and whether the landlord cooperates in providing the relevant materials also affects residential eligibility. Once these chains have actually connected, instability in work makes several procedures that could previously be maintained become vulnerable together. Beyond labor income, whether institutional materials remain continuous and whether other people cooperate likewise determine whether a family can remain in the city.

Moving changes the area one lives in, the commute, and arrangements for taking children to and from school. When the new home is farther away, parents cannot arrive by the end of the school day, while higher commuting costs squeeze the part of wages available for living expenses. If they postpone moving for the sake of school, rent and housing conditions may become new burdens. These consequences arise from the interconnection of working hours, address, and care arrangements. They cannot be deduced directly from a labor position.

Debt deadlines, money borrowed for a father's hospitalization, and old bodily injuries also constrain resignation, recuperation, and the assertion of rights. Repayment dates do not wait for bodily recovery, and taking leave may make wages and jobs more insecure. Some people need to protect their immediate income first; others can no longer bear their former workload because of an old injury. These constraints intersect through family, medical care, wages, and work arrangements. They cannot be reduced to a single economic factor.

The designation “worker” can roughly identify relations of employment, wages, and being dominated. It cannot replace, in advance, actual tracing of contracts, social insurance, addresses, care, debt, health, and available exits. People who share the designation “worker” do not necessarily have the same capacity to wait or the same ways of bearing consequences. A designation is not proof of a natural community.

It is the points at which contracts, working hours, income, materials, and addresses connect or break off that change a person's room to leave a job, find another, or recuperate briefly. The effects of labor relations therefore cannot be summed up by a wage figure. Whether a contract is renewed, whether social insurance remains continuous, and whether leave is permitted will each change the conditions of materials, income, and bodily recuperation. Only when these connect with relations involving landlords, schools, and families do they form the paths a person can actually take. An interruption in social insurance need not mean only the loss of one protection: it may also break the previous continuity of enrollment materials, residential registration, and work choices. Once working hours are fully scheduled, moving, school pickup and drop-off, care, and treatment also become difficult to arrange otherwise.

V. How Property and Housing Become Education and Opportunity

Housing first enters education and institutional eligibility. The difference between owning and renting concerns not only the extent of one’s assets but also whether an address can remain stable, materials can be maintained, and a child can stay on the same educational path. When housing conditions change, educational opportunities may change with them. Housing is therefore more than a property situation.

Rental registration, landlord cooperation, address, and school materials connect within the same relation. A tenant living there may not be enough. Much also depends on whether the landlord is willing to supply materials, whether registration can be completed, and whether the address is recognized. These procedures turn the fact of residence into institutional eligibility, while also making it possible for people who all rent to obtain different results. Whether a lease is stable and an address can continue affects whether a family can make longer-term educational, work, and living arrangements. But a stable address does not necessarily guarantee smooth schooling; these conditions do not lead to one single outcome.

Relocation changes commuting time and time spent together. Living farther away requires parents to keep adjusting between work and taking children to and from school. A longer journey consumes not only money but also time for companionship, supplementary lessons, and school matters. A change of address increases transport expenses and constricts a family's room to arrange its time and income. Housing thus preserves an address, a commuting radius, and family arrangements together. Even if the landlord supplies materials, the pressures of commuting and care are not necessarily relieved.

Housing also enters courtship and marriage and evaluations of the future. Whether someone has a stable home, can afford rent, and can maintain an address is treated by relatives, relations of courtship and marriage, and local evaluations as evidence of whether they can arrange their life. These evaluations are not produced by housing alone. They form through connections between housing, family responsibilities, job stability, and expectations of the future.

Housing is a node where relational chains intersect, not merely an asset that can be calculated. It connects to addresses, materials, schools, commuting, family arrangements, and external evaluations. Precisely for this reason, differences in housing cannot all be compressed into differences between rich and poor, still less can “housing” as a whole be treated as a single differentiating unit. Whether each node can sustain the connection changes how much time and choice a family retains. When someone is forced to change homes, educational materials, time for school pickup and drop-off, and evaluations in courtship and marriage may not change simultaneously, yet they constrain a person's room to arrange the future at different nodes.

VI. How Debt Produces Lock-In

Borrowing after illness makes time harder. The body needs recuperation, treatment takes time, and income may stop, yet repayment dates arrive on schedule. When a sum falls due, the room to stop work, find a new job, or wait for treatment or appraisal is constricted. Debt's weight lies not only in its amount but in how it pulls bodily recovery, work arrangements, and repayment deadlines into the same span of time. This also changes the room to resign, recuperate, wait, and assert rights. Someone who must repay immediately can hardly bear an interruption in income; an injured person may also postpone handling matters because of the conflict between treatment and wages. Lock-in is not caused by the name “debt.” It results from the interconnection of deadlines, income, the body, and others' demands.

Borrowing can connect to different relations: a bank's deadlines and credit, a platform's collection demands and fees, personal regard and responsibilities among relatives, or dependence on work tied to an advance

from a boss. These four paths do not bring the same pressure. Each places a person within different relations of recognition, urging, compensation, and return, and draws different boundaries around seeking help and exiting. The same sum of money thereby has different consequences for different people.

Debt deadlines, repayment pressure, credit, debt collection, and kinship responsibilities constitute a set of differences that can be traced separately; they cannot be merged into a single differentiating unit. Class theory can extract some of these weighty differences and project them as a rough position. The class image is the result: it cannot actively incorporate or compress differences in debt. Analysis must still ask when the deadlines fall, who is pressing for payment, and which work and family arrangements therefore cannot be interrupted.

Lock-in within debt relations is not forever immovable either. A loan repaid, a course of treatment supported, or a job becoming stable again may each loosen one pressure slightly. But other deadlines, credit, and responsibilities may remain. A partial loosening cannot be taken to mean that all consequences have disappeared.

VII. How Risk Is Distributed and Shifted onto Others

Illness does not reveal the same vulnerability in everyone. It brings savings, medical insurance, care, and leave conditions into view together, and these different conditions determine whether someone can wait and recover after bodily harm. Some have savings and can obtain treatment first; others must first think about the cost of medicine. Some can take leave and receive care from relatives; others lose their income as soon as they stop work.

Unemployment reveals time to wait and family fallback support. Some people can rely on their families to cover rent and daily expenses temporarily while waiting for another job. Others lack this buffer: as soon as income stops, they must repay debts, move, or accept worse work. The consequences of unemployment depend on whether the family can provide support and whether time can be extended, not merely on whether a job is lost.

Work-related injuries, in turn, must pass through contracts, surveillance footage, testimony, acknowledgment by the workplace, and appraisal. An injury does not automatically become compensation. Whether a contract exists, whether a record of the scene can be preserved, whether coworkers are willing to testify, whether acknowledgment is given by the workplace, and whether appraisal can be completed all determine who bears the bodily harm. A work injury reveals how responsibility is acknowledged or pushed away at concrete nodes.

A small-business owner may bear rent, loans, operating pressures, and market uncertainty. A landlord, in turn, may shift housing instability onto tenants by raising rent, withholding a deposit, refusing rental registration, or demanding a move at short notice. We must neither deny the risks small-business owners themselves bear nor use those risks to play down risk shifting.

The distribution of risk is a process within real relations, not class-image formation itself. Illness brings treatment and care to the fore; unemployment, time and family fallback support; work injuries, the determination of responsibility and compensation. Their relational chains differ. Class theory extracts a set of differences in risk, income, property, and domination, making the image appear stable. This is only a descriptive judgment about the differences extracted. The class image must not be written as a subject distributing the consequences of illness, unemployment, or work injuries. Risk is taken on or shifted onto

others within different relations, so similar accidents have different consequences for different people. A group designation cannot predetermine these consequences either.

These differences must still be identified within the relations of concrete relational fields. Savings, care, contracts, materials, and recognition must each be traced to establish how they change the possibilities of waiting, compensation, and exit before and after an accident. Some people can obtain treatment but have no long-term income; some have work skills but no time to wait; some preserve materials yet still receive no recognition. We must distinguish which relations take on risk and which shift costs onto others.

VIII. Capacity for Domination: Who Can Arrange Other People's Time and Consequences?

Beyond resource differences, concrete differences within relations of domination must also be traced. Authority to schedule shifts, authority to deduct wages, demands for proof, control over leases, cooperation with rental registration, and job assignments gain weight together in concrete relational fields. They constitute different forms of authority that can alter a person's time, eligibility, income, and available exits, and cannot all be subsumed under the abstract phrase “capacity for domination.” Who can set shifts, demand materials, or decide whether eligibility can continue often comes closer to everyday consequences than a sweeping designation of strength or weakness.

A server cannot pick up their child: a supervisor's scheduling of late shifts and deductions for leave push working time into family care. After a worker is injured, workplace demands for proof, attendance records, and wage deductions turn bodily recovery into a problem within the organization of labor. For a tenant arranging enrollment materials for a child, the question of whether the landlord cooperates with rental registration again connects the fact of residence to institutional eligibility. The three scenes differ, but in each, domination enters into consequences through time arrangements, demands for proof, or cooperation with registration.

Domination is most direct where someone can turn their own arrangements into another person's timetable. The party requiring others to wait, supply further proof, change shifts, or endure a move does not necessarily bear the costs of waiting, obtaining evidence, care, and interrupted materials; the other party's action space nevertheless contracts. The gap between who makes decisions and who bears consequences is precisely the weight of relations of domination in everyday life. It often appears first in who can delay and who must respond immediately.

These real consequences are transmitted along relational chains through specific forms of authority. We must still distinguish which authority is involved, who exercises it, and where it alters another person's choices. Domination must also be examined through whether those whose lives are arranged retain room to wait, refuse, recuperate, or obtain missing materials. Only when this room narrows does a specific authority reveal its consequences in life. Some pressures come from scheduling, others from proof or registration. Each must be traced to the subject exercising authority and the people bearing consequences, rather than attributing all consequences to an abstract position.

Class theory extracts a set of differences in domination from this and projects them as positions of strength or weakness. But the class image is only the result of this explanatory operation. It must not be written as an acting subject that arranges time, transfers costs, or produces domination.

IX. How Families Take On Pressures of Labor, Debt, Risk, and Care

Once wages enter a family, they become rent, food, children's expenses, and parents' medicine costs. Unemployment enters relations between spouses, relatives' evaluations, and future arrangements. Borrowing after illness affects who provides care, who borrows money, and who does the housework. Labor income, bodily harm, and repayment pressures that originally fell on one person are redistributed within the family. These expenses and burdens often demand answers together in the same month: who pays, who takes leave, who provides care, and who explains matters to relatives.

Families can buffer some of this pressure. This is not abstract warmth: someone actually takes on the time, costs, and responsibilities. Parents looking after children prevent working hours from immediately overwhelming care. Relatives lending money and siblings sharing medicine costs can leave a family some time to wait and seek treatment. Spouses bearing unemployment together, and older people offering explanations for younger people in local society, may also temporarily prevent reputation and recognition from breaking down.

Families may also amplify pressure. When a lack of savings, ill parents, children at school, strained kinship relations, and debt incurred to maintain respectability coincide, a single change in income meets multiple responsibilities. It is no longer merely a lost wage payment: it becomes a problem of care arrangements, borrowing pressure, relatives' evaluations, and family shame. How much relatives can lend, whether parents still have the physical strength, and whether spouses can share care all change where the pressure ultimately falls and how long it lasts.

Housing, education, debt, care responsibilities, local evaluations, and evaluations in courtship and marriage may also enter the next generation's circumstances. What children take on is not limited to property: it may also include educational paths, household-registration materials, family debt, and care responsibilities. The family is a real relational node. It cannot be compressed into an appendage of the class image or a shell for class reproduction; it changes where pressure falls and how long it lasts.

Family buffering, amplification, and transmission are not steps in a fixed sequence. The same debt after illness may first be temporarily covered by borrowing from relatives, then increase family pressure through care and repayment. The key remains how concrete responsibilities are taken on or passed along. Whether a family can buffer pressure also depends on whether care, borrowing, and explanation can continue. Once these relations break off, income and bodily pressures that were temporarily buffered may concentrate again.

X. How Class Designations Disguise Projection as Underlying Reality

Designations such as worker, landlord, debtor, and middle class do not arise from nothing. “Worker” identifies relations of employment, wages, jobs, attendance, and being dominated; “landlord” identifies real property, leases, deposits, control over residence, and cooperation with rental registration; “debtor” identifies deadlines, credit, repayment, and responsibility; “middle class” identifies stable income, housing, educational arrangements, and buffers against risk. These designations of different kinds can rapidly identify some relations for particular purposes, but they cannot replace one another.

Rapid identification also cuts continuous, intersecting differentiation positions into coarser group boundaries. Once a designation is fixed, people readily leave aside different household registrations, medical histories, family responsibilities, local recognition, and widths of available exits. What remains is a position that appears already complete. Once a designation covers over materials, responsibilities, and recognition that originally required separate inquiry, group boundaries appear tidier than the actual relations.

Labels in particular cannot prove the existence of a natural group or a real community. A boss may face pressure from upstream actors to lower prices, debt, and local dependencies, and may also go on shifting risk onto employees. People who share the designation “worker” may differ greatly in household registration, medical history, care, and available exits. The same designation does not automatically generate shared memory, shared responsibility, or shared consequences. Nor does it guarantee that people have the same paths for bearing consequences when they suffer harm, wait, or need to exit. Income, occupation, or other limited classifications therefore cannot directly establish the class entity this book rejects.

Reopening a designation does not mean making it disappear or denying the pressures it captures. It means refusing to let the designation reach conclusions about reality in advance. Designations cannot replace judgment about concrete relations, nodes, and consequences. Once a designation is fixed, differences that could have corrected judgment are also readily pushed into the background. Reopening the designation means asking what class theory has extracted, amplified, downweighted, and excluded, and asking in which relational fields these differences cross boundaries and when they can no longer be explained by the same group position. Materials, relations, and consequences can thereby regain their respective explanatory standing.

XI. Lock-In, Room for Adjustment, and Positional Displacement within Relational Chains

In circumstances where the conditions above connect, lock-in comes from multiple relations acting together. Debt shortens waiting time; interrupted social insurance makes enrollment materials precarious; failure to recognize a work injury leaves bodily harm borne by the individual; missing rental registration makes urban eligibility unstable. With education and other institutional eligibility connected to these, change is no longer merely a personal choice. When these relations connect, people may still make choices, yet can hardly bear the consequences of each change.

Within these circumstances, some chains can loosen in part. Release from debt changes time pressure; making up gaps in social insurance may reopen the enrollment chain; recognition of a work injury changes responsibility and compensation; completed registration can make residential eligibility more stable; and changes in educational paths may affect the next generation's opportunities. These changes are not the same thing. Each loosens a different link, and no single change can be mistaken for a transformation of the entire situation.

Positional displacement remains constrained. Whether new nodes recognize someone, whether old reputations can be downweighted, and whether a new community accepts them all determine whether a partial loosening can continue. Different chains do not loosen simultaneously. One relation may ease while another still holds the person in place. Making up gaps in social insurance does not necessarily eliminate debt immediately; recognition of a work injury does not necessarily change family care at once; and completed registration may still encounter restrictions from a lease or reputation.

When relational chains change, people's positions change with them. The image formed by class theory may change accordingly, but the image is not the cause of lock-in, room for adjustment, or positional displacement. Displacement is not an inspirational story or an escape from some class fate. It depends on whether relations have actually changed consequences. If these conditions have not connected, a change in how the image is described does not widen a person's actual available exits. Nor can displacement be judged from the result alone. Seeing someone change jobs, supply materials, or temporarily pay off debt still requires us to ask which relations have not loosened and whether certain materials, qualifications, responsibilities, and support relations have actually changed the way they connect. Otherwise, a partial change can readily be

mistaken for room for adjustment across the whole situation. Changing a designation cannot constitute genuine room for adjustment.

XII. Unpacking the Class Image Back into a Network of Differentiating Units

Strictly speaking, class does not exist at all. What does not exist is class as what society fundamentally is and as its original material. Concrete differences and their repeated connections within real relations are what really exist. Class theory extracts a set of high-weight differentiating units from them, compresses and projects them onto axes of economic relations, labor, property, and domination, and names them, thereby forming a class image. This process of formation cannot be understood in reverse, as if a class entity existed first and reality then supplied its content.

The image's explanatory appeal comes from real, weighty differences; it cannot prove that class exists as an underlying reality. The task is not to assign the class image a smaller place, but to remove its central place as what society fundamentally is. Otherwise, the result of projection will still pass itself off as society itself, and other differences will still be compressed into subordinate explanations. Acknowledging that the concrete differentiating units extracted and their processing can reveal these pressures establishes only that the relevant differences carry great weight. This appeal cannot be made into a reason for retaining class as an underlying reality.

Unpacking must return to concrete differentiating units, nodes, relational chains, weights, and consequences. Analysis must trace who recognizes differences, which subjects extract them and assign weight, which nodes preserve and pass them on, how differences travel along relational chains to change eligibility, risk, evaluation, and action, and where the consequences then reach. This requires preserving the course of when differences are extracted, when they are downweighted, and how they enter into consequences. Explanation must be placed back within concrete processes, rather than allowing a group designation to predetermine how someone ought to be understood.

Differentiating units are not new underlying particles. They acquire traceable weight only within concrete relations. Unpacking the image back into a network therefore does not mean listing labor, housing, debt, and so forth once again, still less replacing it with a longer list of nouns. Merely making the list of nouns longer may still freeze relations back into a plane.

The same wage, lease, or loss of a job does not automatically form the same circumstances. The same difference has different weights in different relational fields. Whether relatives can provide support, whether debt collection is approaching, whether the landlord cooperates with registration, and whether someone can wait for appraisal all make the consequences diverge. Similar economic pressures can coexist, but cannot cancel the roles of landlords, relatives, debt collectors, workplaces, and institutional materials at different nodes. Class theory's low-dimensional image therefore cannot replace differentiation positions within concrete relations.

Only when institutions, organizations, or actors classify, judge, and make arrangements according to a class image can that image enter write-back through concrete subjects and institutional nodes. Write-back requires materials, institutional nodes, and action. The image cannot create labor, debt, housing, or relations of domination on its own.

Removing the image's central place as an underlying reality does not mean playing down real pressures, nor does it require abandoning judgments about labor, property, housing, debt, and relations of domination. They gain weight together within concrete relational fields, but gaining weight together does not mean merging into

a single underlying entity, nor can it cancel other differences' explanatory standing. Unpacking the image requires every judgment to be traceable to concrete relations, nodes, and consequences. Only then will the pressures captured by the image not become a reason to occlude other differences.

Chapter 19. National-Community Formation: How Partially Overlapping Networks Form Historical Communities

I. National-Community Formation Cannot Be Written on the Model of Class-Image Formation

Why would someone call people in a distant place, whom they have never met, “our people,” while another distant worker with a similar income and similar labor circumstances cannot automatically become one of “our people”? The difference lies not in abstract classification but in whether there is an interaction network through which transmission can occur. Transmission here does not mean that an abstract name connects people by itself. Family members, people engaged in exchanges, teachers, religious practitioners, and local organizations preserve designations, explain rites and customs, and retell stories in everyday interaction. Within concrete relations, they also decide which consequences must be borne together.

Class-image formation shows how a set of high-weight differentiating units involving economic relations, labor, property, housing, debt, risk, and capacity for domination is brutally projected into a class image, and how that image is mistaken for what society fundamentally is. National-community formation cannot be written on this model. Class is a brutal projection; a nation, by contrast, consists of partially overlapping networks. National-community formation does not place people in the same box under an abstract name, nor does it project differences onto a single axis. It presents another process of formation: how networks of small communities, similar but not identical, connect link by link through language, accent, marriage, rites and customs, place names, migration, schools, markets, religion, shared institutions, and shared consequences, forming paths along which recognition, memory, and responsibility can be transmitted.

A nation cannot be deduced directly from bloodline, registration, or propaganda. Kinship by descent, the state, and cultural symbols may all participate in national-community formation, but they are not the source of the nation. What actually stabilizes a nation is long-term interaction, partial overlap, shared memory, shared consequences, and transmission across generations. A nation is a historical community formed by partially overlapping networks of small communities through long-term interaction and transmission across generations. Someone who does not know a distant person may nevertheless be able to read their language, understand their history, recognize their rites and customs, know that they stand within certain shared boundaries, and know that certain shared consequences will fall on both of them. A nation does not mean that everyone knows everyone else. It means that paths for transmitting recognition and responsibility have formed among many local interaction networks.

Wimmer discusses how boundaries form within relations at multiple levels; Lamont and Molnár discuss the research traditions concerning symbolic and social boundaries. These are points of contact with scholarship only: boundary research is not used here to prove this book's theoretical judgments that national communities are real or that the state is not their source.

A nation therefore cannot be written as a bloodline entity. Kinship by descent, ancestral origins, family memory, genealogies, and burial grounds may indeed participate in national-community formation. Community members, families, and those who transmit things across generations remember where ancestors came from, where they settled, what migrations they experienced, with whom they intermarried, with whom

they broke ties, and where they left burial grounds, place names, and stories. But these are not a bloodline essence. Ancestral origins are not commands in the blood; they are historical materials preserved from migration, settlement, boundaries, marriage, memory, and narration.

Nor can a nation be written as state registration. Specific personnel in state institutions, together with procedures involving schools, household registration, archives, law, administrative divisions, border regimes, and commemorative dates, can register, classify, name, recognize, or reformat differences involved in national-community formation. But state registration is not the source of the nation. Before registration, a community may already have language, rites and customs, marriage boundaries, shared memory, and shared consequences. The relevant personnel and procedures may recognize the community, or may misread, compress, rewrite, or rename it, or freeze its institutional position. Write-back forms when these results of processing are preserved as differences that can be extracted again in the future. Only when specific people or procedures later retrieve, interpret, or assign weight to the relevant records anew does the content of write-back re-enter real consequences. The state is not the source of the national community.

Nor is a nation a cultural label. Language, clothing, festivals, food, religion, and rites and customs all matter, but they are not decorations. They matter because they enter shared life. A form of address determines who is an elder, who is kin, who may speak, and who must keep away; a form of wedding determines how two families recognize one another and how descendants enter the kinship network.

A festival determines when people return home, to whom they make ritual offerings, what they eat, and how they recount the past. A taboo directly trains the body, determining who may eat together and who is kept apart. If these differences remain at the level of outward display, they are merely cultural symbols. Only when they enter families, marriage, schools, markets, land, boundaries, memory, and shared consequences do they become materials for national-community formation.

Overlap among small communities therefore does not consist in simply adding a number of features together. Language, marriage, markets, schools, and migration memory each provide different channels. Only when these connect through specific people's exchanges, records, and interpretations can recognition and responsibility extend beyond their original local scope.

II. Small Communities, Indirect Interaction, and Partial Overlap

A nation begins with networks of small communities, not with an abstract grand term. Families, villages, towns, schools, local markets, marriage circles, religious circles, language circles, migration routes, and life in border regions are all places where concrete interaction occurs. There people meet, trade, intermarry, help one another, come into conflict, reconcile, borrow money, repay debts, dispute land, make ritual offerings to ancestors, establish schools, serve in the military, seek refuge, migrate, and bear institutional consequences. A village is not a nation; a clan is not a nation; a local market is not a nation; nor is a religious circle necessarily a nation. A nation is not a homogeneous population first given a name and then standing neatly together. It is a historical community that gradually forms as networks of small communities repeatedly develop partial overlaps.

These networks of small communities must connect link by link through repeated interaction. A market brings people from different villages together repeatedly; a trade route establishes stable exchanges among people from different towns; a school has children from different families learn the same language and history; a marriage circle carries kinship relations across village and local boundaries; a religious organization has people from different places share rituals, taboos, and festivals; and a shared institution has people from different regions accept similar rules and bear similar consequences. Only when interaction repeatedly occurs

at such positions as families, markets, schools, marriage, and religion can a community larger than the locality possibly form, along with paths for transmitting recognition and responsibility.

Community does not arise directly from abstract similarity. Belonging to the same category does not mean belonging to the same network; only membership in the same network can make shared responsibility possible. Two poor people, two workers, or two oppressed people may be in similar circumstances. But if they cannot understand each other's language, live under different institutions, have different historical memories, and bear consequences of life that do not connect, and if traceable direct or indirect interaction and paths of shared recognition and responsibility are absent, similarity alone cannot establish that they belong to the same community. Similar circumstances may bring understanding and sympathy, but sympathy is not community responsibility. Interaction may occur directly or continue through relays such as family, language, education, ritual, historical memory, institutional records, migration relations, commemorative activities, and mutual aid across localities. Shared consequences may come from historical experiences, current relations, or shared expectations grounded in real relations. The absence of one kind of shared consequence does not automatically rule out shared responsibility: real connections and paths of recognition and responsibility must still be traced.

Emphasizing interaction networks does not mean that members of a nation must know one another directly. Small villages, towns, families, marriage circles, schools, and local markets often contain direct interaction networks. People know whose child gained admission to school by examination, whose elderly relative died, who owes money to whom, who did not attend a wedding, and who helped during a famine. Yet a national community is not a simple enlargement of such a direct network of acquaintances. Most people within a nation do not know one another. They may live far apart and never meet in their lifetimes. The community therefore cannot be sustained by everyone knowing everyone else; it relies on relaying through nodes.

Families, schools, markets, marriage, and religion can become nodes. Guilds, military service, taxation systems, migration routes, and famine relief can serve as relays, as can local institutions, publishing and media, commemorative dates, place names, shared education, law, and administration. Strangers may thus recognize one another. Even without knowing a distant member of the same nation, someone may still read their language, understand their history and rites and customs, know that they share certain experiences of boundaries, and know that shared consequences will fall on them together. Although this network is not a relation of acquaintance, it can transmit recognition, memory, responsibility, harm, and protection. It results from the gradual stabilization of paths of recognition, memory, and responsibility among local communities.

A structure of relaying through nodes does not operate by itself. What matters is how specific people identify, pass on, and reconnect materials. Through repeated interaction, narrators within families, teachers and students in schools, traders in markets, and those who lead and participate in rituals pass language, memory, rules, recognition, and responsibility to people who originally did not know one another. If family narratives, schooling, marriage exchanges, religious rituals, and market transactions cease to be mutually intelligible, recognition and responsibility may no longer be transmitted even when nodes remain. Material being understood at a subsequent position and reconnected to life is one important mechanism by which an indirect network continues, but it is not the only form. How connections are maintained must still be judged through actual interaction and relay relations.

Within a nation there can be differences in dialect, locality, ways of life, religion, wealth, and occupation. Community forms through partial overlap among small communities. For example, communities A and B may have similar languages, connected markets, and frequent intermarriage; communities B and C may share schools, religion, and migration memory; communities C and D may share place names, institutional

experiences, and common boundaries. A and D need not know one another directly or be completely alike. Yet through intermediate networks such as B and C, they can form paths for transmitting recognition, memory, and responsibility. It must be stressed that A being connected to B and B to C does not automatically mean that A and C belong to the same nation. Partial overlap cannot be treated as a sufficient condition that automatically carries over from one link to the next. Whether the intervening paths of recognition, memory, and responsibility actually connect and are stably maintained must still be examined in concrete context.

The continuity of partial overlap must be sustained through concrete practice. Only when people understand one another in marriage, trade, requests for help, education, and rituals, and explain place names, accents, and past events to those who come later, does overlap become more than a static list on paper: it becomes a relational path through which transmission can occur. Such overlaps can take many forms: similar languages, intelligible accents, place names that can be explained, rites and customs that can be translated, religion that can be shared, marriages that can connect, markets that can interconnect, migrations that can be traced, schools that can link, institutions that can be shared, histories that can be mutually recognized, and risks that can be borne together. These twelve forms of overlap need not all appear at once. As long as transmission can continue, a larger community network will form. A nation's unity comes not from complete internal sameness but from the possibility of continuous transitions, mutual translation, and shared recognition among local differences.

III. Language, Local Life, and Mutual Recognition across Regions

Language is more than a tool of communication: it is a channel through which interaction networks extend. Forms of address are especially important. How someone addresses elders, outsiders, relatives by marriage, people from the same locality, and enemies already contains community boundaries. A community's language often preserves its distinctions concerning kinship, seniority, inside and outside, the sacred, shame, courage, betrayal, land, and death. Through language, people trade, ask for help, quarrel, tell stories, establish rules, discuss marriage, hold funerals, educate children, give accounts of their ancestors, and remember place names.

Place names matter too. They are not words on a map: they preserve migration, land reclamation, war, sacrificial rites, markets, disasters, ancestors, and old boundaries. Writing and schools bring language into larger networks. Language within a family can preserve everyday intimacy; language in school can connect children from different places to a larger shared memory; and publishing, media, examinations, administration, and literature enable people from different places to understand one another through the same forms of expression.

Language is not the essence of a nation. Different nations may share a language, and multiple dialects may exist within one nation. Yet repeated interaction through language by specific speakers, families, schools, media, and rituals can indeed connect local networks into continuity. People far apart need not know one another personally to enter an interaction network in which understanding, recognition, and transmission are possible.

Community is not a background: shared life itself is material for community formation. People in one locality use markets together, enter schools together, face land institutions together, experience problems of public security together, and jointly bear famine, taxes and fees, road building, conscription, migration, epidemics, and external exclusion. These experiences do not automatically form a nation, but they do form shared consequences. Shared consequences matter more than shared labels. If a group shares only a name without

bearing consequences together, the name can hardly form responsibility. If people repeatedly bear consequences together, a community is already forming even if the name is not yet stable.

Local life leaves consequences that can be remembered and examined, not natural sameness. In everyday life and crises, local life lets people know who can be trusted, who will flee in a crisis, who will keep commitments, who will betray them, who will help, and who will step forward when shared boundaries are violated. Families discuss commitments kept and betrayals in crises; neighbors form local reputations. These judgments do not stop with individuals. They enter family reputations, local reputations, marriage choices, shared memory, and the education of later generations; schools and the education of later generations also preserve them. National-community formation does not begin with grand slogans. It often begins with this local life and these shared consequences. The more often shared life recurs, the heavier the shared consequences, and the more readily shared memory reaches those who come later, the thicker the materials for national-community formation become. Whether they can be understood across localities still depends on whether the existing networks connect.

Local networks do not automatically become national networks. The key is mutual recognition across regions. People in one locality need not meet people in another every day. A language or writing system can circulate across localities. People may use similar languages and understand similar rites and customs, and their kinship rules may be mutually intelligible. Commercial exchanges and migration routes can connect different localities; marriage can also connect regions, so that kinship ties are no longer confined to a single village or town.

People in different places may enter similar school systems, follow similar institutions, and face similar external boundaries. Nodes such as schools, scholars, religion, armies, guilds, markets, and state institutions can transmit shared memory among different localities. People may recognize similar accounts of ancestral origins and commemorate similar histories, while shared historical narratives can lead several localities to understand themselves as parts of the same historical community. At the same time, external boundaries or shared threats can make different localities aware that they bear shared consequences.

Paths then form among local networks. Only when these paths stabilize can a national community possibly emerge. A nation is not an enlarged village. It is a community spanning regions, formed by multiple networks of small communities through partial overlap, relaying through nodes, and the transmission of information across generations.

Nor does mutual recognition across regions remain stable forever once formed. Language use, exchanges through marriage and markets, and transmission through schools and religion may all weaken, change, or break off. Only while recognition, memory, and responsibility can still travel back and forth among different places do the paths continue to sustain the community.

IV. The Continuation of Marriage, Rites and Customs, and Religion

Marriage has never been a purely private relation. It brings community boundaries directly into bodies, families, and descendants. At the point of entry into marriage, who may intermarry and who is excluded from the range of possible marriage partners is first a matter of boundaries. When two families recognize one another face to face, whose ritual rules govern the wedding also bears on whether they can recognize one another.

After marriage, the terms relatives use for one another in everyday life, how property enters and is accepted into the new family, who cares for older people within shared life, which side the children belong to, and which language they learn as they grow up all touch and define community boundaries.

Marriage can connect networks. Two neighboring but not identical small communities may develop continuity in kinship, rites and customs, and the education of descendants through long-term intermarriage. Marriage can also sever networks. If intermarriage is not recognized, children are not accepted, rites cannot be translated between the groups, and kinship relations cannot enter community memory, the boundary between the two networks hardens. Marriage boundaries are not naturally legitimate. They can protect a community's continuity and may also produce exclusion, humiliation, and violence. For better or worse, they do bring community from an abstract designation into life. An account of national-community formation that leaves out marriage and kinship boundaries gives community too little weight.

Rites and customs are not cultural decorations suspended in the air, nor is religion merely abstract inner belief. They bring community differences into concrete everyday rhythms, bodily habits, family education, and memory across generations. The conduct of weddings and funerals, when festivals begin, how taboos are observed, and how foods are distinguished connect the pivotal moments of life and death with everyday eating and living. How children address elders, postures of prayer and worship, rhythms of vigils and fasting, procedures of sacrificial rites, clothing for particular occasions, and the songs and stories heard while growing up repeatedly reproduce differences in everyday life. It is through these concrete practices that life is organized.

As rites, customs, and religion are reproduced, specific practices are also adjusted by family members, ritual participants, educators, and migrants. They may be preserved, simplified, reinterpreted, or contested. Recognizable continuity depends on these materials remaining available for narration, practice, and recognition. But reproduction does not mean keeping everything unchanged. A rite or custom changes through migration, is simplified in the city, is reinterpreted in schooling, is formatted within state institutions, and is emphasized anew under external pressure. A transgenerational information-continuity complex is therefore not a static specimen. It is not without change; it maintains recognizable continuity through change. Rites and customs, together with religion, matter because they keep community present in successive generations of people as something that can be seen, enacted, remembered, and contested.

V. The Transgenerational Information-Continuity Complex

A nation can outlast individual lives. A child who did not experience the ancestors' migration may nevertheless know where they came from. Without experiencing a war, the child may take up its memory through commemorative dates, textbooks, family stories, and local legends. Without participating in the formation of old boundaries, the child may know which place names belong to community memory, which boundaries once caused harm, and which people are regarded as part of “us.” This is no mystery of bloodline. It results from families, schools, rituals, commemorative sites, and institutional records repeatedly preserving, checking, and transmitting community materials.

Jan Assmann's study, translated by John Czaplicka, and the research of Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins concern the cultural transmission of shared memory and the historical sociology of memory practices. This research supports the claim that memory must be maintained through media and practices; it does not complete this book's ontology of the nation on its behalf.

As an information-continuity complex, a nation involves at least six elements: preservation, reproduction, checking, variation, write-back, and retransmission. When children take up memories they have never

personally experienced, the first question concerns the carriers through which materials continue. Language is reproduced in families, schools, media, and rites; rites and customs are repeatedly reproduced in the everyday practices of weddings and funerals, festivals, food, forms of address, and taboos. Place names are reproduced through migration, maps, household registration, burial grounds, and stories. Historical memory is likewise continually reproduced through preservation and reuse in family stories, commemorative dates, school narratives, museums, inscriptions, and local legends.

Yet materials being carried and reproduced through these channels is one thing; which contents still count as "our own" is another question requiring checking. The transmission of just anything does not count as continuity of the information carried by a nation. Family elders, educators in schools, participants in religious rituals and in wedding, funeral, and festival practices, and the recorders and narrators of place names, commemorative dates, ancestral halls, burial grounds, inscriptions, museums, and local stories all participate in this gatekeeping from their respective positions. They check which languages, rites and customs, memories, boundaries, and designations still count as "our own." State archives and legal recognition also participate in checking.

This checking is not performed by a single authority. Different positions—families, schools, rituals, commemorative sites, and institutional records—may preserve different versions. Members judge which differences remain recognizable through everyday narration, concrete practice, and even disputes. Complete agreement among all versions need not be demanded. As long as they can still be translated into one another, mutually recognized, and reconnected to shared responsibility, the existence of variants does not mean that the community has been interrupted.

This information does not remain completely unchanged. It changes form, is simplified, forgotten, reordered, and mixed; in crises it is also extracted, interpreted, and corrected anew. A nation is not an unchanging bloodline, and an information-continuity complex does not keep everything in its original state. Through preservation, reproduction, checking, variation, write-back, and retransmission, and through repeated preservation, checking, and transmission by successive generations of nodes, it maintains recognizable continuity amid change.

VI. Joining, Leaving, and Migration Memory

A nation is not a bloodline essence, so community boundaries are not absolute boundaries of descent. An outsider may gradually enter a community: they live there over time, learn the language, participate in rites and customs, enter kinship networks through marriage, and share life, defense, and institutional consequences with others. They accept shared memory and are recognized by community members. Given sufficient time and sufficiently stable paths of responsibility, they may cease to be merely an outsider and become part of "us."

This is not a simple theory of assimilation. It does not mean that changing a name or making a statement of identification allows immediate entry into a community. Entry requires connection to a network: language, life, rites and customs, responsibility, shared consequences, and recognition must all connect. Conversely, someone originally close by descent may gradually leave the community. If language, memory, responsibility, shared life, and shared recognition break off, the network between that person and the community thins. They may retain a designation of origin while no longer bearing shared consequences or entering paths of shared memory and responsibility.

Nor is this a theory of identification at will. Leaving a community is not accomplished in a sentence; it comes from network rupture. Entry into or departure from a community is not a single change of name. Residence,

language, marriage, shared life, and institutional consequences must repeatedly connect over time, while existing members grant or withdraw recognition in interaction. Only thus do the thickening and thinning of networks acquire concrete conditions. The boundaries of national communities are not walls of bloodline but paths of connection, recognition, and responsibility within interaction networks. Becoming one of "us" depends not only on origin but also on whether one can enter shared language, shared memory, shared life, shared institutions, and shared consequences.

Migration is not the past event as such. It becomes community memory only when it is narrated, named, commemorated, and handed down. Asking where ancestors came from and why they left preserves their place of departure and reasons for leaving. Asking who accepted or excluded them along the way and which route passed through famine preserves their encounters on the journey. Asking where they finally settled, which village name came from the old place, and which grave retains the direction of migration preserves the traces left after settlement. Asking about these details explains what, concretely, is being handed down; it does not appeal to commands of descent. It is precisely these memories that enter the process of national-community formation.

Place names are especially able to preserve historical paths. They may preserve ancestral origins, migration, or war, and also land reclamation, expulsion, and resettlement. Someone may not have experienced that history, yet may have heard the place name from childhood and know that it is connected to their community. Migration memory is not necessarily always true and complete. It may be simplified, embellished, forgotten, or rearranged, yet can still become material through which a community understands itself. National-community formation often begins not with present identification but with preserved and repeatedly narrated migration memory.

VII. The Formation, Hardening, Splitting, and Reconstruction of Boundaries

The boundaries of national communities are not lines drawn in advance. Nor can they be established solely by descent, a name, subjective identification, state registration, a single cultural marker, or one interaction. A national community can maintain continuity through many paths: transmission across generations, mutual recognition, the preservation and renewed extraction of shared memory, relations of protection and responsibility, and language, rites and customs, family, marriage, migration, education, local life, shared harm, and shared consequences. The continuing reproduction of membership relations, boundaries, and carriers over time also supports this continuity. These items are not a fixed checklist, need not all appear together, and still less constitute a numerical threshold.

Analysts must explain, on the basis of current materials, which paths remain, which can serve as relays for one another, which have thinned, changed direction, or ceased to function, and whether together they support the same community, bridging relations, a split, reconstruction, or a new community. A being connected to B and B to C does not automatically prove that A and C belong to the same national community. If local networks share only trade, occasional contact, a single cultural similarity, or one-way mediation, the materials establish at most contact, bridging, or partial overlap. For bridging to become evidence of membership in the same community, it must actually carry the sustained transmission of mutual recognition, memory, protection, responsibility, membership relations, or shared consequences.

Changes in membership do not automatically cancel community continuity. If key relations, memories, recognition, responsibilities, and relays are still preserved, extracted, and renewed by real carriers, a community can outlast individual lives and changes in membership. Without having experienced past events, a new generation can take up community materials through family narratives, education, rites and customs,

commemoration, local life, and practices of responsibility. Yet inheriting a name, language, memory, or institutions is only one kind of evidence of continuity. It cannot establish on its own that the new network is still the original community.

A split can form when original paths of mutual recognition, memory, protection, and responsibility thin, change direction, or cease to function over a long period, and members' principal centers of recognition and responsibility shift stably into different networks. Splitting does not require every contact to disappear. Language, marriage, trade, and historical memory may remain, yet these residual ties may not suffice to maintain the same community. After old relations have broken off or changed significantly, the renewed formation of a community network by new members, organizers, keepers of memory, and paths of protection and responsibility constitutes reconstruction. Reconstruction may take up old materials, but the new relations that actually carry them must still be explained.

The boundaries of national communities therefore require distinctions among formation, gaining weight, hardening, splitting, and reconstruction. Formation means that recognizable relations of inside and outside begin to appear stably. Gaining weight means that some channels keep thinning or forces of exclusion increase. Hardening means that mutual recognition, responsibility, membership relations, and shared consequences across a boundary face intense restrictions. Splitting involves principal centers of recognition and responsibility shifting stably into different networks. Reconstruction means re-establishing sustainable relational paths after interruption or significant transformation. These five processes may lead into one another; they cannot be replaced by a single formulation of a threshold.

Strong legal divisions, institutional coercion, sustained violence, blocked migration, educational segregation, identity registration, and exclusion from responsibility can cause boundaries to gain weight or harden rapidly while other ties have not entirely disappeared. The complete interruption of all interaction, mutual recognition, and shared responsibility is not the only condition for boundary hardening. Conversely, a difference in names or a single dispute is insufficient to establish that a network has split. Where evidence is insufficient, the judgment may be limited to bridging, inheritance, contact, partial overlap, or an inability to determine the matter. Analysts must not force a verdict of one community merely to obtain a neat image of a nation.

VIII. Shared Harm, Shared Responsibility, and the Limits of Substitution by Class

Shared harm matters, but it is not the sole source of a nation. A nation cannot be written as a community of memories of victimhood. Mutual intelligibility of language, local life, marriage boundaries, cycles of rites and customs, religious practice, migration routes, and shared institutions are more everyday and more basic materials for national-community formation. War, expulsion, occupation, exclusion, massacre, resistance, sacrifice, and commemoration make boundaries harder. Once certain harms are preserved by families, schools, monuments, museums, state narratives, and community rituals, they are no longer merely past events: they become materials through which later generations judge closeness and distance, boundaries, and legitimacy.

Shared harm has force because it makes shared consequences clear. Who suffered together, who resisted together, who remained silent, who provided protection, and who recorded the harm all enter community memory. Yet care is still needed here. Shared harm can preserve boundaries and can also produce revenge and essentialization. Through commemoration, family narratives, school narratives, institutional records, and judgments of responsibility, these historical experiences can strengthen members' reasons to protect one another. But these practices of preservation and interpretation may also compress complex experience into a

single story. Shared resistance can protect a community, but later narratives may likewise simplify it into a single story. Harm cannot be treated as the root of a nation apart from the ways it is preserved and interpreted.

A national community does not exist for the sake of a romantic sense of belonging. Its force comes from community members' long-term sharing of language, institutions, memory, boundaries, risks, and consequences. Community responsibility is not a moral demand conjured from nothing. It comes from shared life, shared defense, shared institutions, shared memory, shared risks, shared victimization, shared protection, shared recognition, and shared transmission. More precisely, it comes from paths of recognition and consequences within partially overlapping networks. Who has borne consequences with whom? Who shares institutional paths? Who shares memory and language? Who protects whom, who is recognized by whom, and who bears risks in a crisis? These questions matter more than abstract slogans. Similarity does not mean connection; only connection can make responsibility possible. Community responsibility comes from real interaction networks, not abstract classification.

Interpreters adopting class theory can point out that two distant workers face similar circumstances, are both constrained by employment relations, and both confront wages, unemployment, debt, housing, and risk. These similar circumstances may bring sympathy and may also bring cooperation, but this explanation cannot automatically produce community responsibility. Abstract class classification can produce a sense of belonging to the same category, but it cannot produce a community's chain of responsibility. Class classification can say that two groups are similar; it cannot establish that they are connected. Even if a distant, unfamiliar worker resembles me in income and labor circumstances, if that person is outside my interaction network and does not share language, institutions, memory, risks, boundaries, and consequences with me, they cannot demand that I destroy my own community network merely because we are “of the same class.”

This does not mean that distant strangers are unworthy of sympathy, nor does it rule out aid or cooperation across regions in advance. Similar economic positions cannot automatically produce community obligations, nor can a class name write strangers directly into the same network of responsibility. Class classification can form a sense of belonging to the same category; it cannot thereby prove membership in the same network or shared responsibility. Whether moral, legal, contractual, or emergency-assistance obligations to strangers hold is a normative question at another level, requiring its own grounds of value, scope of application, conflict rules, and exceptions. As a foundational social theory, this book does not predetermine the priority of all obligations here. What it can establish here is that community responsibility must be demonstrated through relations of real interaction, recognition, protection, memory, and shared consequences; it cannot be deduced from abstract class classification alone.

IX. State Intervention, Protection, and Exclusion

The state is not the source of the nation, nor is it merely an external position of recognition. A community is initially sustained by members, families, and those who transmit things across generations through language, rites and customs, marriage, place names, and shared memory. Once specific personnel in state institutions and procedures involving schools, language policy, household registration, borders, archives, commemorative dates, law, the military, and administrative divisions intervene, they register, classify, and name existing differences involved in national-community formation, set standards and boundaries, arrange education, or form official narratives, reformatting those existing differences.

Write-back forms when these results of processing are preserved as differences available for renewed extraction in the future. Only when specific people or procedures later retrieve, interpret, or assign weight to the relevant records anew does the content of write-back re-enter real consequences. This state intervention

brings two kinds of consequences. On the one hand, the state can protect downweighted languages, rites and customs, and community memory. On the other, it may compress complex differences, freeze fluid boundaries into fixed identities, rewrite multiple forms of belonging as a single administrative field, and merge local differences into administrative classifications. The state cannot create all nations from nothing. But it can amplify, downweight, rewrite, freeze, and rename differences involved in national-community formation, altering how national differences are preserved, extracted, and put into effect.

Protection and exclusion are not automatically set in motion by the name “nation.” In social practice, how specific members, organizations, schools, religious practitioners, recorders, and institutional personnel interpret boundary materials affects who receives protection, how exclusion occurs, and whether internal differences can be preserved.

Specific institutional personnel, educators, registrars, and narrators reclassifying and interpreting existing materials of national-community formation constitute an important chain of state intervention, further affecting how boundaries and the scope of protection are drawn. The effects of such reclassification and interpretation always presuppose existing materials of national-community formation.

In concrete practice, community members, families, those who transmit things across generations, recorders, educators, and organizers can protect language and memory, keep downweighted communities from being swallowed up, make people remember migration, harm, resistance, and shared life, and enable community members to protect one another in danger. But community members, organizers, or institutional personnel may also exclude. They may write boundaries as natural, others as dangerous, intermarriage as betrayal, language differences as superiority and inferiority, shared harm as a reason for unlimited retaliation, and reduce internal differences to a single voice.

Acknowledging a nation as a real network therefore does not mean acknowledging it as a moral absolute or as always legitimate. A national community's responsibilities have boundaries and cannot become a pretext for unlimited expansion. A nation can be a real network and still require constraint. It is not a bloodline entity, state registration, a propaganda slogan, or a disguise for class contradictions. It is a historical community network gradually formed as networks of small communities that have similar features, partially overlap, and can sustain interaction connect through mutually intelligible language, mutually translatable rites and customs, marriage ties, migration memory, preserved place names, shared institutions, shared risks, shared recognition, and the joint bearing of consequences. A nation is not a homogeneous whole but partially overlapping networks. The boundaries of national communities are not presupposed lines; they are breaks that appear where this network continuity reaches its limit. Such a break does not mean that a boundary exists only after every other connection has vanished completely. Strong legal divisions and institutional coercion can rapidly give boundaries greater weight or make them harder while other connections have not all disappeared.

Yet national-community formation is not the endpoint of Volume V. The differences formed by historical communities are further organized into an order that can be put into effect through law, administration, archives, borders, education, welfare, the military, and mechanisms of punishment. National-community formation forms historical community boundaries; state incorporation of differences brings them into chains of law, administration, archives, and implementation.

Chapter 20. State Incorporation of Differences: How Differences Are Formatted, Mutually Recognized, and Connected to Chains of Implementation

I. How State Incorporation Takes Up Existing Differences

Chapter 19 examined national-community formation: how language, memory, locality, marriage, rites and customs, migration, boundaries, shared consequences, and shared recognition form historical communities within networks of long-term interaction. Yet national-community formation is not the endpoint of Volume V. A community has language, memory, boundaries, shared life, and paths of shared responsibility. Once these enter the state, however, they are processed anew: languages become official languages, languages of schooling, and languages of examinations; place names become administrative divisions; community boundaries become registration fields, regional institutions, and legal recognition; migration becomes household-registration transfers, residence registration, and border records; shared harm becomes commemorative days, teaching materials, museums, and archives. National-community formation produces the boundaries of historical communities; state incorporation of differences connects differences to chains of law, administration, archives, and implementation.

This chapter does not ask, “What kind of subject is the state?” It asks how differences undergo state incorporation. State incorporation of differences is neither the state as an entity pressing down from above nor the simple sum of institutionalization, class-image formation, and national-community formation. It connects differentiating units dispersed across families, localities, markets, communities, and workplaces to a network of nodes of greater intensity, wider reach, and stronger capacity for implementation. A person's birthplace, household registration, nationality, ethnicity, age, sex, marriage, educational qualifications, occupation, tax records, eligibility for military service, records of legal violations, property, border position, welfare eligibility, and educational eligibility do not naturally become state order. They must first enter documents, numbers, fields, archives, forms of eligibility, permits, penalties, welfare, taxation, military service, border records, and legal consequences. After entering state nodes, differences in lived life are extracted anew, preserved, mutually recognized, and given form through documents, archives, service counters, laws, systems, and implementing agencies. State incorporation does not create these differences out of nothing; it enables existing materials to enter preservation, verification, and the processing of consequences across nodes.

When a child enters the education system, the fact of birth must be reported under household-registration rules. When school admission is sought, some of the materials concerning household registration, residence, rental arrangements, parents' social insurance, school districts, or applications may be examined under local policy and the relevant admission category. After enrollment is completed, the school establishes and updates the student's registration under student-registration rules. This is not one fixed chain of materials identical everywhere. A child does not naturally become a student in the state education system simply by reaching a certain age. Age is only one difference; education nodes must extract, certify, and put it into effect together with the birth certificate, household registration, residence materials, parental materials, school places, and application counters. Enrollment is not a single educational event but a process in which family differences, local differences, and state archives are connected to chains of implementation. The fact of the child's birth,

the home address, the parents' employment materials, and school places are held at different positions; the consequences connected through them are student registration and an educational position.

A migrant worker's identity card may be valid while his household registration is elsewhere. He does live in the city, yet his residence registration is unstable. He does work on a construction site, yet his labor contract, wage records, social insurance contributions, and employer information may be disconnected. Once wages are in arrears, what labor inspection and arbitration examine is not the hardship of everyday life but whether the employment relationship can be proved, the employer identified, and the unpaid wages brought into a procedure. The difficulty facing migrants is often not a complete lack of identity but an identity dispersed across several chains of implementation that cannot readily recognize one another's materials. Residence, work, and remuneration are scattered among documents, registrations, contracts, and records. The materials connected through them may lead to determinations concerning work-related injury, remuneration, or eligibility.

Family languages, local rites and customs, migration memory, and community boundaries form historical communities through national-community formation. Once they enter state incorporation of differences, some of these differences become ethnic registration, school language policies, textbook narratives, cultural protection projects, administrative classifications, resource allocation, and eligibility for representation. National-community formation produces the boundaries of historical communities; state incorporation turns some of their differences into registrations, teaching materials, policies, administrative divisions, and forms of eligibility that can be put into effect. State registration is not the national community itself, but it changes the community's external position and also changes who within it is seen, represented, or suppressed. Differences of national communities are connected to family languages, local rites and customs, and community memory; the resulting registrations and materials affect positions in classification, representation, and resources.

The three chains extract different materials and produce different consequences. They cannot be reduced to a single, one-time processing of the same kind of material. In these chains, specific personnel at the relevant positions must verify differences and materials dispersed across different places, then send the parts that can be established on to the next stage of processing. Family relations, workplaces, and national communities are not created by state registration. Yet it is upon entering state nodes that differences already formed within families, workplaces, and communities acquire another form in which they can be preserved, compared, or put into effect.

For this reason, the state cannot be written as one enormous person, as though it stood outside society, could see everyone at once, and could handle all differences with a single command. The state is a high-intensity network of differentiation nodes, not a unified personality or a unified consciousness. Agencies, documents, archives, laws, forms, schools, police, courts, the military, borders, taxation, social insurance, neighborhoods, and administrative divisions are all nodes in state incorporation of differences. Nodes are not subjects acting on their own but actual positions at which personnel, materials, authority, and procedures connect. Specific personnel or procedures within them extract the relevant differences and connect them to consequences. Applying for an identity card requires connections among a birth certificate, household registration, a photograph, an address, family relations, and the public security system. A child's school enrollment encounters household registration, a residence permit, parents' social insurance, property ownership or rental filing, school-district divisions, the application system, and the establishment of student registration. After a worker is injured, the employment relationship, medical records, appraisal, social insurance contributions, the employer's attitude, work-related injury procedures, and eligibility for compensation connect with one another. A person crossing a border faces passports, visas, entry and exit records, travel purposes, risk

judgments, and border inspection. These nodes belong to different places and institutions; the structural generalization “the state” cannot replace the personnel, documents, and procedures within them.

Nodes differ in the materials they can extract, the rules they apply, the authority they possess, and the consequences to which they connect. Registration materials preserved by agencies, admission materials checked by schools, evidence handled by courts, identities and records used by police, eligibility assessed by the military, residence circumstances known to neighborhood organizations, and documents and travel materials checked at borders all have different points of entry. The fact that one position holds information does not mean that another can already extract it. What processing the same name or address can support at different positions often changes with the scope of the materials. Schools can establish student registration and process admissions; courts can make judgments within their procedures; police and border inspection handle identity, records, and passage within their respective scopes. Residence relations visible to neighborhood organizations may not directly serve as a basis elsewhere. Nodes sometimes connect and sometimes leave breaks. Even if materials have been preserved or recognized at one position, the receiving position must still judge whether they can be used under its own authority, rules, and procedures. If materials are insufficient, formats do not fit, or the scope of extraction differs, processing may stop where it is. The power of state incorporation of differences comes from relations that can actually connect nodes; it does not require the assumption that every position obeys the same will.

State incorporation of differences is the process by which state nodes format dispersed differences into an order of implementation within which they can be identified, registered, mutually recognized, allocated and coordinated, rewarded or punished, and excluded. The most important part of this definition is not the grand word “state” but how differences change form. Families, localities, nations, languages, property, labor, debt, illness, migration, marriage, education, risk, and conflict exist before state intervention. The state is not the source of all differences, but it changes how these differences are preserved, extracted, mutually recognized, and put into effect. In everyday life, “living here” may be known only to neighbors, the landlord, and people in the market; through state incorporation, it must become household registration, a residence permit, a rental filing, and address registration. In everyday life, “having a child” may be simply a family fact; through state incorporation, it must become a birth certificate, household registration, guardianship relations, student registration, and vaccination records. In everyday life, “having been punished” may be a single event; through state incorporation, it becomes a judgment, a penalty record, credit restrictions, and future eligibility determinations. State incorporation of differences is not simple recording. It rewrites differences in lived life into forms that state nodes can preserve, compare, mutually recognize, and put into effect.

This rewriting proceeds through nine stages: identification, formatting, registration, classification, certification, mutual recognition, allocation and coordination, implementation, and write-back. Each has its own position of processing. Completion of one stage does not guarantee that the next will be established. Materials must still pass through the rules, authority, and procedures of the relevant nodes before they can possibly enter an order of implementation of wider scope. Identification gives a person or matter an entry point through which it can be extracted; formatting places materials from lived life in fields, documents, or other processable forms; registration leaves records of those forms that can be checked again. A name, address, or photograph may make an object identifiable without guaranteeing that residence, family, or employment circumstances have been fully entered in a suitable format, still less that the corresponding records have been registered and established.

Once materials enter processing, classification places them on different paths, certification judges whether they count at a given position, and only mutual recognition gives a record the opportunity to cross to other nodes. The categories used in classification may not be adopted at the receiving position, and registered

materials may not yet have passed certification. Even if certification is established at one position, another may refuse to use the materials because their scope, format, or the relevant authority differs. Whether the chain can continue depends on whether classification, certification, and mutual recognition can connect at the receiving position.

Allocation and coordination then connect usable materials to the distribution of resources, responsibility, or risk. Implementation turns some of these allocations into actual consequences, and write-back brings the results into subsequent records and future judgments. Each connection depends on whether materials can be extracted at that time, who has authority to process them, how rules apply, and whether the procedure can be completed. Only when these stages connect in concrete matters do differences enter an order of implementation of wider scope.

II. Identification and Formatting: How Life Enters Positions of Processing

The first step in state incorporation of differences is to turn people and matters in flux into objects that can be reliably extracted. A person can be recognized in everyday life by family, neighbors, colleagues, and people from the same home area, but recognition by acquaintances does not mean that state nodes can process that person. State nodes need stable entry points for identification: a name is one, a date of birth another; sex, photographs, fingerprints, identity-card numbers, household-registration addresses, nationality, ethnicity, family relations, schools, employers, property, vehicles, and accounts can all become entry points. They allow a person to be extracted at different places. In everyday movement, names may recur, people migrate, families disperse, and workers change employers; state incorporation therefore has to rely on these more stable means of identification.

Stable identification is not intended to compress a person into a single label but to enable different nodes to match the same material to a position that can be checked. Which entry points are adopted and which relations in lived life are suppressed directly affect subsequent processing. These entry points offer different clues for verification and often need to work together: names and dates of birth connect people to verifiable birth materials; photographs and fingerprints distinguish people with the same name or similar appearance; addresses place people at a residence position; identity numbers and existing documents allow previously formed records to be extracted. When one entry point is insufficient, the processor must still return to available materials to confirm the correspondence. Migration separates an address from everyday residence; family dispersal leaves relational materials at different positions; a change of employer may fragment work experience across different records. People with the same name are not necessarily the same object, nor do those bearing the same name necessarily carry the same relations in lived life.

Identification is not a neutral act. Once some differences become entry points for identification, others are suppressed: an identity-card number is easier to extract than a person's reputation in the village, a household-registration address easier than actual residence relations, and a registered name easier than an everyday form of address. This step has already changed how a person is seen. Yet an identifiable object is not the whole person. Names, photographs, addresses, identity numbers, and existing documents provide only a starting point for verification. They make processing materials possible but do not exhaust a person's relations, experience, and positions. Differences in lived life that have not entered these entry points are not necessarily absent; the current node may simply lack the materials and means to process them. Memories, care, circumstances, and community relations not extracted through these entry points continue to exert real effects in everyday life.

After identification, differences still cannot directly enter implementation: they must be formatted. Formatting is the state's rewriting of differences in lived life into forms it can preserve, compare, and put into effect. The state does not receive life as it is. It does not preserve all of a person's experience, relations, and circumstances; instead, it requires differences to enter processable formats. Living here must become household registration, a residence permit, a rental filing, and address registration; being ill must become medical records, diagnoses, medical-insurance coverage lists, and disability appraisals; having a child must become a birth certificate, household registration, student registration, and guardianship relations; having property must become a property certificate, vehicle registration, and tax records; belonging to a community must become nationality, ethnic registration, and identity documents; having been punished must become a judgment, a penalty record, and credit restrictions.

Many mismatches arise between facts of life and formats. A person really lives in the city but lacks corresponding residence materials. A child really lives with the parents, but the guardianship materials are incomplete. A worker really was injured on a construction site, but the employment relationship has not been formatted into a contract and social insurance records. A community really has its own language, memory, and boundaries, but state registration leaves only one field. The key to state incorporation of differences is not simply “whether the facts exist” but also whether they can enter state formats.

Only after facts of life enter forms, fields, archives, documents, forms of eligibility, or records do they become relatively easy to preserve, compare, and transfer. This conversion is not reception by an empty container: it selects the parts that can be entered, arranges how materials are compared with one another, and makes some differences easier to preserve, compare, and put into effect. Fields determine which parts can remain in a fixed form; documents and archives allow some materials to be extracted at subsequent positions; eligibility materials connect certain contents to consequences that can be processed. Residence, illness, kinship, labor, and property originally carry different relations and experiences. Once broken into items that can be filled in and checked, formerly dispersed differences acquire the conditions for comparison and transfer across nodes. This conversion increases the intensity of processing, but at the same time suppresses relational backgrounds, community memory, concrete circumstances, and complete experiences. Without corresponding positions, relational backgrounds, community memory, and concrete circumstances are harder to bring in fully along with the materials.

Formatting remains bounded by facts of life and the scope of the materials. Formats change which differences can be preserved, compared, and put into effect, but cannot by themselves replace facts of life. Preservable forms make the parts not entered in them harder to see at particular nodes; forms and records themselves do not produce implementation results on their own. A form can show an address without necessarily showing actual care relations. Medical records preserve certain conditions but cannot replace a person's entire situation. Employment or property materials left in archives likewise cover only the parts that can be entered and checked. Formats make processing more stable while leaving compression and omissions. Whether consequences form still depends on processing at the relevant positions in accordance with materials, authority, and procedures.

III. What Registration Leaves Behind

After formatting, differences must still be registered under their respective rules. The fact of birth enters household registration through reporting; marriage relations enter marriage information after verification by marriage registration authorities; property rights and legally prescribed matters are entered in the real-property register; schools establish and update student registration after enrollment; administrative penalties produce corresponding records under penalty decisions and statutory disclosure rules. Registration can form materials that may be extracted again in the future. Whether they become effective again still depends on subsequent events, authority, procedures, and interpretation; records themselves are not acting subjects.

Registration is not simple recording: it determines whether a difference can later be extracted, recognized, and put into effect. A fact may still exist without registration yet be unable to pass through state nodes. Registration does not necessarily make a fact more real, but it makes the fact easier for the state to extract. Yet the materials registration leaves are not a person's complete identity, and their contents may not fully match actual life. Registration gives differences a form in which they can be extracted repeatedly, but cannot settle all future judgments. Whether a record can be recognized or connected to substantive consequences must still be handled by concrete nodes under existing rules and procedures. Even where registration exists, subsequent nodes may handle matters differently because the scope of materials or review requirements differ.

Registration of births, marriages, property, student status, and penalties turns matters originally established only within the relations of the time into materials that can later be located and checked repeatedly. Birth materials can connect to household registration and later documents; marriage materials can enter judgments about relations; property and student-registration records also give residence, property, or educational positions a verifiable form. Once formed and entered in a register, materials preserve not life itself but some of its contents that can be located and checked later. A birth, a marriage, an item of real property, a student registration, or a penalty each has its own time of recording and scope of matters recorded. Registration enables later processors to find these materials but does not bring all the relations of life at that time before them.

As time passes, a distance may open between records and present life. Marriage relations can change, and the actual use of property and an individual's educational position may differ from those at the time of recording. The matter to which a penalty record refers likewise cannot replace substantive identification of current circumstances. Extracting an existing registration means returning to verifiable material, not treating the past directly as the present.

Registration can send materials to subsequent nodes, but a record does not itself confer eligibility on a person or impose responsibilities or restrictions on them. Birth registration does not directly complete school enrollment, nor does student registration settle every educational judgment. Only when relevant records are used in concrete matters can they connect to corresponding consequences. The same registration plays different roles when extracted at different times. Birth materials offer a starting point for verification in later document applications or the establishment of student registration; marriage, property, student-registration, and penalty records each preserve specific matters and their time of formation. Later processors can judge whether a record connects to the current question only from what it actually preserves. If relations in lived life have changed, registration can still establish that certain material once held true, but cannot extend the past state directly into the present. It makes differences across time traceable while retaining the distance between the scope of the record and changes in reality.

IV. Classification and Certification: Processing Paths and the Efficacy of Materials

After registration, differences are placed in categories: citizens, residents, students, workers, taxpayers, military personnel, people serving sentences, recipients of the minimum subsistence guarantee, migrants, foreigners, minors, retirees, and people at borders. These are not neutral names. Classification does not name a person; it determines the chain of implementation along which that person will be processed. Categories tell processors which materials to start from, but each path handles different matters. Someone classified as a student enters processing involving student registration, examinations, further education, financial aid, and school rules. Someone classified as a taxpayer enters processing involving income, property, declarations, inspections, and collection. Someone classified as a recipient of the minimum subsistence guarantee enters household-income and property checks, assistance eligibility, and periodic review. Someone classified as a person at a border enters processing involving passports, visas, entry and exit records, examination, and passage restrictions. Classification compresses complex life into paths that can be put into effect. This is its power and its danger.

The same person can simultaneously occupy the existing categories of resident, worker, student, or others without appearing under all those categories in every matter. Educational positions primarily use materials relevant to student registration and admission; employment matters extract the parts concerning work relations; resident or taxpayer materials operate only in the corresponding processing. Students may connect to student registration, examinations, and aid; workers to employment materials and responsibility; taxpayers, military personnel, or recipients of the minimum subsistence guarantee to different positions of eligibility, obligation, or protection. Overlapping categories show only that different directions of processing converge on the same person. Adding several names does not produce a complete identity, still less can those names be inverted into an account of what the person fundamentally is in society.

A category can bring a set of differences onto a designated path, but cannot also explain the family responsibilities, community relations, and life experiences that path does not extract. Some care, experiences, and community relations are difficult to accommodate in existing categories or relevant only to a particular matter. They have not thereby disappeared from reality; they simply enter less often into the processing path opened by that category. Classification brings some differences onto processing paths that can be put into effect, but this does not mean that the consequences of implementation have already formed. It cannot determine a person's entire situation. Categories point toward what can be processed; they are not a person's essence, nor can they be inverted into what social relations fundamentally are.

Where classification marks out paths, certification involves the state not merely recording differences but also judging whether they are valid. Certification determines whether a difference can enter state consequences. It concerns concrete matters such as whether an identity card is valid, educational qualifications are recognized, a marriage is registered, property rights are confirmed, disability has been appraised, a record of legal violation is established, or a person's border status allows passage. There is a clear boundary between everyday statements and formal state certification. Saying one lives here is not equivalent to state nodes recognizing that residence. Saying one has received education is not equivalent to recognition of educational qualifications. Saying one is injured does not establish a disability grade. Nor does saying one has family responsibilities establish eligibility for assistance.

Certification hardens differences. Once certification is established, differences can connect to welfare, compensation, responsibility, punishment, eligibility, and restrictions. If certification fails, a difference may be unable to enter state consequences even though it really exists in life. Identity cards, educational qualifications, marriage, property, disability, records of legal violations, and border status may already have

corresponding materials, but the existence of materials does not mean that they already count. Preservation makes verification of some content possible. Submitting materials to a specific service counter or node certainly brings them before a particular question, yet does not establish whether that position can treat them as a basis for processing.

Certification occurs at positions authorized to process matters; materials do not accomplish it by virtue of their form alone. Schools, courts, service counters, and border inspection face different matters. Schools handle education-related materials; courts judge evidence under their procedures; counters and border inspection can confirm identity, eligibility, or conditions for passage only within their respective matters. Which materials each node recognizes remains bounded by its existing scope of processing and procedural conditions. Between the existence of materials and successful certification lie at least several distinct positions: materials are first preserved, the person concerned or relevant personnel then submit them to a concrete node, and an authorized processor checks their form, content, and subject matter to establish whether they meet the rules applied to the current question.

Verification asks whether materials connect to the current matter; it does not deliver an omniscient verdict on the facts of life. A relation or experience may really exist without appearing in the form adopted at that position. If the scope and content of the materials do not correspond to the matter to be handled, certification cannot be established there. Only when materials, the matter, authority, and rules connect at that position is certification established for that question. This result can lead to corresponding consequences, but it is not a determination of the person's entire life.

Once certification is established at one position, materials can connect to consequences in that matter, but the conclusion does not naturally cover other nodes. When purpose, duration, and scope of application change, the receiving position also faces a different question and must examine the matter anew. Failure to establish certification temporarily halts that particular state consequence; it does not erase facts that have already occurred in life.

V. The Pathways and Limits of Mutual Recognition

The intensity of state incorporation of differences lies not only in a particular node recognizing you, but also in documents, numbers, forms of eligibility, and archives being able to enter subsequent nodes where concrete rules permit. Resident identity cards are used only in matters requiring proof of identity; education authorities and schools establish and update student registration under the rules; social insurance agencies preserve contribution and benefit records; court-imposed consumption restrictions require an enforcement decision and assistance procedures; access to real-property registration information also requires a legally specified status, an investigative matter, or a legitimate purpose. Records cannot circulate freely without limits of authority, purpose, jurisdiction, and procedure.

Mutual recognition gives local records the possibility of connecting across settings. The intensity of state incorporation of differences comes from different nodes being able to extract the same set of formatted differences: the stronger the mutual recognition, the more readily differences can cross settings; the weaker it is, the more readily people become stuck between nodes. Without these connections, records often remain at the original node: a school's knowing does not mean a hospital knows; what a neighborhood organization knows may not be used by a bank; local recognition may not allow passage at a border. Mutual recognition gives documents, numbers, forms of eligibility, and archives the opportunity to pass across nodes. Yet this intensity is not an abstract degree of unity. It concerns whether materials can actually connect between

concrete nodes. Whether a record can pass across nodes still depends on the receiving node's material requirements, certification authority, conditions of extraction, and processing procedures.

An identity card gives several positions the opportunity to identify the same object; student registration can be extracted in education-related matters; social insurance, court records, and property registration each may also be used at subsequent positions. For a local record to leave its original place of preservation and enter another node, its format must first be readable so that the receiving position can identify the material. Readability, however, does not yet mean suitability for the current question. Schools, hospitals, banks, borders, courts, and neighborhood organizations handle different matters. An address, student registration, or property registration may be relevant at one position but have no use at another. If the object, time, or content referred to by the materials cannot connect to the question at hand, even a complete record may remain within its original scope of preservation.

Even if materials are readable and relevant, the receiving position must also have authority to extract and use them, and its procedure must permit them to enter current processing. What is known at one position is not necessarily open to inspection or use as a basis for processing at another. Nodes cannot indiscriminately use one another's materials. Mutual recognition always remains subject to these concrete boundaries; it is not a condition in which all nodes share all information.

Within the established path for a particular matter, mutual recognition may extend along the entire path or take materials only to some positions. Student registration can connect to educational matters without necessarily handling banking or border questions. Property registration can be extracted in relevant matters without necessarily supporting other forms of eligibility. Schools, hospitals, banks, borders, courts, and neighborhood organizations cannot indiscriminately use one another's materials merely because they are all state nodes. The intensity of state incorporation of differences is manifested in how many relations materials can actually pass through. Mutual recognition thus takes the form of bounded but actual connections between concrete nodes, not the automatic passage of all information within a single whole.

VI. Allocation and Coordination, Centralized Decision-Making, and Responsibility

Certified and mutually recognized differences enter allocation and coordination: who enrolls, pays taxes, serves in the military, receives welfare, undergoes examination, is subject to levies or expropriation, is resettled, is restricted, is isolated, or receives assistance. Allocation and coordination connect classified and certified materials to the distribution of resources, responsibility, and risk, determining which differences become resources, obligations, or risks. This is not mere roster management, nor can it accomplish itself apart from concrete nodes, rules, and authority. Who enters which path still depends on whether existing eligibility, records, examination, and processing authority can connect within the same chain.

In concrete matters, the incorporation of differences has definite material bases and limits imposed by rules. A child's household registration, residence, parents' social insurance, and school district affect the distribution of school resources under admission and student-registration rules and connect to the corresponding admission position. A family's income, property, illness, and disability certificates affect the allocation of assistance resources. Yet the minimum subsistence guarantee and medical assistance are handled separately under conditions such as household economic circumstances, assistance categories, and medical expenses. Different processors act within their respective authority; these procedures cannot be merged into one unified allocation and coordination process.

The allocation of obligations and controls likewise proceeds through the corresponding materials and nodes. A young person's age, health, household registration, and political record affect the distribution of

military-service responsibilities. An enterprise's registration, taxation, records of legal violations, and credit rating affect the direction of inspections, loans, permits, and penalties. These materials are retrieved only in concrete inspections, licensing, or other legally prescribed matters.

Classification places materials on a processing path; certification judges whether they count in a concrete matter; mutual recognition determines whether they can cross to another position. When these conditions are met, allocation and coordination direct resources, responsibility, and risk accordingly. These stages connect but cannot replace one another. Moreover, allocation and coordination form paths of distribution; only implementation brings permissions, restrictions, assistance, levies or expropriation, or other consequences into effect. Bringing an object within the scope of an arrangement does not mean the result is complete. Until consequences take effect, distribution remains at the position of allocation and coordination. Only actual action at subsequent implementing positions truly establishes consequences. This distinction prevents state incorporation of differences from being written as an abstract will allocating everything on its own.

Centralized decision-making within state incorporation of differences cannot be observed only from the last service counter or implementing position. Who controls the use of assets, whether equipment and data can be brought into processing, who holds nominal ownership and where actual control lies, and which personnel and decision procedures allocate budgets, staff, time, and service coverage all constrain in advance the materials that the final position can use, the exceptions it can allow, and the supplementation and correction it can provide. When the same rule produces different results at well-resourced and resource-poor nodes, analysts must trace the allocation decisions, rather than attributing all differences to the attitudes of frontline personnel.

Authorization between higher and lower levels must also be separated from coordination across nodes. Unified formats, database fields, review requirements, and transfer rules can maintain connections among processing at several positions. Yet those who actually set, interpret, and implement these requirements are concrete rule-makers, authorizers, data managers, reviewers, and receiving personnel. The abilities to review an existing determination, revoke consequences, correct records, and change who exercises discretion through appointments, supervision, or temporary orders may be dispersed across different positions. Formal authorization does not automatically amount to actual processing capacity: authority over materials, resources, time limits, and the documents in force when the event occurred must also be checked.

Responsibility should be distributed along the actual connections among design, allocation, authorization, transfer, discretion, implementation, and correction. Rule designers and resource allocators delimit the available roads; those who authorize and transfer carry requirements to subsequent positions; frontline personnel process matters within the established scope. Personnel with the ability to review, revoke, appoint, supervise, or correct may affect whether consequences persist. The fact that the last action is completed at the grassroots does not place all responsibility at the end of the chain. Nor can the participation of many positions allow responsibility to dissolve into an abstract state, institution, or organization.

The fact that a position continually benefits can be a clue for investigating whether it helps maintain an arrangement; benefit alone cannot establish motive, authority, or causal responsibility. Knowing the accumulated consequences but lacking the ability to change them differs, in its conditions of responsibility, from holding corrective authority yet refusing to act. Someone able to stop a transfer, raise an objection, or initiate review who nevertheless maintains the original arrangement also requires separate examination in terms of choices, authority, and consequences. Centralized power is formed through these traceable relations of control, allocation, authorization, and correction. There is no need to write the state, institutions, ownership, budgets, or databases as unified acting subjects.

VII. Implementation and Write-Back: Present Consequences and Future Positions

Implementation makes differences not merely visible but consequential. Even where earlier recording, classification, certification, mutual recognition, and allocation and coordination have brought differences to processable positions, they have not yet converted judgments into actual effects on people. Permissions, prohibitions, assistance, penalties, detention, judgments, migration, enrollment, welfare, border inspection, or compulsory enforcement must be carried out at the concrete positions responsible for those consequences before materials and judgments become tangible passage, eligibility, responsibilities, resources, or scope for action. The intensity of state incorporation of differences appears here: once a difference enters a chain of implementation, it is no longer merely a matter of how others see someone. It substantively affects whether that person can enroll, migrate, obtain a document, pay taxes, join the military, receive welfare, leave the country, be punished, or receive assistance. Implementation is therefore not an isolated mechanical act at the end of a chain. It actually changes people's real positions: a document can allow passage, a record can impose restrictions, eligibility can secure assistance, and a judgment can change a person's future settings.

The formation of consequences always depends on concrete personnel, materials, rules, authority, and procedures connecting with one another. A chain of implementation cannot be treated as an abstract mechanism running on its own. What matters in implementation is not only that a result has coercive force, but also that a concrete processing position can bring an existing judgment into concrete activity. After enrollment materials have been checked, a child's educational position actually changes only when the school takes the corresponding action. After border materials have been extracted, an authorized position must likewise permit or restrict passage before a record becomes an actual scope for action. Permissions, assistance, penalties, judgments, and compulsory enforcement work in the same way: preceding classification, certification, mutual recognition, and allocation and coordination prepare the path; actual implementation brings resources, responsibilities, or restrictions into life.

Implementing positions always handle particular matters at hand, not the whole person and the person's entire life. A document is checked at border inspection, a form of eligibility is used in enrollment or welfare processing, a record connects to consequences in punishment or compulsory enforcement: each effect comes through its materials, rules, authority, and procedures. If materials cannot enter a usable form, the rules do not cover the current matter, or processing authority fails to connect, earlier records and judgments do not turn into consequences on their own. These effects have clear boundaries of subject matter and authority. One completed implementation cannot justify extending the same judgment to all of that person's eligibility, relations, and future positions. Even if the same material has been recognized elsewhere, the implementing position must still confirm its relation to the present consequence. It cannot use the previous node's judgment to exceed its own authority or directly expand the scope of effects. Implementation changes what people can do now, which positions they can enter, and what responsibilities they must bear. It rearranges the actual scope of activity but does not exhaust a person's relations, experience, and circumstances in a single instance of processing.

State incorporation of differences does not end with one act of implementation; it writes the result back into the next round of judgment. A penalty becomes a record; assistance becomes a history of eligibility; migration changes household and student registration; military service changes identity, relations, and state memory; a border examination affects future passage; compulsory enforcement changes credit, loans, travel, and eligibility applications. Write-back gives state incorporation an extent in time: past processing does not naturally disappear but enters the range of what can later be extracted through forms of eligibility, penalty

records, household registration, student registration, or other materials. It becomes a condition that may be seen at the next verification.

The temporal tension established by write-back lies in a person's believing a matter has ended while the record remains in the archive. In a future relational field—for example, the next time a person takes up employment, borrows, migrates, leaves the country, enrolls, receives assistance, or undergoes eligibility review—these materials may be extracted again and regain weight in new processing. The power of state incorporation of differences lies not only in present implementation but also in how its results return to the future. Yet what write-back preserves are conditions that can be extracted again, not a comprehensive prediction or predetermination of a person's future positions or path through life.

This temporal continuity comes from later processors being able to extract past results anew in a new relational field, not from the past remaining on a person with the same weight at all times. An assistance record may be used in a later eligibility determination to identify earlier processing; household or student registration changed by migration may also become new materials. Results left by punishment, military service, border examination, and compulsory enforcement are each bounded by the matters for which they are extracted and the scope of the nodes. The same past material does not have the same weight in different relational fields. It may be invoked again at a particular node or remain only within the scope in which it was originally processed. It does not predetermine that every future position will make the same judgment.

Preserving records keeps open paths by which the past can enter the future. It does not mean that the past can directly fix subsequent conclusions like fate. New materials in the present, the questions asked by receiving nodes, and their procedural conditions still change how old results are interpreted and assigned weight. Write-back extends the time during which differences can be processed again; it does not copy the original consequence endlessly into every later position. Nor must the same record become effective in the same way in different relational fields.

VIII. Cross-Institutionally Usable Identity and Institutional Non-Passability

In a society of acquaintances, a person can rely on others knowing them: the village knows who they are, the neighbors know where they live, relatives know whom they married, and colleagues know where they work. But in a society of strangers or an urban environment, acquaintance is insufficient when facing unfamiliar institutions such as schools, hospitals, banks, borders, courts, and welfare systems. The person must be identified through documents, numbers, archives, and eligibility. State incorporation of differences produces a form of passability across unfamiliar settings, allowing identity cards, household registration, passports, student registration, social insurance, tax numbers, driving licenses, business licenses, and property registration to be extracted before unfamiliar institutions. Passability here means the processability formed through formatting, registration, certification, and mutual recognition; it cannot be equated with abstract freedom. Whether a person can get things done often depends not on whether they really exist in life but on whether that existence has been entered in state formats and can be mutually recognized by different nodes. State incorporation turns the concrete person within relations among acquaintances into an object that can pass through and be processed by unfamiliar institutions.

The efficacy of a cross-institutionally usable identity always changes with the matter to which its materials refer. It is not a natural attribute of a person, still less the whole person. This passability depends on whether the materials are valid, their scope of application fits, and the processing node has the relevant authority. Student registration can support processing at education-related positions; property registration and social insurance are also used only in the corresponding questions. The same material does not open identical

channels at different positions. A cross-institutionally usable identity is often jointly established by several materials at concrete positions, not by one document automatically taking effect in every relational field. An identity card can provide a stable entry point, while household registration, student registration, social insurance, tax numbers, driving licenses, business licenses, or property registration support different matters. Nor can the role of a passport at a border directly replace the materials required at schools, hospitals, banks, courts, or welfare positions. What unfamiliar nodes can process is the verifiable part these materials form within their authority, not a person's complete life. Family responsibilities, community relations, work experience, and concrete circumstances that have not entered the current materials still exist in life. They cannot be subsumed under a cross-institutionally usable identity as a complete self. Materials can have different efficacy at different positions; passability is always bounded by concrete relational fields.

State incorporation of differences not only produces passage but may also leave people stuck at the entry to a procedure. Institutional non-passability is the position formed when differences in lived life cannot be identified, certified, or mutually recognized by state nodes. These people do not lack facts of life: they really do reside, work, have families, experience illness, receive education, and migrate. The problem is that the corresponding facts of life have not been correctly recognized in state formats.

Missing or expired documents, gaps in student-registration or social insurance records, errors in archives or registered matters, and incomplete eligibility materials may temporarily make it difficult for relations already existing in life to enter the corresponding nodes when the current matter actually requires those materials and they have not been lawfully supplemented and corrected. People who become stuck do not lack facts of residence, work, family, or education. Rather, those facts have not yet connected in materials and formats extractable at that position. Border status and recognition of educational qualifications have their own specialized rules and are not merged here into one uniform consequence.

The boundaries of proof and inspection involving resident identity cards, the establishment and updating of student registration, social insurance contribution and entitlement records, and changes and corrections to household registration are governed by their respective rules. Corrections to archives are separately governed by the Archives Law and its implementing regulations.

Institutional non-passability often appears where a concrete chain is cut off. The break may result from insufficient materials, unsuitable formats, unsuccessful certification, or mutual recognition failing to extend. It may also arise from missing or expired documents, gaps in student-registration or social insurance records, errors in archives or registered matters, inconsistencies between registration and life, broken employment relationships, or incomplete eligibility materials. This is not an essential defect of the object itself. The threshold concerns connections between materials and procedures; people who become stuck should not be written as inherently unqualified.

The same person's documents may be usable while their employment materials cannot necessarily connect. A migrant worker's possession of a valid identity card does not mean that employment relations, wage records, and social insurance materials can already support the processing of work-related injury or unpaid wages. Even where the work is real, if the fact of working has not connected to materials capable of establishing the employment relationship, or that relationship has not been formatted, it may be difficult to establish a work-related injury in the relevant matter, and processing may be blocked.

Another concrete problem appears at the point of a child's school admission. Even if the child really lives in the city and the neighborhood organization or landlord knows that fact, where local policy or the specific admission category actually requires the corresponding materials, admission may be blocked if household

registration, a residence permit, a rental filing, or parents' social insurance are incomplete and fail to connect with student-registration requirements.

Assistance to families likewise depends on verification of specific materials. Even where a family faces real pressures and real difficulties, it may be unable to enter welfare arrangements if the materials cannot provide proof, income cannot be calculated, or relationships cannot be certified—if income, property, illness, or family relations have not formed verifiable materials. These experiences do not mean that the facts of work, residence, or family hardship themselves do not exist. Concrete life has not yet connected through materials extractable by the corresponding nodes.

Thus passability and non-passability are not fixed boundaries between two kinds of people. They are concrete positions formed by the same object in different matters, materials, and relations among nodes. A person can pass through some nodes yet be cut off at others because of gaps in materials. The protective and exclusionary capacities of state incorporation of differences are connected in this way: the same conditions that allow materials to pass across nodes also leave people who fail to connect outside the channels.

IX. The Different Consequences of Education, Welfare, and the Military

Education nodes turn differences of family, household registration, locality, and eligibility into future positions. Whether a child can enroll is not simply a question of age. In some areas and particular admission years, under local admission policies and categories, application materials may include some of the following: birth or household-registration information, proof of residence, property or rental materials, social insurance or work records, application information, and student-registration information. Vaccination records, school districts, and places are handled under separate concrete rules; they are not required simultaneously everywhere. Enrollment is not a single educational event. It connects family, residence, household registration, employment relations, administrative divisions, and school resources to concrete examination.

Central legal sources and annual local policies for compulsory-education admission must be used at distinct levels. The Compulsory Education Law of the People's Republic of China establishes the framework for enrollment of school-age children and adolescents and local guarantees. Shanghai's 2023 admission policy, Beijing's 2024 admission policy, the guide for the 2024–2025 school year in Dapeng, Shenzhen, and the 2024 points-based admission policy of Baiyun, Guangzhou, establish only the material requirements for their respective areas, years, and categories, not a nationally uniform checklist.

Birth certificates, household registration, residence permits, parents' social insurance, property or rental filings, school districts, and student registration are not the same kind of material. In admission processing, they refer to family, residence, and educational positions respectively, connecting to school places and subsequent arrangements only after verification. What education forms is not simply an immediate determination of whether a child is of school age. It is a concrete processing path that connects family, residence, and different eligibility materials to the child's future position.

Welfare concerns how hardship is identified through materials, family relations, and eligibility for protection. Reviews for the minimum subsistence guarantee check co-resident household members, household income, and household property under the relevant measures. Severe disability, major or exceptionally serious illness, and the unavoidable expenditure they entail may, under specific conditions, affect applications, separate applications, or income calculations. Medical assistance is handled separately according to categories of recipients, household economic circumstances, medical expenses, and payments under basic medical insurance. The requirements of different welfare systems do not form one unified review standard. Their

materials and consequences differ from those of education and cannot be replaced by education's admission path.

The two systems must not be merged into a unified welfare standard. The minimum-subsistence-guarantee framework addresses co-resident household members, income, property, disability, major illness, and information checks. The medical-assistance framework separately addresses categories of recipients, household economic circumstances, medical expenses, referrals, and application review.

Welfare nodes certify hardship. The minimum subsistence guarantee, medical insurance, social insurance, disaster relief, disability allowances, housing support, pensions, unemployment relief, and assistance to children are not simply distributions of resources. They must first determine whether hardship is established, materials are complete, eligibility is continuous, and family relations are recognized. Welfare can protect people and also classifies them. If actual pressures in life cannot be converted into compliant application materials and continuous eligibility, or if family relations are not recognized by review procedures, people may be unable to enter protective arrangements. Thus, while providing protection, welfare nodes also create the possibility of exclusion through eligibility checks.

Military nodes connect bodies to state responsibility. Age, sex, health, household registration, education, political records, eligibility for service, resettlement after discharge, military-family status, military merit, disability, and commemoration of sacrifice all enter military nodes. The military does not merely process individual bodies: it joins bodies, community responsibility, risk, implementing positions, and state memory. The bearing of danger, attribution of responsibility, and posthumous commemoration it handles differ both from education's arrangement of future developmental positions and from welfare's confirmation of eligibility for protection.

Education, welfare, and the military all connect current materials to consequences over longer periods, but each handles different questions. All must proceed through their respective examinations and procedures, with corresponding classification standards and eligibility thresholds. All may produce exclusion through missing materials or unmet conditions, and all may also produce protection. Yet they cannot be written as the same function, still less as simply benevolent distribution or indiscriminate exclusion. Protection, eligibility, and responsibility have different entry points. Education is not welfare protection; welfare does not occupy the military's position of responsibility; nor can the military replace schools or welfare nodes in handling their respective matters. None can replace the others' processing relations.

X. Renewed Extraction and Implementation at Borders

A border is not a natural geographical line endowed with will or personality. It is a high-intensity node where differences incorporated by the state are extracted anew, certified, and put into effect. The intensity of border consequences comes from concentrated processing at nodes; it is neither decided by the geographical line itself nor produced by an abstract state will selecting objects on its own. The same person is a resident locally, and that position does not disappear in border processing. Yet the person may simultaneously become an object of entry and exit, visa, residence, deportation, or examination procedures requiring fresh verification. Differences that usually go unnoticed and appear inconspicuous in everyday local life may, at a border, connect to passage, staying, leaving, deportation, examination, or exclusion. They thus suddenly gain weight and connect to stronger consequences of implementation.

This change of weight comes from materials originally dispersed across different relations in life being brought together again at one position for entry and exit processing. Upon entry into the border relational field, nationality, documents, passports, visas, language, destination, travel records—including past entry and

exit records—kinship relations, property, occupation, and risk judgments are extracted anew. Yet a document or material usable at an internal position may not directly allow passage at a border: it does not thereby cross the border automatically or automatically acquire efficacy. Nor does concentrated processing in any way give the node unlimited authority to judge all differences. Among these materials, nationality, passports, visas, destinations, and travel records relate directly to entry and exit matters, whereas language, kinship, property, or occupation are extracted and checked only when the current matter specifically requires them.

Both passage and exclusion form after concrete materials are used at implementing positions. Border inspection personnel check documents, visas, existing records, certification results, the current matter, and processing authority, identifying which contents support entry, departure, or stay, and which make examination, deportation, or exclusion possible. Whether connections can be established depends on whether the extracted materials fit the passage matter at hand and whether the processing position has the corresponding authority. It is at concrete relational positions where border personnel, documents, visas, records, certification, and authority work together that boundaries between inside and outside are realized as different enforceable consequences.

XI. How Punishment Records Continue

The intensity of punishment lies not only in the present but also in whether records enter subsequent matters under concrete rules. Once effective legal instruments enter court enforcement, consumption restriction orders may affect air travel, train seating, and other consumption not necessary for life and work. Whether administrative penalty information is disclosed, preserved, or used in later matters is subject to statutory limits of scope, duration, authority, and purpose. Local reputation belongs to this book's composite situations; it is not written as a nationally uniform institutional consequence. A penalty does not end when the event ends. It will be preserved in archives and extracted repeatedly in future relational fields.

The provisions on restricting high consumption and certain other consumption by persons subject to enforcement address specific consequences of court enforcement records; the Administrative Penalty Law addresses disclosure and processing of administrative penalty information. These legal sources do not support presenting consequences for taking up employment, loans, border passage, and local reputation as uniform across all records.

A person who is punished may lose certain forms of eligibility; a person subject to compulsory enforcement may face credit restrictions; a criminal record may affect employment, travel, family, and local evaluations. Punishment nodes connect violations of law, debt, risk, and identity records to state coercive power. Here lies the difference between state punishment and ordinary conflict: ordinary conflict may remain in acquaintances' memories or in reputation within relations among people who know one another, whereas state punishment enters archives, records, and future systems of implementation.

The write-back of punishment involves two distinct formations of consequences. If these two levels are collapsed into one step, it becomes impossible to see how a penalty extends from current processing into future relational fields. The first consequence occurs when a present judgment, administrative penalty, or compulsory enforcement actually changes the person's eligibility, actions, or responsibilities in a concrete matter. The results are then preserved as records of legal violations, criminal records, or archives, which may be extracted again later in connection with taking up employment, loans, travel, eligibility applications, border passage, and family and local evaluations. The second consequence comes from subsequent concrete processing; preservation itself does not automatically produce a second punishment.

Yet later processing cannot automatically repeat the original penalty simply because a record exists. Past materials have continuity, but punishment is by no means an inevitable result automatically produced by records. The formation and continuation of restrictions must still pass through the relevant rules, authority, procedures, and concrete implementing positions. The receiving position must identify the matter referred to by the record, the applicable rules, and its own authority. It cannot treat one record as the sole cause of later experiences or an inevitable fate determining a life. Because archives and implementing nodes enable connections across settings, state punishment is harder than local memory. Yet this hardness comes from institutional relations that permit extraction and implementation. It does not mean that a record has already adjudicated the person's entire future. When the same record is extracted anew in different matters, the intensity and scope of the restrictions it can produce may quite well differ.

XII. How Three Different Sources Enter State Nodes

The state is not the source of these differences, but it changes how they are preserved, extracted, mutually recognized, and put into effect. The three sources entering state nodes have different mechanisms of formation. Differences produced through national-community formation come from the long-term formation of community relations. Class images are not entities within what society fundamentally is, but low-dimensional images formed by the brutal projection of multiple high-weight differentiating units. Institutional eligibility is shaped by particular organizational relations such as those of schools, hospitals, companies, or neighborhood organizations. State nodes reformat these materials according to materials, rules, and authority, but cannot flatten their mechanisms of generation into one mechanism.

Differences produced through national-community formation first form in languages, place names, shared harm, community boundaries, and experiences of boundaries. Once brought into state nodes, these contents are reformatted through administrative and legal procedures. Languages become official languages, languages of schooling, and examination languages; community boundaries become registration fields, regional institutions, and legal recognition; place names are fixed as administrative divisions; shared harm is organized into commemorative days, teaching materials, museums, and official narratives; experiences of boundaries are distilled into passports, border inspection, nationality, visas, and state borders. This formatting changes how materials are processed, giving them the capacity to be preserved and invoked across settings, but does not make the state the source of nations. Ethnic registration leaves only part of the form of community differences in particular fields; it cannot replace the national community itself. The original formation of language, shared memory, and experiences of boundaries continues outside state formats. State incorporation of differences can connect some differences to administrative divisions, teaching materials, or border inspection, but cannot contain all of a community's relations in one registration.

Once concrete personnel, organizations, or institutional procedures bring classifications, materials, or low-dimensional images formed by class theory into state nodes, they are processed anew. At the concrete processing positions of archives, taxation, welfare, education, housing, and judicial procedures, what state nodes actually extract and format are concrete differentiating units—income, employment relations, housing, property, debt, social insurance, taxation, and assistance eligibility—not a reified class. The relevant personnel and procedures format these differentiating units into forms of eligibility and records that can be registered, mutually recognized, and put into effect. State nodes do not discover within social structure a unified class entity existing at the level of what society fundamentally is. They extract these high-weight differentiating units and connect them to concrete state positions.

Forms of institutional eligibility, such as those of schools, hospitals, companies, and neighborhood organizations, originally depend on their respective particular organizational relations. Once connected to state nodes, they may acquire the capacity to be processed across regions, institutions, and settings, allowing local certification to produce consequences over a larger space. Yet this extension still depends on the nature of the current matter and the receiving node's authority. Different nodes may not automatically recognize one another's materials, and some forms of eligibility are effective only within a limited scope. The original formation of institutional eligibility does not disappear upon connection to the state, nor can institutionalization at the organizational level be directly equated with state incorporation of differences.

After entering state nodes, differences produced through national-community formation, class images, and institutional eligibility can meet in the same document, archive, or processing of administrative eligibility, yet still cannot replace one another. State incorporation of differences changes the scope these materials can cross, the nodes that extract them, and the consequences of implementation to which they connect. It does not retroactively create their original sources. Only by retaining the differences among these three chains can we explain how state nodes increase the intensity of processing without conflating national communities, low-dimensional class images, and organizations' institutional eligibility as one-dimensional creations of the state.

XIII. Protection, Exclusion, and the Historical Materials Left Behind

State relations can protect people and also trap them in positions of non-passability. Resident identity cards can be used where the law specifies or a concrete service genuinely requires proof of identity; student registration records a student's enrollment status under education rules; social insurance provides statutory protection in the separate circumstances of old age, illness, work-related injury, unemployment, and childbirth; courts and other administrative procedures maintain order within their respective authority. These protections are not provided by a unified personality, nor can they be understood apart from concrete rules. State relations can also create thresholds: missing documents block people, archival errors block people, mismatched household registration blocks people, incomplete eligibility materials block people, and past records block people. The sources concerning student registration, remedies, and documentary requirements are used here only within their expressly stated jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material scope.

State incorporation of differences is not inherently legitimate. It can protect or exclude, recognize or misread, grant eligibility or create gaps, stabilize order or freeze complex differences. It cannot be written either as worship of the state or as a simple theory of oppression. Once complex differences are entered in fixed formats, they may gain support or be frozen at thresholds. The question remains how differences are formatted, mutually recognized, put into effect, and written back within concrete circumstances of materials, rules, personnel, authority, and procedures.

Documents give people verifiable entry points in a society of strangers; student registration connects children to educational positions; social insurance and assistance give hardships such as illness, unemployment, or old age an opportunity to enter protective processing. Courts, police, borders, and administrative nodes provide order and passage within their respective scopes and existing authority, and can bring some risks into an order of implementation. These protections do not fall abstractly on everyone. Specific personnel form them at particular positions according to materials, rules, authority, and procedures. When documents, student registration, and social insurance materials are recognized, they can give people passage, education, or protection at unfamiliar nodes.

Conversely, when documents are missing, archives contain errors, household registration does not match, eligibility materials are incomplete, or past records are extracted anew, the same chain may stop before certification, mutual recognition, or implementation. The object then cannot connect to paths that would otherwise allow passage, enrollment, protection, or processing. This shows that protection and exclusion are not two unrelated aspects of the state. There is not one state responsible only for protection and another responsible only for exclusion. Rather, the same chain of nodes makes different connections in response to different states of materials. Judging the consequences of state incorporation of differences requires a return to concrete processing relations: which materials are seen, which relations are suppressed, which forms of eligibility are connected, and who is left outside the threshold.

It is through these nine stages—identification, formatting, registration, classification, certification, mutual recognition, allocation and coordination, implementation, and write-back—that dispersed differences enter documents, archives, law, administration, education, taxation, welfare, the military, borders, and punishment mechanisms. This chain gives differences passability and also produces institutional non-passability. It brings differences into chains of implementation and writes implementation results back into future judgments. Documents, archives, judgments, commemorations, teaching materials, border records, records of sacrifice, administrative divisions, and punishment records preserved by state nodes bring implementation results back into subsequent judgments. That these materials can remain and later be extracted anew shows that state incorporation of differences extends through time beyond a single instance of processing.

State incorporation of differences leaves here materials that have been preserved and can still be extracted later, but this is not the last step of Volume V. State incorporation writes differences into chains of implementation; historicization then takes up these preserved materials. The materials described above continue into historicization, passing to those who come later through preservation, interpretation, forgetting, commemoration, and contestation, and regaining weight in future relational fields.

Chapter 21. Historicization: How Past Differences Become an Order of Differentiation Available for Future Extraction

I. How the Past Enters the Lives of Those Who Come Later

Why must people who never experienced their ancestors' division of the family household still face its consequences many years later? Why do people who never experienced war or migration inherit judgments and distances left by earlier generations through commemorative days, teaching materials, boundary disputes, place names, surnames, and routes? The question is not whether the past existed, but how it enters the lives of those who come later. The descendants did not sit at the table when the household was divided. They did not hear who spoke first, who remained silent, who took on debt, or who was away and could not return in time. Yet decades later, when property is divided, elder care arranged, money borrowed, or relationships and marriage considered, accounts of that division may still be extracted. “The eldest took more that year” will affect who should contribute more money later. “The second child did not look after the elders that year” will affect whether a marriage receives approval. “Her family was treated unfairly back then” may alter the allocation of responsibility among relatives. Through these entry points, the past enters later judgments, and historicization occurs.

Historicization is neither recalling the past nor lyrical reflection on history. Only through preservation, compression, indexing, triggering, interpretation, contestation, and renewed weight assignment do past differences become an order of differentiation that later people can extract. State incorporation of differences writes differences into chains of implementation; historicization then passes preserved, compressed, interpreted, and contested differences on to those who come later, allowing them potentially to regain weight in future relational fields. What later people take up is not a past that arrives automatically, but entry points left by earlier people and the judgments current users form through them. Only when family members, people involved in local relations, or institutional personnel bring materials into the current question do old differences bear on responsibility, eligibility, evaluation, and boundaries.

The same index can be set aside, disputed, or reinterpreted by different people. If materials cannot be identified, no one brings them forward, or the current relational field makes no corresponding demand, time alone will not make them produce consequences. Only when materials, those who present them, conditions of recognition, and a relational field connect do old differences move from traces to an order available for later people to use. Later people must first identify old materials as clues relevant to the current question. If they treat them simply as old objects, they may remain in the background for a long time. In concrete relational fields such as property division, care, or relationships and marriage, those presenting materials must also explain why they connect to present relations. Whether differences can persist also depends on whether later people treat them as part of the current question. If materials exist but have no point of connection with relations, or if that connection is not recognized, the past will not directly change judgment, and old differences may remain only in the background. Together, these conditions determine when an old difference becomes part of an actual judgment.

What happened in the past and how later people remember it are not the same thing. Take the division of a family household. Many complicated circumstances may have existed at the time: the elders were in poor health; one branch of the family had cared for them for years; one branch was working elsewhere and did not

return in time; one branch took on debt; one branch received housing but also took responsibility for the subsequent funeral arrangements; a daughter contributed money but was not formally included in the arrangements for dividing property. All these details may be true. Yet a few years later, the family may retain only two or three remarks: “The eldest took an extra room that year”; “The second child did not look after the elders that year”; “The daughter who married into another family contributed money that year, but no one remembered.” These remarks are not the whole past, but they will become materials through which later people judge closeness and distance, what is owed, responsibility, and respectability.

Such compression also occurs in history at different levels. In a local famine, who opened the granaries, who hoarded grain, who fled, who saved people, who said what, who was later wronged, whose role was exaggerated, and who was forgotten may originally have been entangled. Later, the locality remembers only a place name, a monument, an elder's account, or a family's reputation. National history, faced with shared harm, migration, resistance, betrayal, protection, silence, mixed settlement, intermarriage, and changes in boundaries, may likewise be compressed into a few stories, commemorative days, passages in teaching materials, burial grounds, and names that cannot be spoken casually. The state, in turn, will enter part of the past in archives, teaching materials, laws, commemorative days, museums, rolls of martyrs, and administrative boundaries. It does not preserve the whole past, but organizes some past differences into public memory. Historical memory is therefore not the past itself. The past did happen; historical memory is the order of differences left after that past has been preserved, selected, compressed, indexed, and interpreted.

The original scene of an event contains interlinked circumstances; preserved materials carry only the parts that can be recorded, narrated, or identified. Cash-gift ledgers retain amounts, IOUs retain debts, oral accounts retain relations and evaluations, and burial grounds and place names retain belonging, migration, and spatial relations in spatial form. Different nodes leave different parts and different gaps. Formal archives may preserve determinations and procedural results without preserving lived circumstances. Family accounts and talk may preserve relations and relatives' evaluations but lack public procedures. Teaching materials and commemorations have a range within which they circulate and can be used, yet may compress local differences. Gaps thus also become part of later accounts.

Later people encounter materials that have been processed at various nodes. Only when oral accounts are brought into property division, or archives into eligibility reviews, do materials acquire weight in current relations. Even then, they cannot replace all the relations at the original scene. We must compare what each retains and omits, and the weight each carries if we are to avoid treating any one form of memory as the whole event. Once a current judgment has formed, those affected may preserve its result as a new account, providing a new entry point for subsequent use. Preserved traces, their presentation in the present, and concrete consequences must therefore be analyzed together.

Past differences enter preservation nodes such as families, localities, nations, states, archives, teaching materials, commemorations, place names, burial grounds, oral stories, and institutional records. Only through selection, compression, indexing, latency, triggering, interpretation, forgetting, commemoration, education, contestation, transmission, renewed extraction, and renewed weight assignment do they become an order of differentiation that later people can use; in future relational fields, these differences regain weight. This process is historicization. Put briefly, past differences are preserved, indexed, and rewritten before being passed on to later people, and can therefore still be extracted and assigned weight in the future. Overlap among the stages also changes the visibility of materials. An interpretation may affect the identification of an index beforehand; a contest may affect which records are preserved beforehand. These changes are not additional stages, but intersections of the same mechanisms across different relations and relational fields.

The full mechanism cannot be reduced to “the past is remembered.” Preservation nodes first select and compress materials; indices retain entry points for extraction; relational fields trigger extraction; interpretation, contestation, and renewed weight assignment then connect materials back to later people's judgments. What matters is not the event that has already passed, but what entry points it left and in what relational fields they are triggered. Names, place names, surnames, judgments, burial grounds, genealogies, photographs, teaching materials, commemorative days, old homes, and migration routes can all become entry points. Yet entry points do not open themselves. Dividing a household may trigger family historical indices; relationships and marriage trigger relatives' reputations; land disputes trigger place names and migration memories; conflict between national communities triggers shared harm and resistance; state commemoration triggers sacrifice, victory, and shame; eligibility reviews may trigger archival records. Only when specific people or procedures extract, interpret, and assign weight to relevant materials anew in a new relational field, according to current relations, do historical differences re-enter real consequences.

The stages listed have relations of sequence, but not every case passes through them all. Transmission carries entry points beyond the original people concerned; renewed extraction connects them back to new relational fields. Yet preservation may lack an index, an index may lack a trigger, and even after triggering, an effective judgment may fail to form because recognition is absent. Being preserved is not the same as having been extracted; being extracted does not mean necessarily receiving the same weight. Preservation, selection, compression, indexing, and triggering may overlap, or stages may be missing or cut off. Some differences may be renamed before being extracted, and only then may the results leave new accounts, records, or evaluations.

The same difference can yield different results at different nodes; a single sequence cannot be presupposed. Interpretation sometimes participates in identifying what kind of past difference a material represents, while contests among versions may also affect which materials can be extracted. Interpretation and contestation sometimes affect entry points before extraction, and sometimes occur together as materials enter judgment. Renewed weight assignment depends on how materials enter current judgment and whether they gain recognition within it. The role of the same material will change with the person presenting it, the procedure, and the relations; it cannot be explained in isolation from these conditions. Without this connection, an expanded memory remains only an abstract name and cannot act directly in place of actors and procedures.

II. Preservation, Selection, and Compression

For past differences to take effect across generations, they must first enter preservation nodes. Someone once helped relatives, but if no one remembers, and there is no cash-gift ledger, IOU, elder's account, or later family evaluation, the matter may soon fade away. A locality suffered a disaster, but if no place name, inscription, burial ground, local gazetteer, elder's account, or commemorative activity remains, it may later survive only in a few people's private memories. A judgment lacking documents, archives, and records can likewise hardly reappear later in hiring, loans, relocation, or eligibility reviews.

Preservation is not neutral: it gives some differences entry points into the future. Family stories preserve relatives' historical indices; genealogies preserve ancestors, generational rank, migration, and marriage boundaries; cash-gift ledgers preserve attendance, absence, and amounts; burial grounds and place names preserve ancestral origins, sacrifice, migration, land reclamation, war, famine, and old boundaries. Archives, teaching materials, monuments, museums, and oral stories each preserve in their own ways qualifications, punishments, rewards, public narratives, and past matters absent from formal records. Only by entering such nodes can events leave their original scenes and become differences still available for later people to extract.

Preservation within families maintains identifiability through relatives' accounts, objects, and records. Local preservation is carried by place names, burial grounds, inscriptions, local gazetteers, and the use of space. Institutional preservation makes materials searchable through documents, archives, and procedures. If no one maintains the carriers, or if they cannot be identified, the chain of preservation will break. Preservation also requires someone to identify materials as something connected with past differences. An old object can be just an old object, or it can become an entry point in family evaluations, land disputes, or eligibility procedures. The difference comes from how relations and procedures identify it.

Preservation therefore provides only an entry point for the future. Whether materials can be presented, whether they are recognized, and which interpretation they support must be decided by specific users and recognition procedures in later relational fields. Preservation nodes need to maintain materials' existence and the means of identifying them. Damage to old objects, changes in place names, the departure of narrators, or the loss of rules for finding archival records may all break a preservation chain. Even when materials have not disappeared, later people may lose the path of access to them. Preservation thus leaves only the possibility of extraction; it does not guarantee that an entry point will always remain effective. The degree to which materials are recognized will also determine whether old differences become grounds for responsibility or remain at the margins. What later people encounter is only a processed entry point, not the complete re-creation of an event.

Historical memory begins with selection; not all differences will be preserved. Some suffering and contributions are remembered, while others are downweighted or omitted. Some people leave names; others become nameless. Designations such as protector, troublemaker, traitor, and someone forced to choose are likewise formed through selection. The division of family property may retain “who received the house” while omitting “who cared for the elders all along.” A local conflict may retain “which family caused trouble” while omitting the injustice in land distribution. In memory on a larger scale, records of harm suffered by a nation may emphasize external harm while downweighting internal sacrifice, silence, and gains. State commemoration may likewise retain victory, sacrifice, and heroes while omitting ordinary people's fear, migration, hunger, and nameless deaths. All preservation involves selection; that does not make it equivalent to falsification. Genuine occlusion occurs when the retained part passes itself off as the whole past.

Selection is affected by positions from which records can be made and by the availability of materials. People able to leave their names, preserve documents, or enter public accounts can more readily make their own differences into shared materials. Those without positions for recording or conditions for dissemination may have their contributions retained only in family narratives or weak nodes. Differences that enter formal documents or public accounts are usually more visible to later people than those circulating only through weak nodes. Omitted contents may not enjoy equal strength of preservation. They may be reduced to a designation, a taboo, or a stretch of silence, yet old objects, reputation, or relatives' memories may still preserve an entry point. Material availability concerns not only whether something exists, but who can preserve, find, and present it. Those omitted may leave traces, but their versions may not achieve the same range of circulation and use. Later people who see only the main version may easily mistake the retained part for the whole. Only by comparing different nodes may they see downweighted responsibilities and circumstances. The intervals between preservation, extraction, and weight assignment are precisely where subsequent differences may be contested and changed. This difference allows versions to coexist and leaves the main version always open to questioning.

The past must also undergo compression; otherwise it is difficult to transmit. Complex events involve many positions, motives, fears, misunderstandings, silences, interests, and responsibilities that later people cannot take up in full. They are therefore often condensed into names, place names, labels, stories, commemorative

days, judgments, inscriptions, teaching materials, family accounts, or local reputation. Arguments, illness and debt, care, favoritism, silence, work elsewhere, sex differences, and elders' self-interest in a family's division of its household may ultimately leave only “The eldest took more that year.” This remark makes the past transmissible while occluding more details. Children remember their ancestors' migration through place names, students encounter war through commemorative days, and descendants remember household division through an old family remark. Meanwhile, mixed settlement, internal harm, the nameless, the background to judgments, and the difficulties of the time may all disappear from the image.

Compression changes the unit of transmission. Only when complex relations are condensed into names, place names, labels, or short remarks can later people remember and present them in everyday relations. Without portable images, differences can hardly cross time. Yet compression also changes visibility. Removing the background makes transmission easier but makes it harder for later people to work back from the image and question the background that was removed. People readily remember who received what, yet do not know who cared for others, incurred debts, or was absent; they thus connect outcomes directly to responsibility and evaluation. When background, relations, and multiple accounts are compressed into shorter images, some differences become visible while others become harder to bring forward. The convenience and occlusion of compression therefore coexist.

The results of compression can serve only as entry points and materials for judgment. They cannot replace complex relations, nor can they replace specific actors and procedures as explanatory subjects. Ease of transmission must leave room to question positions of preservation, missing parts, and different versions. Later users must ask not only whether something has been preserved, but who can see it, who can present it, and who can enable it to circulate and be used. In subsequent relational fields, judgments formed earlier may also become new materials.

III. How Indices Are Found and Triggered

The preserved past also needs indices if it is to be extracted anew in the future. Place names lead to old differences; commemorative days periodically trigger memory; written judgments can be retrieved in eligibility reviews; genealogies provide entry points into kinship order, migration, and marriage boundaries. Village names, rivers, bridges, old factories, and burial grounds may point back to the past in land disputes, migration narratives, and local identities. Surnames, burial grounds, and photographs can also bring out, respectively, clan relations, ancestral origins and sacrifice, or scenes a family is reluctant to discuss openly. Teaching materials connect part of the past to schools, examinations, and public judgments, while names in family stories may immediately evoke avoidance in relationships and marriage, old grievances, and unsettled responsibilities. Indices provide only entry points; whether they open still depends on the relational field. Preserved materials and indices are also on different levels. A photograph preserves traces of a scene; a name guides relatives toward a relation. An archive preserves a determination; it takes an eligibility procedure to connect that determination to the current question.

For an index to be usable, rules of identification and positions of knowledge are also needed. Relatives familiar with family designations, institutional personnel able to read archives, and local people who know the origins of place names each turn materials into entry points. Entry points cannot predetermine meaning; meaning must form within the relational field. For an index to function, later people must be in a position to know how materials point to the past and must command the rules for identifying personal names, place names, burial grounds, photographs, or archives. The same place name can point to a boundary in a land dispute and to origins in a migration narrative. An index provides direction but does not decide the question

for the relational field. If materials cannot connect to concrete action, historical differences will not gain real weight by virtue of names alone. Continuity across generations thus retains conditions and disputes; it is not a closed chain of necessity.

Past differences must be triggered within a relational field before they re-enter reality. Family historical indices may ordinarily remain silent. The old house, cash-gift ledgers, burial grounds, and elders' remarks still exist, yet no one necessarily brings up the old household division at a shared meal. When it comes to household division, elder care, borrowing, or relationships and marriage, the old house may become an entry point into who received more and who received less. Cash-gift ledgers may become grounds for judging who contributed and who was absent. A single name may bring out an entire sequence of relatives' evaluations, old grievances, and what is owed.

In land disputes, grave relocations, land expropriation, and disputes over local identity, place names will bring out migration, old contracts, burial grounds, irrigation channels, ancestral origins, and boundaries. Harm suffered by a nation can be triggered by commemorative days, boundary conflicts, educational disputes, or external pressure. Judgments in archives may reappear through hiring reviews, loans, travel, or eligibility applications. Without triggering, an index can remain silent for a long time. Once the relational field connects, the silent past may regain real operative weight.

The question raised by a relational field changes the relevance of materials. Property division concerns houses and contributions; elder care concerns care and what is owed; relationships and marriage concern relatives' evaluations; eligibility reviews concern archives and determinations. The same index may thus be presented or remain silent. Triggering requires more than the emergence of a relational field. Someone must present the index, procedures must permit its entry, and conditions of recognition must make it relevant material. Even when materials exist, old differences will remain at weak nodes if the people concerned do not present them, relations do not recognize them, or procedures do not allow them to enter judgment.

Triggering makes materials weightier, but does not mean that there is already a single conclusion. Different interpreters can connect materials to compensation, injustice, responsibility, or boundaries; consequences change with the relational field, procedures, and contests among versions. Once extracted, an index may still be challenged by other versions. Gaps between versions will affect later judgments, but the gaps themselves may also become part of the dispute.

IV. Positions of Interpretation and Latent Historical Space

Triggered differences still need specific people to interpret them; the same past does not explain its own meaning. Someone who left their native place may be described as fleeing famine or as abandoning their home. Absence from a relative's funeral may be interpreted as disregard for propriety, yet may also have arisen from being burdened by illness and debt and unable to return home. Silence during a conflict can be seen as cowardice or understood as protecting one's family. Conviction, a community's failure, and sacrifice may likewise give rise to conflicting accounts. Once an index of a family's household division is extracted, the senior branch may explain receiving more housing by its responsibility for the elders' funeral arrangements, the junior branch sees it as injustice, and the daughter who married into another family points out that her financial contribution at the time was omitted. In disputes among versions, elders' remarks, cash-gift ledgers, IOUs, burial grounds, and the old home may all be used to support the respective accounts.

Whoever gains standing to interpret can affect the meaning with which past differences are extracted later. Even when the same event is preserved, different interpretations will produce different consequences. Interpretive authority comes from a combination of positions in relation to materials, capacity for

dissemination, and recognition procedures. These positions do not automatically guarantee that an interpretation is correct.

Older people and senior relatives within families hold knowledge of experiences and forms of address; influential local people and clan elders command local relations; teachers and systems of teaching materials command circulation and use through education; entry points into formal procedures lie with archival institutions and local documents. In addition, narrators, educators, religious figures, writers, and preservers of historical materials within national communities, as well as archives, law, teaching materials, commemorative days, museums, and administrative naming within the state, each form their own positions of interpretation within different scopes, thereby affecting the meanings assigned to differences.

When an interpretation enters teaching materials, archives, commemoration, or legal naming, it gains a stronger capacity to circulate and be used publicly. This does not mean that its interpreters created the past. An interpretation with greater reach is not necessarily correct. It must still confront gaps in materials, versions at other nodes, and disputes in current relations. The same cash-gift ledger or written judgment may still be connected to different judgments of responsibility; other materials, different nodes, and subsequent procedures may still change its position within the main version. Transmission across generations is therefore conditional and may still be interrupted, rewritten, or understood anew. In transmitting differences, historicization also retains room for their reinterpretation.

Forgetting is not a blank; it too is part of historicization. Some differences have not entered teaching materials, archives, inscriptions, or public commemoration, yet may still be preserved at weak, marginal, and silent nodes. Family silences, local reputation, taboos, old objects, burial grounds, place names, avoidance in relationships and marriage, kinship designations, marginal narratives, migration routes, and informal accounts may all constitute latent historical space. Old family grievances go unmentioned in ordinary times but are raised when relationships and marriage are considered. Conflicts not recorded in local gazetteers may still prompt avoidance through surnames, streets, or land. A migration occupying only one line in an archive may be known to local people through place names and burial grounds as a history of who arrived first, who arrived later, and who was pushed out. Shared harm absent from formal commemoration may also remain in taboos, designations, and silence.

The fact that explicit history has not extracted a difference does not mean it has lost its consequences. Latent historical space refers precisely to historical differences not yet extracted by the current explicit narrative but which may regain weight in future relational fields. Yet weak nodes may also break: the departure of narrators, damage to old objects, and the loss of recognition for local reputation will all make entry points disappear. Latent historical space is not a safe storehouse containing everything omitted.

Reappearance requires identifiable entry points and a concrete relational field in which they are presented. Relationships and marriage, land disputes, migration narratives, or kinship designations may make silent materials relevant again. Without an explanation of the relations, however, they may still fail to enter explicit judgment. Forgetting includes downweighting, silence, and possible loss. Loss differs from continuing silence. Weak nodes may remain silent because objects are damaged, narrators lose their positions, or surrounding relations cease to recognize them. Entry into latent historical space therefore does not mean that everything omitted is preserved in full. Only when indices, people to present them, and relevant relational fields become available again can certain differences reappear. Even then, they may bring back only fragments, not the entirety of what was forgotten. Analysis should focus on the paths through which materials enter relations and procedures, rather than personifying the past as a single force. The core question remains who can present materials and which procedure recognizes them.

V. Continuity across Generations through Commemoration and Education

The past does not return to reality on its own. Archives, old family matters, or local harms may lie dormant for a long time. Specific organizers, carriers, and procedures arrange times for past differences to return repeatedly to reality. Carriers such as commemorative days, ritual offerings, inscriptions, burial grounds, museums, classrooms, ceremonies, and lists allow particular materials to appear periodically. Specific people and institutional procedures arrange venues and ceremonies and maintain inscriptions and rolls; institutions connect dates to public time. Participants then bring materials back into shared judgment by laying flowers, observing silence, reading names aloud, telling stories, paying ritual respects, or retracing old routes.

In this process, commemoration fixes not only events themselves, but also specific lists, designations, and the direction of responsibility. Who enters a list and who remains nameless; who is described as having been sacrificed, as a perpetrator, as a protector, or as a traitor: these affect how later people define victims, protectors, perpetrators, and community members, and thus understand themselves, others, boundaries, and responsibilities. Commemoration can safeguard the memory of harms that were previously downweighted, but may also fix a complex past as a single narrative. It can enable members to remember sacrifice, yet may also pass unresolved hostility on to descendants.

As commemoration recurs, a single interpretation may be reinforced. If other materials cannot enter commemoration, complex circumstances become harder to make publicly visible. Yet although periodic appearance increases visibility, it does not thereby eliminate disputes. Carriers differ in their strength of preservation, and later people's use of them differs in scope and consequences. Participants may still form different interpretations from materials retained within families, localities, or other nodes. Only by specifying these concrete carriers and institutional conditions can we avoid abstracting history or memory into an acting subject with an independent will.

Education brings those who did not experience events into contact with preserved historical differences. Children did not experience their ancestors' migration, wars, massacres, victories, defeats, divisions, sacrifices, and humiliations. Yet they will encounter them in family stories, teaching materials, classrooms, examinations, flag-raising ceremonies, museums, film and television, commemorative days, and local narratives. Education does more than let people “know the past.” It also tells later people which sufferings deserve remembrance, which names should be respected, and which failures must not be repeated, and gives particular meanings to boundaries, responsibility, protection, and danger.

Educators select materials, teaching materials arrange narratives, and examinations and commemorations repeatedly present contents. Together they affect which entry points become available to those who did not experience events and arrange which names, boundaries, and responsibilities are easier to extract. Disputes over education are intense and concern the future precisely because what is at stake is how the next generation will later extract the past: who will be treated as one of their own or as someone who inflicted harm, and what will be seen as shame, responsibility, something forgivable, or something that cannot be forgotten. The question must still return to materials, positions from which accounts are told, and procedures.

Family accounts, teaching materials, and classrooms connect those who did not experience events to versions already selected and compressed. What students enter here is a set of transmissible images and conditions of interpretation, not the original scene itself. Education does not automatically produce the same result. Some accept existing judgments; others compare versions or understand them anew within new relations. Students may reinterpret conclusions in teaching materials on the basis of different family experiences, local memories, or other materials. That one version circulates and is used more readily neither means that no materials remain at other nodes nor, still less, that disputes have ended.

VI. How Multiple Versions Enter into Contestation

As the past enters different nodes, it leaves different versions. Families, local reputation, state archives, and school teaching materials, as well as victims, perpetrators, bystanders, the defeated, and the victorious, each preserve materials from different positions. Oral stories and silence may also carry versions; they do not naturally converge into one. Family materials are maintained by relatives and may preserve details but lack the capacity for public circulation and use. Local reputation circulates through space and accounts, preserving reputations but potentially downweighting what preceded them. Archives and school teaching materials gain circulation and use through institutional procedures. Archives are adept at preserving times, places, and determinations, but may not preserve lived circumstances. State versions have greater public reach but readily compress local differences.

On informal or ritual dimensions, oral stories can retain suffering outside formal records, but may change shape during transmission. Silence, though not explicitly voiced, may persist through avoidance, taboos, and arrangements among relatives. Commemoration recurs through ritual. The history of household division is no exception. Senior and junior family branches and daughters who married into other families each have their own accounts, while elders' remarks, cash-gift ledgers, IOUs, and neighborhood reputation carry different forms of them. Multiple versions first indicate different positions of preservation; their existence does not yet mean that contestation among them has occurred.

Multiple versions do not remove the demands of analysis. Accounts cannot be treated as equally valid merely because several exist. Versions must still be compared in relation to material sources, purposes of recording, interpretive authority, and conditions of recognition. We must ask where materials come from, who can present them, through which procedure they gain recognition, and within what scope they can circulate and be used.

Different nodes also affect one another. Local reputation enters teaching materials, family narratives enter archives, and public commemoration changes relatives' evaluations. Old versions acquire new weight in these transitions and may also lose details. Differences among versions arise from preservation nodes, kinds of material, the scope of circulation and use, and interpretive authority. Family oral accounts, local place names, archives, teaching materials, and commemorations each have different visibility. Once a public name is fixed, later interpretation becomes easier, but may still face challenges from other materials.

What historical contestation seeks to determine is which version becomes the main version most readily extracted by later people. The objects of contestation include preservation, naming, public dissemination, and which version enters teaching materials, archives, commemoration, and legal names. This is not the automatic opposition of two abstract groups. Actors in different positions use materials and procedures to contend over which version becomes the main one.

Contestation in different domains involves different rules of recognition and different consequences. Family contests concern care and property division. After elders die, siblings may argue over “who provided more care,” “who owes the most,” or “who is entitled to a share of the property,” thereby also reordering family history. Local contests concern old contracts, place names, and land. Land disputes will lead different families to extract their respective migration memories, old contracts, origins of place names, and elders' accounts. Families, recorders, educators, and participants and organizers of commemorative activities within national communities may form different versions concerning shared harm, those written into the record, those downweighted, and internal betrayal and protection.

The writing of teaching materials, establishment of commemorative days, opening of archives, museum displays, and legal naming will also change public memory. Interpretive authority, the capacity for public dissemination, and opportunities to enter teaching materials, archives, commemoration, and legal naming determine whether a version can gain a dominant position. Contestation does not aim to retrieve the bygone past intact; it points toward the future. When later people encounter a place name, personal name, identity, commemorative day, or archive, which differences will they extract, how much weight will they assign, and to what responsibilities and boundaries will they connect them?

Once the main version acquires the capacity to circulate and be used publicly, future use becomes easier. This often depends on mutual support among naming, teaching materials, archives, commemoration, and procedural positions, rather than the will of an abstract group alone. Marginal materials may still retain entry points within family, local, or oral nodes. A version with stronger public reach therefore remains open to questioning by other materials. Contestation continues to affect what descendants encounter, what responsibilities they bear, and how they draw boundaries. Concrete consequences must be put into effect by the people concerned, those involved in local relations, or procedural personnel; they cannot be attributed to abstract history.

VII. Historical Indices in Families and Localities

Family historical indices are an order of differences passed on to later people. Injustice in grandparents' division of the household may reappear at grandchildren's weddings and funerals. Relatives' past care, absence from weddings and funerals, the amount of housing property held, debts undertaken, and past matters such as a paternal aunt's financial contribution or a maternal uncle's avoidance may also be used to judge descendants' closeness and distance, responsibility, and respectability. Although descendants were not present at the original scene, they still receive indices such as old homes, burial grounds, names, wedding seating orders, amounts in cash-gift ledgers, and elders' old remarks. Household division, elder care, relationships and marriage, borrowing, and gatherings of relatives trigger these entry points, followed by interpretation and contestation. Some call receiving more housing unjust; others see it as compensation. Still others point out the difficulties at the time or remind everyone that the contributions of a daughter who married into another family have long been forgotten. An old remark that once carried little weight may thus gain weight in new divisions of property and arrangements for elder care. Family history preserves not the whole past, but old differences that descendants will still use to assess closeness and distance, what is owed, responsibility, and respectability.

For family indices to enter descendants' responsibilities, relatives must present them and current relations must recognize them. Old homes, burial grounds, seating orders, cash gifts, and designations do not automatically prescribe who should provide care or contribute more money. They act only when interpreted in concrete relational fields. Different kinship positions will change the weight of old materials. Senior and junior branches and daughters who married into other families can present materials concerning care, financial contributions, debt, or absence. Family memory can support compensation as well as opposing judgments of responsibility.

When family indices are presented in property division, care, relationships and marriage, or lending and borrowing, they connect old evaluations to descendants' responsibilities. Who once provided care and who is considered to owe others may alter present allocations and recognition among relatives, making responsibility a result of old differences re-entering relations. New judgments may also be preserved: current evaluations among relatives, cash-gift records, and arrangements for relationships and marriage leave indices for the next

round. If current judgments are written into new accounts, cash-gift ledgers, or relatives' evaluations, they may in turn become materials for later extraction. Family history is thus not a constraint established once and for all. Preserved differences affect later responsibilities and qualifications only when they enter new chains of judgment.

Local history turns disasters, migration, and land conflicts into materials through which local people judge insiders and outsiders, closeness and distance, and responsibility. Who opened granaries or hoarded grain during a famine, who fled or stayed, who saved people, and who seized land amid the disorder may not all enter formal records, yet may remain in place names, reputation, local gazetteers, inscriptions, elders' stories, and family reputations. The order of arrival, land occupation, settlement at the margins, intermarriage, and recognition brought by migration gradually enter local boundaries. Land conflicts may make old contracts, place names, burial grounds, irrigation channels, wooded hills, ancestral graves, and elders' testimony into indices for the next dispute. Local history does not sit motionless in local gazetteers. It returns to actual judgments, affecting who is seen as a local or a later arrival, which family is reliable or carries old grievances, which piece of land cannot be lightly disturbed, and which road and which name make people fall silent. Historicization brings local disasters, migration, and reputations into judgments of insiders and outsiders and the allocation of responsibility.

Local nodes need to be sustained through both space and narration. Place names, roads, old homes, old factories, burial grounds, and irrigation channels provide visible entry points. Elders' stories, local reputation, local gazetteers, and family reputations explain what those entry points mean in local relations, connecting visible things back to migration, disasters, and reputations. Materials concerning migration and disasters differ in their strength of transmission. Formal records may leave only a one-line trace, while local accounts may retain relations concerning who arrived first, who was pushed out, and who gained recognition. When the two enter a dispute, they will produce different interpretations.

Only when land, grave relocation, land expropriation, or local identity becomes an issue do these old entry points change evaluations and boundaries. If space is altered or narration interrupted, the origins of an index may become hard to identify, and local history may be unable to enter judgment. Later people may still find fragments in old routes, place names, or burial grounds. Whether those fragments can reconnect to local relations, however, depends on who preserves them, who recounts them, and whether the current relational field raises the question. Changes in boundaries, evaluations, and responsibilities all need to be carried out by actors and procedures within the current relational field.

VIII. National Memory and State Historicization

National history is not proof of bloodline, nor can it be reduced to a narrative solely of victimhood. A nation forms through long-term interaction and transmission across generations among partially overlapping networks of small communities. National history is the result of these networks preserving, interpreting, transmitting, and contesting shared memory. Shared harm can harden boundaries, but it is not the sole source of a nation. Language, rites and customs, marriage, migration, place names, religion, schools, institutions, shared risks, shared recognition, and shared consequences likewise enter national history. Once harm is preserved, it may pass on to later people through family stories, commemorative days, schooling, museums, literature, oral accounts, and state narratives. Those who never experienced it can thereby take up a sense of boundaries and responsibility, shame, vigilance, and community consciousness. What is preserved is also contested. Whose harm and sacrifice receive names, who is downweighted, how internal betrayal and protection are interpreted, and how intermarriage, mixed settlement, blurred boundaries, and shared life are situated all affect whether the boundaries of national communities harden or retain room for adjustment.

Shared memory enters later people's lives precisely through narration, education, commemoration, and recognition, making certain differences more readily seen as a shared past. The strength of boundaries thereby acquired through transmission across generations comes from concrete historical connections, not bloodline itself; it cannot be written as bloodline unfolding on its own. Contests over national history determine which memory can acquire a public name and a direction of responsibility. This can harden boundaries or retain room for adjustment. Those concerned within a community occupy different positions, and which materials are presented, which harms, acts of protection, and silences are preserved, and which interpretations are recognized vary accordingly. Partially overlapping networks mean that boundaries carry intersecting relations. Intermarriage, mixed settlement, shared life, and shared risks preserve connections across boundaries, and these may coexist with narratives emphasizing shared harm. Multiple local and family versions may also resist a single boundary. National history thus contains both cohesion and dispute.

The state formats some past differences into public memory that can be taught, commemorated, and put into effect. Many memories already existed in families, localities, and national communities; the state is not the creator of the entire past. Yet archives, teaching materials, commemorative days, museums, rolls of martyrs, administrative divisions, legal names, border records, and written judgments will change how they are preserved, extracted, mutually recognized, and put into effect. The strength of state nodes comes from connections among preservation, mutual recognition, education, and implementation.

Archival institutions preserve and locate records and documents. When relevant personnel and procedures retrieve and mutually recognize archival records, parts of the past can gain recognition across institutions. Writers of teaching materials and educational procedures bring organized materials into schools and examination systems to extend their circulation and use. Organizers of commemorative activities and commemorative procedures arrange periodic public appearances, bringing some materials into public life at regular intervals. Administrative naming and legal names bring certain designations into everyday implementation and connect them to formal judgment. Other records and facilities, too, can potentially give parts of the past a stronger capacity to circulate and be used only when those records and facilities are used in concrete situations.

Formatting is also accompanied by compression. In organization and formatting, materials already held by families, localities, and national communities are reorganized and may lose local circumstances, individual circumstances, and differences among versions. Local differences may be condensed into public narratives, a past with multiple versions organized into a teachable version, fluid boundaries turned into administrative

boundaries, and complex and varied individual circumstances placed under names such as reward, punishment, sacrifice, illegality, hero, or enemy. State historicization may preserve downweighted harms, but may also create new forgetting through its selection and trimming. Procedures for transmission across generations may extend recognition, or may continue to downweight versions already downweighted.

Although state nodes have a stronger capacity for circulation and use, they are neither the source of the entire past nor the sole subjects of historicization. Family, local, and national nodes may still preserve differences not subjected to public formatting, retain different versions, and contest interpretive authority. How procedures select and name is the key to understanding state historicization. The entry point for analysis remains which differences are preserved or compressed in concrete procedures, how indices form, who gains positions of interpretation, and how later people will extract these pasts anew.

IX. Renewed Extraction and Renewed Weight Assignment

The force of historicization lies in past differences being available for renewed extraction and renewed weight assignment in future relational fields, rather than retaining the same operative weight forever. Their weight depends on what kinds of nodes preserve them, what kinds of indices trigger them, and in what kinds of relational fields they enter actors' judgments.

Old family matters ordinarily carry little weight but may gain weight when households are divided, elder care arranged, money borrowed, or relationships and marriage considered. Place names and surnames also gain new operative weight in land disputes, grave relocations, land expropriation, or old clan or local grievances. Even if a local conflict has long remained outside public view, an elder's old remark, a place name, or a burial ground may become an entry point in a new conflict. Harm suffered by a nation may reappear through boundary conflicts, commemorative days, educational disputes, or external pressure. Judgments in archives may be retrieved during hiring reviews, loans, travel, and eligibility applications.

The consequences of historicization thus fall in the future: after preservation, compression, indexing, and interpretation, past differences re-enter events and acquire weight. This is not historical determinism. Without preservation, entry points, triggering within relational fields, concrete extraction, and renewed weight assignment, the past will not automatically determine the present.

Renewed extraction first requires materials that can still be found and indices that can be identified. Relatives present cash-gift ledgers, local people present place names or burial grounds, and institutional personnel present archives or judgments. The materials then enter property division, land disputes, eligibility reviews, or educational disputes. Weight forms through interpretation and recognition. Materials can be connected to responsibility, eligibility, evaluation, belonging, or boundaries. Consequences depend on who presents them, who can disseminate them, whether procedures recognize them, and whether other versions can be compared.

The standing of those presenting materials, the completeness of the materials, and the scope of procedural recognition will jointly affect the results of renewed extraction. Materials gain relevance through current relational fields involving property division, eligibility, land, or other matters. Interpretation, comparison, and recognition jointly form their weight. Even after a difference has entered judgment, subsequent actors may readjust its weight within that judgment through new records, accounts, or contrary materials.

Renewed extraction does not change the past itself, but changes present action. The results of new judgments about responsibility, eligibility, evaluation, boundaries, or action may in turn be written into accounts, records, commemoration, or naming, becoming materials for the next extraction. If the results of renewed extraction are recorded, the new records will in turn change subsequent visibility.

X. Historicization's Protection, Dangers, and the Boundaries of Volume V

Historicization can protect people and experiences that have been downweighted. If harm is not preserved at all, later people can hardly know what happened. Those sacrificed may also be swallowed up by the later order if they lack names, burial grounds, stories, archives, and commemorations. Place names, routes, genealogies, and accounts within families enable descendants of people forced to migrate to understand why they are where they are. Historical indices and testimony may allow families subjected to injustice to explain anew what is owed within kinship relations. Yet the force of preservation may also turn into danger. Selective memory will draw new boundaries; harm may be connected to endless revenge; sacrifice may be used as a reason to exclude others; a complex past is compressed into a single opposition between friend and enemy; community is written as a pure essence; forgetting and a single version may also produce new injustice. Recognizing the force of historicization does not mean that historical memory is inherently legitimate. We must keep asking what has been preserved and compressed, who acquires interpretive authority, who is forgotten, and which indices will be triggered and assigned weight in the future.

Protective effects require materials to be seen, presented, and recognized. If names, burial grounds, place names, archives, and family testimony cannot enter current relations or procedures, they may remain at weak nodes and cannot automatically produce accountability, repair, or protection. Historical materials can support accountability, protection, and repair through archives, commemoration, teaching materials, family accounts, or procedural recognition. Yet accountability, protection, and repair all depend on specific interpretation and conditions of recognition.

Danger, too, arises through concrete processing. Fixing selective preservation as the only version, compressing complex relations into friend and enemy through commemoration, and excluding other materials through interpretive authority will all turn old differences into new boundaries and punishments. The same preservation may also be used to exclude, sacralize one version, downweight other memories, or freeze complex relations. Danger comes from how materials are organized and circulate for use, not from historicization having a single predetermined value.

Analysis of historicization must examine together whom it protects, whom it downweights, which materials are sacralized, and how subsequent relational fields extract them, avoiding the treatment of memory as inherently just or inherently oppressive. This retains the openness of the mechanism without prescribing any historical version in advance as the final answer.

Volume V has now formed a continuous line of mechanisms. Institutionalization brings differences into rules and thresholds, organizing the present. Class theory and its interpreters brutally project high-weight differences into class images. National-community formation enables partially overlapping networks to form the boundaries of historical communities, connecting memory across generations. State incorporation of differences formats differences, brings them into mutual recognition, and connects them to chains of implementation, extending their circulation and use. Historicization preserves the past as an order of differentiation available for future extraction, retaining entry points into the future. Institutionalization, class-image formation, national-community formation, state incorporation of differences, and historicization can all give differences forms available for extraction across generations. Yet each handles different stages and positions of differences, using different mechanisms of preservation, classification, boundaries, and circulation and use. They can connect to one another, but cannot replace one another.

Differences do not act only in the present. High-intensity social orders formed through concrete materials, nodes, rules, and interpretive procedures all have real consequences; they are not fictitious. The orders formed by these mechanisms can persist, and can also encounter disputes or be rewritten. Yet persistence explains

only how an order is sustained. The results of preservation, the results of compression, low-dimensional images, formatted records, and historical versions are not what society fundamentally is, nor do they amount to legitimacy or historical inevitability. Subsequent judgments must still ask which versions were downweighted in the process. The danger lies in users mistaking these products of preservation and compression for what society fundamentally is. The erroneous mechanisms of explanation this gives rise to will be examined in the next volume.

Chapter 22. Why Theory Must Simplify

I. Simplification Is the Starting Point of Judgment

When judging a job, a person cannot unfold their entire life, their whole family, all their local relations, all their historical indices, and all their forms of eligibility within state systems at once. Someone looking for work carries more than a question of wages: there are also age, medical history, elders at home, children's schooling, rent, debt, household registration, local relations, past employment, whether their body can cope with staying up at night, and whether they have a fallback. A school receiving a child likewise cannot fully understand every aspect of the family's circumstances. School admission is not simply a question of student registration; behind it lie family migration, the parents' work, residence permits, social insurance, rental housing, household registration, school districts, school capacity, and local institutions.

Still less can a theory unfold every differentiating unit, every weight, every node, and every historical index in a single sentence. This is not because these differences do not exist. They are all there, but judgment must begin. Once judgment begins, it cannot unfold all of reality at once; it must undertake limited distinction extraction. Simplification does not abolish complexity. It is a form of compression necessary for action.

Judgments in everyday life, institutional judgments, and theoretical judgments must all proceed from limited positions. Limited extraction in everyday life lets people address the most pressing responsibilities first. If everyday judgment had to shoulder every relation at once, it could not form an immediate response. If institutional judgment rejected form fields and ordering, it too could not process materials. Rules, form fields, materials, and processing deadlines bring particular differences into judgment to be identified first, while other differences remain temporarily at the periphery. Without concepts and images, theoretical judgment could not even compare different consequences. All three need a limited beginning, but such a beginning authorizes no judgment to replace the rest of reality. All three kinds of judgment may omit important relations.

Volume VI addresses erroneous explanation, but it cannot begin by opposing theory. If simplification is treated as an error from the outset, every explanation will be struck down, leaving only the lament that “society is very complex.” That is not theoretical clarity but the abandonment of judgment. Conversely, if simplification is treated as all-powerful, and the set of differences one has extracted is taken to be the whole of reality, explanation will move toward illusory construction. The first step in this volume is therefore to establish simplification's legitimate place rather than criticize it: theory must simplify reality, or it cannot judge. Without simplification there is no judgment; without compression there is no transmission; without limited distinction extraction there is no action.

Examining simplification and rejecting theory are two different questions. Examining how institutions extract materials does not amount to denying that institutions need simplification. To examine simplification is to ask how these selections and omissions came about, whether the extracted differences still correspond to current consequences, when the simplification ceases to work, and whether a return remains possible. The test of a theory is not whether it needs compression. Examination must instead address its particular ways of extracting: whether it knows how it compresses, what it extracts, what it downweights, and whether it still retains a channel for unfolding complex reality again. Rejecting theory cancels these questions as well, pushing every judgment back to its starting point.

II. Limited Distinction Extraction Is Not a Copy of Reality

Judgment does not copy reality; it undertakes limited distinction extraction within a concrete relational field. Take the same family of a worker from elsewhere. The differences extracted in judgment vary completely with the events the family faces. When wages go unpaid, those concerned and those intervening do not begin by unfolding the family's entire migration history, marital relations, and local reputation. They first extract wages, working hours, the labor contract, the timing of wage arrears, debt, rent, and work risks.

When the occasion is a child's school admission, judgment does not begin by asking what historical indices of kinship the family has back home. It first extracts household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, length of residence, the school district, and available school places. If the question becomes whether the family can gain local recognition, the focus of differentiation shifts to accent, ties with people from the same place of origin, length of residence, exchanges with neighbors, participation in weddings and funerals, and local rites and customs. In relationships and marriage, family reputation, medical history, kinship responsibilities, local historical indices, and past disputes may suddenly gain weight. None of these extractions captures the family's entire reality. Yet any concrete judgment, if it is to be formed, must first extract some differences from complex reality.

Society is not a plane that can be seen all at once, nor is an individual's social position determined by one label. The same person may be a worker, a person from elsewhere, a father, a patient, or a debtor; someone from a particular village or within a particular national community; someone outside a particular school system, a descendant within a particular family historical index, or someone with or without documents in a particular state record. These identities are not decorations. They all gain weight in different relational fields: wages in labor disputes; household registration when a child enters school; accent in local recognition; medical history in employment and in relationships and marriage; kinship responsibilities in borrowing money, elder care, and household division; national memory in boundary conflicts, commemoration, and shared responsibility; and historical indices in new distributions, disputes, and recognition.

The presentation of differences is also constrained by the positions from which materials can be obtained. Some people can present formal proof; others can preserve only oral accounts or memories within relations. Materials not yet presented have not entered the current image; this does not mean they have been judged nonexistent. If an explanation were required to unfold all differences at once, it could not begin. If an institution were required to understand a person's entire life at once, it could not operate. If a family were required to reinvestigate its entire history whenever borrowing money, considering relationships and marriage, or arranging elder care, everyday family judgment would also come to a halt. The abundance of reality is invoked to explain why judgment must be limited, not to cancel judgment. Limitation is not an error; it is a condition for judgment to occur.

Limited distinction extraction does not require everyday judgment to become a complete theory. In making a provisional judgment, people can refrain from rewriting unprocessed differences as an absence of differences, while retaining a position from which to look back and re-examine them later. Materials appear at different times, people's attention is occupied by current responsibilities, and procedures arrange different materials at different positions. Three states must be distinguished here. Not yet extracted means that a difference has not entered the image immediately before us. Temporarily downweighted means that the difference has been seen but has not acquired relatively high weight at this moment. Denying its existence cancels its standing to re-enter the field of view. Only by distinguishing these three can we avoid mistaking the limits of our own view for the boundaries of reality without abandoning judgment.

Processing capacity also limits how many relational chains can be maintained at once. When materials exceed present capacity, some differences recede temporarily, but their positions of retreat can still be recorded. When consequences show that the original ordering is no longer appropriate, judgment can rearrange priorities. This is fundamentally different from declaring that the differences which receded never existed. Distinction extraction does not copy the whole of reality, because every image leaves some parts unprocessed. Nor is it arbitrary selection: the extracted differences must still be capable of being brought back to the question, relational positions, and actual consequences for examination.

The questioner does not stand outside relations and cut them up at will. The question faced, the materials available, the position occupied, and the consequences to be borne constrain the direction of extraction. People within families can form judgments through care and responsibility; people within local relations can form judgments through exchanges and recognition. Everyday life need not wait for formal procedures before distinction extraction begins. Non-arbitrariness comes from examinable connections between extraction and the question, materials, and consequences, not from approval by a single procedure. Everyday judgments within families, localities, or communities can also form examinable connections. They do not have to be converted into institutional materials before they can be non-arbitrary.

Limited extraction within institutions can likewise be compared, because different ways of handling things leave different consequences. Comparing those consequences does not require an institution to shoulder the whole of life at once. It examines whether a particular extraction has hidden the positions bearing the results. Extracted materials are temporarily presented in a working image along a particular direction, enabling the questioner to judge the next action. The scope within which that image is effective must be bounded by the question and consequences faced. How materials are seen and connected affects the direction of the working image. This does not require every judgment first to gain recognition through the same kind of procedure; it requires those judging to explain their position of extraction and scope of application.

Users of theory, too, can undertake only limited distinction extraction. A working image can be formed along axes of labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, and relations of domination. Working images addressing other questions also form along axes of documents, archives, borders, certification, and implementation, or of prices, rents, wages, consumption, and competition. None of these images is a copy of reality. Users of theory must still explain which differentiating units they extracted, which differences they downweighted, and precisely which concrete questions the image applies to.

III. Relational Fields and Weights Bound the Direction of Simplification

Simplification does not arbitrarily reduce reality, nor does it mean theory sitting on high and deciding in advance what will always matter and what will never matter. A relational field first presents a demand for judgment. A relational field describes a concrete combination of questions, positions, materials, and consequences; it must not be written as an independent personality issuing demands. The field itself neither chooses nor acts for anyone. Different explanations extract different differences from the same family of a worker from elsewhere because the questions themselves differ, not because interpreters can choose materials at will. The relational field first presents a demand for judgment; only then does explanation begin distinction extraction.

These acts of extraction must be traced back to concrete positions: the people concerned present their circumstances, reviewers identify materials according to the procedures in which they operate, and relatives or people within the relations respond through existing forms of recognition. In a question of unpaid wages, the relational field calls for labor, wages, working hours, contracts, and risks to be extracted; the parties to the

dispute and those handling it bring earnings and risks into judgment. In school-admission procedures, what must be extracted is household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and the school district. Both families and schools or reviewers identify eligibility materials.

Local recognition calls for the extraction of accent, exchanges with neighbors, ties with people from the same place of origin, and local rites and customs. Relationships and marriage call for family reputation, medical history, kinship responsibilities, and local historical indices; those concerned, together with relatives or people within the relations, reassess exchanges and responsibilities. Historical migration calls for ancestral place of origin, migration routes, old family accounts, burial grounds, and local memory.

Without asking about the relational field, theory will extract the differences most familiar to it everywhere: economic oppression whenever it sees a family, forms of eligibility within state systems whenever it sees a school, class displacement whenever it sees a nation, and narratives of victimization whenever it sees history. Such explanation may look clear, but it is already being used in the wrong relational field. When this happens, specific users have moved a familiar image to an ill-matched position; no abstract environment has made a wrong choice on its own. Different relational fields extract different differences from the same object, and the same set of differences carries different weights in different relational fields. Different fields give simplification different directions. Without attention to the relational field, simplification turns from a tool into occlusion. Misplacing materials need not change the materials themselves, but it changes the consequences to which they are connected. Household registration can acquire weight in school-admission eligibility, but when moved into the handling of unpaid wages it cannot replace working hours and earnings. Family memory can affect evaluations in relationships and marriage, but it cannot automatically acquire the same position when moved to other questions.

The existence of differences, their extraction, and their acquisition of weight are continuous but distinct levels. Existence means that differences are already present in the world. Extraction means that concrete judgment brings differences into the foreground. Weight assignment concerns the intensity with which differences enter into consequences within current relations. If these three levels are collapsed, seeing materials will be mistaken for their always being important. Separating them makes it possible to explain why the same difference carries different weight in different relational fields. A difference may exist for a long time without necessarily being presented in every judgment. Wages can exist in life and can be brought into a dispute by those concerned, yet even after being presented, a difference may still not have entered the current relational chain. The existence of materials does not guarantee that they can change eligibility, responsibility, or evaluation. Limits arising from procedural positions are not abstract defects. They explain who can present materials, who can respond to them, and which differences will change form in transmission. These differences of position can offer clues for later revision. The visibility of materials also changes over time. Differences not presented earlier may become entry points for renewed judgment after results have formed. Temporary downweighting is therefore not permanent exclusion.

Extracting differences is only the first step. Explanation must also judge their relative weight and assign weight to them within concrete relational fields. There is no table of weights fixed in advance, nor any single threshold through which differences acquire weight. Weight must always be observed within concrete relational fields. Wages, household registration, accent, medical history, kinship responsibilities, local relations, national memory, and historical indices may all coexist in the same family of a worker from elsewhere, but they will not be equally important in every relational field.

Weight assignment has different points of emphasis in concrete situations. When wages go unpaid, wages, working hours, labor risks, debt, and rent weigh more. When a child enters school, household registration,

residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and the school district weigh more. In local recognition, accent, ties with people from the same place of origin, length of residence, and exchanges with neighbors weigh more. In relationships and marriage, family reputation, medical history, kinship responsibilities, and local historical indices may gain weight. In household division and elder care, historical indices, care records, houses, cash-gift ledgers, and things elders have said may gain weight. In boundary conflicts, commemoration, and shared responsibility, national memory may gain weight.

This weight assignment is not arranged at will; it arises from the demands of the relational field. Wages gain weight in labor disputes because the current question calls for judgments about labor earnings, the bearing of risk, and fallbacks in life. This does not mean wages always override everything. Household registration gains weight in school-admission eligibility because current institutional nodes are extracting household registration, student registration, and residence eligibility, not because household registration is always more real than wages. Family historical indices gain weight in relationships and marriage because new relations are entering an old kinship network, triggering past differences, not because historical indices always govern the family. The relative weight of wages, household registration, or family memory depends on how the current question connects them to fallbacks in life, access through eligibility, or evaluations of responsibility. A material's gaining weight in another relational field does not mean it can govern every question forever.

Dangerous explanation often begins not with extracting the wrong differences, but with mistaking weight assignment within one relational field for eternal weight. Real differentiating units such as labor, debt, housing, and risk, together with their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression, may form powerful explanations within a limited scope on relevant questions. But if interpreters using class theory turn such explanations within a limited scope directly into the highest weight in every relational field, they will occlude nation, locality, family, institutional eligibility, and historical indices. A state image may be powerful on questions of documents, archives, borders, and implementation. Yet if it is turned directly into the supreme explanation of all society, it will occlude family, markets, localities, communities, and historical memory. Healthy explanation must recognize that weights form within concrete relational fields; they are not an eternal underlying reality.

IV. Explanation Must Connect Differences into Relational Images

Listing wages, household registration, accent, medical history, kinship responsibilities, local relations, national memory, and historical indices is not explanation. It merely heaps society back into a pile of materials. A list can enumerate differences such as wages, debt, housing, and family fallbacks; multifactor analysis likewise only places differences side by side. Social Differentiation Network Theory asks how these differences connect to form positions and consequences. Explanation means finding how differences connect, rather than listing more factors. A relational image must return differences to nodes, transitions between nodes, and relational chains, tracing how they jointly change positions.

When attention is limited, distinction extraction creates an order of priority, but that order is not an eternal ranking of value. A difference not given priority now may still become decisive in another question. Listing wages, debt, housing, and family fallbacks together means only that the materials are visible at the same time. Explanation also requires tracing how wages are determined at employment nodes, how debt changes the risk that can be borne, how housing constrains action, and how family fallbacks ease or worsen consequences. The role of counterexamples is limited to requiring a fresh look at whether a connection holds or a node has been omitted. They are not to be made into a new principle governing every explanation.

Positions of transition between nodes may also change the form of materials. A material may first be evaluated within a family and then enter institutional procedures, or it may first be fixed in an archive and then return to the action space of those concerned. Once old family accounts enter a record, some relational evaluations become fixed while other background recedes. When institutional results return to a family, they may become new grounds for responsibility. Different sequences of nodes and different ways of recasting may produce different consequences. If explanation misses these transitions between nodes, it can hardly show how differences actually enter into consequences for action.

Only when wages, debt, housing, fallbacks, and risk are connected do they form an image for judging a labor situation. Someone with low wages but no debt, no rent to pay, and family fallback support is not in the same situation as someone on equally low wages who carries debt, rents, supports a sick person, and has no fallback. Only when household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and school districts are connected do they form an image for judging school-admission eligibility. A child does not abstractly “want to go to school.” The child must enter a set of institutional nodes: where they live, what their parents have provided, whether their documents are continuous, how school districts are drawn, and how places are allocated.

Only when language, marriage, place names, shared memory, and shared consequences are connected do they form an image for judging national networks. A national community is not an isolated label; it consists of paths of recognition, boundaries, and responsibility transmitted over time through partially overlapping networks. The same holds for historical images. A place name, a grave, an old account, or an archival document does not act in isolation. They must be triggered, interpreted, and contested within a new relational field before they re-enter judgment. Explanation does not place differences side by side; it explains how those differences connect to form consequences. This is also why this book opposes multifactor collage. Society is not a few factors added together. Differences are extracted, assigned weight, and connected within relational fields, forming consequences for action.

V. Compression Makes Transmission of Materials Possible

A relation of distinction extraction exists between the questioner and the materials. A question does not arise from materials naturally arranging themselves, yet neither can the questioner invent it at will. Subsequent actual consequences can be used to examine whether this distinction extraction holds up. In this process, different carriers undertake compression in different directions.

As entry points for identifying eligibility, documents point to eligibility that can be identified. Records preserve the traces of procedures and the results of handling that were once written into them. Unlike these two, family accounts preserve relational evaluations that can be retold and carried forward. Categories facilitate comparison across positions, while concepts gather dispersed differences into forms that can be discussed, laying out common threads for comparison.

Every kind of carrier downweights some of what was present at the scene, but such downweighting does not necessarily mean error. Concrete judgment requires entry points appropriate to the current question. One must neither demand that a single carrier encompass everything carried by other carriers, nor neglect to examine whether the downweighted contents affect the current question and whether other entry points remain through which they can be unfolded again.

After limited distinction extraction, weight assignment within a relational field, and the connecting and combining of differences, explanation must still compress. Without compression, judgment cannot be transmitted. Compression lets complex reality leave the scene of its occurrence and enter forms that can be

transmitted, compared, and judged. Without compression, the past cannot be transmitted, institutions cannot operate, and theory cannot be expressed. Family historical indices must be compressed into a few sentences to be passed to the next generation: “The eldest took more that year”; “Her family contributed money back then”; “That branch of the family did not look after the elders.” These statements are not the whole past, but they allow past differences to move across generations.

Local history must be compressed into place names, inscriptions, reputation, and stories to circulate. State records must be compressed into archives, documents, and categories to be mutually recognized. Schools must compress complex families into student registration, household registration, social insurance, and eligibility materials. Theory must compress complex reality into concepts, sentences, images for judgment, and accounts before it can be discussed.

Concepts also perform compression in transmission. They make differences comparable and capable of being passed on, but do not preserve together with them the positions where things happened, the relational chains, and what remains unsaid. Using a concept still requires returning to what it extracted.

Yet compression necessarily sacrifices detail. When a family historical index is compressed into one sentence, care, illness and debt, work away from home, differences of sex, and elders' favoritism may be downweighted. When local history is compressed into a place name, mixed settlement, exchange, intermarriage, and conflict during migration may be downweighted. When state records are compressed into a category, people's concrete circumstances may be downweighted. When theory compresses reality into an image for judgment, differences that have not entered the image also recede. Compression itself is therefore not the error. The error comes when compression is forgotten after it has occurred. Information loss does not automatically prove a judgment wrong. What matters is to examine whether this loss obscures precisely the crucial differences in the current consequences, and whether other materials still preserve an entry point for return.

VI. Limited Explanations Can Still Be Compared

Not exhausting reality does not mean that all explanations fail equally. This must be made clear in advance, or we will later encounter an illicit substitution: since every explanation is limited, every explanation fails; since every explanation fails, effective and ineffective explanations are indistinguishable. This is the error of Model C: it substitutes “all fail” for “all are limited.” Here we establish the distinction without developing Model C, which will receive dedicated treatment later. Acknowledging limitation serves to enable more precise comparison, not to cancel comparison. Limited, erroneous, and ineffective are therefore not synonyms. Still less can limitation entail that all accounts have the same value. Ordinary limited explanations can retain explanatory power provided they state their scope, accept counterexamples, and permit comparison.

The provisional character of a working image is not weakness. It allows the image to enter concrete comparison with other materials and consequences. The more clearly the image specifies its scope, the easier it is to know when it needs reopening. Ordinary limited explanations can be compared by what they extract. What they extract, what they downweight, and whether this is proportionate to the weights of the current question are all differences that can be examined concretely. Accuracy in identifying materials is one measure of comparison here. Accuracy does not mean piling up quantities of material within an image, but whether the extracted materials can explain the consequences now occurring. Whether nodes and relational chains are seen affects an explanation's accuracy. Merely listing materials without tracing their transitions between nodes, leaving crucial nodes and transitions out of the image, may yield an image whose wording is clear but which cannot explain consequences.

Fit with the relational field is another important measure of comparison. Fit is not an abstract verdict of good or bad; it concerns whether an image is placed in an appropriate relational field. If the same image explains consequences in one question but occludes relations when moved to another, the results in both fields are not thereby equally effective. Connected with this is the capacity to revise in response to counterexamples. Such capacity does not mean changing one's account at will. It concerns whether interpreters acknowledge difficulties when contrary materials appear, whether they can adjust the scope, and whether they specify which weights, nodes, or connections need re-examination. An explanation can be compared with others as long as it states its scope and makes clear what it extracts, what it downweights, the relational fields in which it is effective, and whether it can face counterexamples and permit revision. A limited explanation is not an ineffective explanation.

Under these explicit constraints, ordinary limited explanations taking different approaches can indeed be compared with one another. For example, interpreters using a state image can trace documents, archives, borders, certification, and implementation. Interpreters using a market image can trace prices, rents, wages, consumption, and competition. Interpreters using a historical image can trace how past differences are preserved, triggered, and assigned weight anew. These ordinary limited explanations can be compared using the measures just stated, rather than relying on closed systems that cannot be compared.

Class theory does not belong among these ordinary limited models. Real differentiating units such as labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, and capacity for domination, together with the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them, can form partial explanatory power. An image can also present certain real circumstances, but this presentation of circumstances is not attributable to any autonomous explanatory power of the image itself. The class image is only a low-dimensional output of this process. It cannot on this account be placed alongside Model A and Model B as a limited explanation.

VII. The Same Object Requires Multiple Limited Images

The same person or family exists simultaneously within relations of labor, institutions, kinship, locality, and history. Different questions give different differences within these relations greater weight. Faced with the same family of a worker from elsewhere, someone handling unpaid wages can first trace wages, working hours, debt, housing, and risk. Someone handling the children's school admission must trace household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and administrative eligibility. When the question concerns local recognition, relationships and marriage, or historical memory, accent, exchanges, kinship responsibilities, migration routes, and historical indices come to the foreground. Each image has its own scope of materials and consequences. One cannot require any image to shoulder all relations at once, still less let any of them decide the answers for every relational field in advance.

Simplification has force because it brings dispersed differences into a single image through which judgment becomes possible. Someone who finds life hard may be unable to say exactly what weighs them down: low wages, high rent, pressing debt, dangerous work, no fallback, dependents at home. When these differences exist separately, they are simply many pressures. Class theory and the interpreters who use it place labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, and capacity for domination within the same image, enabling people to see a burdensome situation concretely.

Likewise, a family meeting obstacles everywhere in the city may be unable to say where the problem lies: materials are required for the child's school admission, renting cannot prove stability, social insurance is insufficiently continuous, household registration is elsewhere, and the residence permit falls a few months short. Interpreters using an image of state incorporation of differences place documents, archives, borders,

certification, mutual recognition, and implementation within the same image. People can then see why they cannot readily pass through the procedures of many institutions.

In local society, the unwillingness of people in a locality to accept marriages involving a particular family may likewise have more than one cause. Accent, old grievances, ancestral place of origin, migration, wedding and funeral exchanges, local reputation, and kinship designations are all at work. Only by connecting these differences can interpreters using an image of local networks explain why the obstacles facing this family cannot be reduced to “low income” or “a different culture.”

And when relations become tense again on a national community's commemorative day, the past has not returned automatically. Only when language, place names, shared harm, shared resistance, education, commemoration, external pressure, and shared responsibility are triggered together do they produce the consequence of hardened boundaries.

Images enable dispersed materials to be named, compared, and transmitted, and allow people at different positions to coordinate action around a consequence. Family accounts can arrange responsibilities; records and documents can support procedural handling; concepts can guide theoretical comparison. This power takes shape through these uses. This does not mean that an image has become an autonomous entity. In concrete operation, comparison makes dispersed circumstances visible on a common scale; transmission lets materials cross their original nodes; coordination enables people at different positions to connect their handling of matters; and action brings judgment back to responsibilities, qualifications, and choices. Each kind of power depends on concrete practice. None proves that the image has revealed an underlying reality that need not be unfolded further. If a successful image is applied repeatedly after leaving its original question, convenience in use may occlude the differences it has not processed.

Multiple limited images of the same object therefore cannot simply be added together, still less directly combined into a total image. Images capable of complementing one another usually each retain a clearly defined partial scope. Interpreters using a labor image can trace earnings and risk; those using an institutional image can trace eligibility and certification; those using a historical image can trace preservation and triggering. If one partial image addresses earnings and risk and another addresses access through eligibility, they can complement one another at their interface and check one another where they connect, rather than either image encompassing the whole.

Differences in weight assignment may also be affected by changes in relations. When new responsibilities, qualifications, or risks appear, materials that once seemed slight may acquire a new position, but this does not make them a fixed highest weight. Different explanations can extract different differences from the same object. The key to theoretical comparison is not which explanation can encompass everything, but which better fits the dominant weights in the current relational field. The error lies in passing off a set of differences as the whole, not in extracting that set. If users all claim that the images they employ grasp every consequence, their judgments may conflict. Conflicting images must return to the question and consequences. If one image elevates weights within a limited scope into the highest weights for every question, differences retained by another image will be downweighted. Merely placing their names side by side in writing cannot remove this conflict.

Even after a difference enters an image, we must ask along which relational chain it acts. If intermediate nodes remain unseen, the distance between differences and consequences will be improperly shortened. When judgments conflict, the solution is to compare materials, relational fields, and relational chains, not to invent another model encompassing every image. Complementarity requires users to acknowledge the partial scopes addressed by the different images. When conflict occurs, they must judge which image has been pushed

beyond its scope of application. If labor differences really change school-admission or family consequences, interpreters can trace how they connect across nodes. Without that relational chain, however, two images cannot be combined directly merely because they address the same object.

VIII. Healthy Simplification Must Retain a Return Channel

Transitions between nodes turn a list into an image. Who preserves materials, who recasts them, and who accepts them affect whether they can enter subsequent judgment and how they return to the positions of those concerned. Transmission never moves content unchanged: every passing-on retains some differences and downweights others. Only with this understanding can users of carriers avoid mistaking form for complete reality. The danger of simplification arises not from failing to exhaust every detail, but from cutting off paths to what remains unprocessed. Forgetting boundaries lets a partial image expand outward; denying remaining differences rewrites the unprocessed as nonexistent; reification lets a tool of judgment masquerade as reality itself; using an image in the wrong relational field connects effective materials to erroneous consequences; and excluding counterexamples closes the entry point for renewed examination.

These forms of overstepping have concrete mechanisms in different images that cannot substitute for one another. One danger cannot stand in for the others. The risk of the class image lies in its brutal projection masquerading as underlying reality: differences of labor, income, property, housing, debt, and risk are projected into the sole underlying reality. National-community networks, however, are real historical relations. Their members, families, and those who transmit things across generations, record keepers, educators, organizers, or disseminators also simplify in practice, compressing intricate interactions into names, boundaries, designations, and responsibilities. This simplification is itself useful. Its distinctive danger lies in detaching long-term interaction, shared memory, boundaries, and responsibility from their historical course, then turning them into an essence, a matter of bloodline, and something eternal. This differs in origin from the danger of class theory's ontologizing projection.

Interpreters using state, market, or historical images likewise face different risks of overstepping. Those using a state image extract nodes such as documents, archives, borders, and implementation. Their danger lies in expanding institutional nodes such as certification and implementation into the whole of society and compressing them into a single personality. Users of a market image may expand exchange and prices into all of society, elevating them into the sole governing force. If users write historical materials as causes that automatically govern the present, they too overstep the concrete conditions of preservation, triggering, and renewed extraction. Identifying where these different images begin to overstep serves here to mark their respective limits, rather than to develop their subsequent mechanisms in advance.

Healthy simplification must therefore retain a return channel. A return channel is defined as what allows a compressed image to be reopened. Healthy explanation does not reject simplification; it knows where simplification occurs. It extracts some differentiating units from complex reality, assigns them weight within a concrete relational field, connects them into an image for judgment, and further compresses them into an account that can circulate and be transmitted. A return channel requires interpreters to specify three things together: which differences were extracted, which contents were downweighted, and which relational fields the image applies to. Only when the scope is specified does the position at which later materials can re-enter become clear. Differences that did not enter the image have not disappeared; they may gain weight again in other relational fields. As long as an explanation retains the capacity to reopen its image, it is a limited explanation. Once it cuts off the return channel and treats itself as reality itself, it begins moving toward illusory construction.

When an explanation begins to harden, first ask which differences it extracted and which contents it downweighted, then whether those differences have gained weight in the current relational field. In this examination, overlooked records and relational positions that never entered the procedure may both alter the weights originally assigned and the consequences derived from them. Re-examining records previously given little attention can fill gaps in the materials.

The next questions are which crucial nodes have gone unseen and which relational chains have been cut off. Severed paths of transmission may likewise alter the original weights and consequences. Identifying where materials were preserved and by whom they were recast allows a return to nodes; tracing the process through which consequences cross different positions allows a return to relational chains.

Whether historical indices have been misread, whether counterexamples have been treated as noise, and whether revision remains possible when materials cannot be accommodated are also crucial to unfolding the image again. Historical indices make it possible to examine how old differences are triggered in the present. Place names, old accounts, archives, and memories are not the past itself. Only after they have been extracted, connected, and assigned weight within new relational fields is it possible for them to change current judgment. The existence of counterexamples forces interpreters to confront materials their images cannot accommodate. Such unfolding again will alter the original bearing of responsibility, judgments of eligibility, and evaluations, and change the starting point of subsequent explanation. It need not overturn the entire original image. Once materials are added, the original bearing of responsibility, judgments of eligibility, and existing evaluations may be revised. The new explanation thus formed will in turn become an entry point for later people to continue examining.

An explanation that cannot be reopened will increasingly resemble a closed image. Only an explanation that can be reopened retains the capacity for calibration. The boundary of healthy simplification concerns whether omissions can still be opened up through materials, nodes, relational chains, historical indices, and counterexamples, rather than whether an image omits details. Once simplification no longer states its boundaries, no longer acknowledges remaining differences, and no longer retains a return channel, it enters dangerous compression. By elevating validity within a limited scope into validity for the whole and treating downweighted differences as nonexistent, compression exceeds its working scope, turns boundaries that should be clear into occlusion, and hardens an image into underlying reality. This is precisely the beginning of explanation's movement toward illusory construction.

Chapter 23. Dangerous Compression

I. How Necessary Compression Oversteps Its Bounds

Compression makes judgment possible in the first place. Without compression, people could not judge, institutions could not record, history could not be transmitted, and theory could not be expressed. The problem lies not in compression itself, but in its being so useful. An entirely ineffective image can hardly sustain people's belief over time; what is truly dangerous is often an image effective only within a limited scope. It captures part of reality, so people are willing to keep using it. The more it can explain part of reality, the more readily it is mistaken for an explanation of all reality. This is the entry point into dangerous compression.

Validity within a limited scope needs particular clarification because it is both the reason an image can be used and a condition under which it may overstep its bounds. In a case of unpaid wages involving the family of a worker from elsewhere, interpreters can form an image along lines of labor, wages, working hours, debt, housing, and risk that captures the heavy consequences now occurring. In a child's school admission, those handling the matter can form an image along lines of documents, archives, eligibility, and mutual recognition that likewise shows how institutional nodes restrict passage through procedures. Weddings and funerals, accents, exchanges, and historical indices within local communities can reveal boundaries of recognition and responsibility. The danger is not that these extractions were once effective, but that users forget what the image downweighted and come to treat a partial image as the whole of reality. When users repeatedly see wages and labor risks in unpaid-wage cases, they may carry this set of effective extractions into different relational fields, such as school admission, local recognition, or kinship responsibilities. If the arrangement of weights originally suited to one question is no longer re-examined, a limited image may be treated as a fixed entry point.

What must therefore be asked is not whether an image was once effective, but who uses it in which relational field, from what materials it was formed, and whether it allows other differences to re-enter. Users of theory, institutional personnel handling matters, and disseminators may all carry forward the same image, but what they carry forward is a way of undertaking distinction extraction, not reality itself. Only when the boundaries of distinction extraction within a limited scope are forgotten does the image's clarity turn into occlusion of the remaining differences.

When the same image is used at different positions, sameness of materials must also be distinguished from sameness of weights. Wages, documents, and local reputation can all be present at once, but the questions faced by those handling unpaid wages, by school-admission procedures, and by community members differ, and the same ordering cannot be retained. Only if users preserve one effective judgment as an answer valid in every relational field does the image begin to detach from the conditions that formed it. Keeping those conditions visible allows limited distinction extraction to remain open to comparison; only when the conditions are erased can a partial image acquire unrestricted explanatory standing. Comparison among images must retain this condition as well. If two explanations extract different materials, the fact that one was effective in a particular question cannot authorize it to govern the other in advance. Comparison should return to the current relational field, establish which nodes, relational chains, and remaining differences each explanation sees, and use whether each explanation can accept counterexamples and revision as an important boundary for judging and calibrating limited explanations.

II. Compression Loss and the Loss of Entry Points

Every compression makes some differences recede; receding is not disappearing. Calling a family a “low-income family” may capture its income difficulties, but does not mean that income is its only problem. It may simultaneously face elder care, medical history, migration, debt, children's school admission, historical indices of kinship, local relations, household-registration eligibility, and marital pressures. If explanation sees only “low income,” the other differences recede, but they do not disappear: the sick still need medical care, elders still need care, debts still fall due, children still need to enter school, historical indices of kinship are still extracted in borrowing money, household division, and relationships and marriage, and local relations still play a role in finding work, renting, school admission, and wedding and funeral exchanges.

Likewise, calling a community a “backward culture” does not mean that its circumstances are in fact determined by culture alone. Institutional pressures, historical harms, state borders, economic circumstances, educational resources, and external hostility may all have been downweighted. Calling a state a “machine of oppression” does not mean that oppression is all it does. Passage enabled by documents, public order, assistance, education, border protection, allocation and coordination in disasters, and resource allocation may also be downweighted by this designation. Writing a historical community as purely a victim does not mean that it contains no disagreements, mixed settlement, protection, intermarriage, boundaries of responsibility, or actual interests. Downweighted differences do not disappear because an explanation has not extracted them; they have only temporarily remained outside the current image for judgment. The danger begins here: explanation treats differences that have not entered the image as though they had never existed.

The distinction between downweighting and disappearance must also be identified in the materials. Medical records, debt deadlines, exchanges among relatives, local reputation, and institutional records may remain preserved at different nodes even if an explanation has not extracted them. When events change, these materials can become visible again along new relational chains. If interpreters acknowledge the possibility of extracting them anew, the earlier omission remains merely a selection within a limited judgment.

The real risk appears when users take unextracted differences to have no actual efficacy. At this point, even people whose differences have been downweighted may be told that the materials they present about medical history, care, migration, or historical indices are irrelevant to the question. What is excluded is not abstractly “more detail,” but concrete differentiating units that could have changed eligibility, responsibility, risk, and consequences for action. Nor does a difference regaining weight mean that the earlier judgment must have been wrong. Income can be the dominant weight in one instance of handling unpaid wages; only when the question turns to care, school admission, or local recognition do other materials acquire a greater role. Healthy explanation permits this shift in weights and can explain why judgment changes. Closed explanation fixes an earlier extraction as a permanent feature of the object, so that later materials can only be downgraded to exceptions. The boundary between the two lies in whether users acknowledge that a change of relational field requires renewed distinction extraction.

If downweighted differences have merely receded temporarily, the problem is not yet at its most serious. As long as explanation still allows the image to be reopened, these differences may return within new relational fields. What is truly dangerous is compression loss: certain differences lose their entry points back into explanation. Healthy compression merely downweights differences temporarily while retaining an entry point for reopening. Heavy compression not only downweights differences but makes it increasingly difficult for them to re-enter explanation. Closed compression treats the image as reality itself, refusing to let counterexamples, remaining differences, and other nodes re-enter. Dangerous compression downweights differences and cuts off their entry points.

The obstruction of entry points for naming takes the form of differences being difficult to articulate if they have no names. A family bears the pressures of low income, medical history, elder care, migration, historical indices of kinship, and school-admission eligibility at the same time. If it is named only a “low-income family,” the other differences become difficult to voice. Elder care is classified as “an internal family matter”; medical history becomes “a personal health matter”; migration is described as “their own choice to move”; historical indices of kinship are absorbed into “family affairs”; and the child's school-admission eligibility is reduced to “incomplete paperwork.”

The loss of entry points through indices means that differences are difficult to extract anew if they lack place names, archives, stories, records, and evidence. If a local conflict leaves only a reputation for “households from elsewhere causing trouble,” with no record of land allocation, the course of migration, or old contracts, later people can hardly reopen the antecedents. They can only continue judging along the lines of the reputation that remains: who causes trouble, who will not stay in line, and who is not local.

The loss of entry points into explanation lies in differences being difficult to bring into judgment if theory does not recognize them. If a theory recognizes only labor, income, property, debt, and capacity for domination, nation, locality, family, kinship responsibilities, and historical indices are readily downgraded to subordinate differences. Even when people see these differences, they will say they are merely surface phenomena, secondary matters, forms of occlusion, or displacements.

The loss of entry points into action means that differences can hardly change how matters are handled if they cannot enter institutions, public opinion, or community action. Once a person is compressed into an “object of management,” their care responsibilities, historical circumstances, local relations, and community recognition may be difficult to bring into actual handling. When institutions deal with the person, they see only records, documents, risk categories, and management requirements. When public opinion discusses the person, it sees only trouble, order, and cost. When community members avoid the person, they too see only the label and no longer the relations. The deepest loss in dangerous compression is that certain differences no longer have names, indices, positions in explanation, or entry points into action. These differences have not disappeared; they are trapped outside the image.

These four kinds of entry point do not form a list of mutually isolated entries. Differences without names are difficult to record; differences without records and indices are difficult for users of theory to extract anew; and differences that cannot enter explanation are in turn difficult to bring to bear on how institutions, public opinion, or communities handle matters. Compression loss may therefore accumulate along nodes and relational chains, but these are not inevitable stages. Preserving any one entry point may allow materials to reappear in a new relational field.

Entry points are sustained at concrete positions of use, and different people may control entry points for naming, indexing, explanation, and action. Family members can articulate care burdens; archives preserve medical histories or qualifications; local stories preserve migration and contracts; and record keepers decide whether these materials are preserved. Interpreters recognize national, local, and kinship relations; users of theory decide whether materials can acquire explanatory standing; institutional personnel bring materials into judgment and decide whether they can change actual handling. Together, these positions constitute the conditions under which differences regain a position. Only by distinguishing these actors can we judge precisely where a difference lost its entry point and through which node it can still return.

Losing entry points also changes who has the capacity to present differences. When records retain only management categories, even if the people being processed know their own care responsibilities, migration, and local relations, they may still be unable to bring these materials into institutional positions or positions

within public opinion. Later people, in turn, can read only the existing classifications. Downweighting thus ceases to be merely an omission in one judgment and changes the possibility of materials passing between nodes. The conditional character of this mechanism must be retained: entry points may be weakened or cut off, but not every compression necessarily loses all four kinds in sequence. Conversely, if positions of naming, recording, theory, and action accept only existing labels, the remaining differences will be trapped outside the image.

III. The Hardening of Images and Fixed Labels

An image for judgment initially helps people grasp a set of differences within complex reality, but use and dissemination may gradually harden it. Statements such as “They are the bottom stratum” circulate more readily than an account unfolding wages, debt, household registration, medical history, kinship responsibilities, and local relations. “This is a backward culture” dispenses with institutional pressure, historical harm, state borders, and economic circumstances. “The state is a machine of oppression” is also more striking than tracing documents, archives, borders, assistance, public order, and chains of implementation. Management favors categories, mobilization relies on slogans, argument seeks opponents, and dissemination needs short sentences. Through these practices, an image originally used provisionally acquires the appearance of reality itself. Once users forget that an image is only a provisional low-dimensional tool, they stop using it to return to complex reality and may instead use it to prevent other differences from entering explanation.

The hardening of images is brought about by concrete carriers operating at different nodes; not all hardening can be attributed to a single abstract force. Disseminators choose short sentences that are easy to repeat, relying on repeatability; management procedures require stable categories, relying on classifiability; mobilizers favor clear boundaries; and participants in arguments need both to identify opponents quickly and to classify quickly. Each of these positions selects some differences, assigns relatively high weight to the same name through repeated use, and continues using the same compression.

The format of materials also affects this process. Short sentences can be transmitted quickly, categories readily enter forms and records, and labels readily connect to existing reputations. Medical history, kinship responsibilities, the course of migration, and historical indices, by comparison, often require longer explanations. When processing positions accept only formats convenient for transmission, differences that resist compression into short sentences are more likely to recede. Different positions harden images in different ways; these ways may connect with one another or occur only within a limited scope. What matters is tracing precisely which differences are retained as materials pass from one position to another, and which drop out because of format requirements.

An image for judgment can still serve as a provisional tool, provided users know when it needs reopening. If new materials can change existing weights as they emerge, counterexamples can compel interpreters to revise, and other nodes can fill gaps in severed relational chains, the image has not closed. Hardening occurs when users stop examining these conditions and treat whether the object fits an established category as the only question to be answered.

Dangerous compression cuts continuous differences into labels. Income admits no single clean division: earning slightly less or more in a month, carrying debt or not, renting or not, having elders and sick people at home or not, and having a fallback or not all change circumstances. Yet dangerous compression cuts this set of continuous differences into “the bottom stratum,” “the middle class,” “the poor,” or “the vulnerable.”

People with similar incomes may bear different risks because their debt deadlines, housing stability, care burdens, and width of available exits differ. It is precisely these variable weights that the labels omit.

Local recognition admits no single clean division either. How long a person has lived somewhere, whether they attend weddings and funerals, whether they understand the dialect, whether they have ties with people from the same place of origin, whether their children attend school locally, and whether their relatives live locally all change their position. Yet dangerous compression divides these continuous relations into “locals” and “people from elsewhere.” People all described as being from elsewhere may inhabit different relations because their length of residence, wedding and funeral exchanges, and local recognition differ. Historical processes likewise admit no single clean division. Migration, mixed settlement, conflict, intermarriage, protection, betrayal, distribution, and mediation all form later relations. Yet dangerous compression cuts complex processes into “victim,” “perpetrator,” “from elsewhere,” “unruly,” or “backward.” Labels originally help judgment; the danger is that they turn back and swallow up continuous differences. Differences swallowed by labels often do not disappear immediately. They become difficult to articulate, find, explain, or act on.

Those who name and use names perform this division. When disseminators, institutional personnel, or community members receive an object under one name, they often simultaneously determine which materials deserve further questioning. Intermediate states falling outside the label's boundaries are not readily recorded, leaving later people able to understand only through the classifications left behind. A label can be a preliminary entry point, but cannot be the endpoint of judgment. As long as users still ask how income, debt, local relations, migration, and historical materials combine, continuous differences can be unfolded again. If a name directly replaces these questions, the label does more than compress information: it restricts which differences can acquire a position in explanation.

Continuity also reminds interpreters that materials near the boundaries of labels are especially important. A slight change in income, a longer period of residence, resumed exchanges among relatives, or new historical materials may all change an object's concrete position in reality. If an existing classification system permits only a choice between two presupposed extremes, these subtle dynamic changes cannot alter actual handling. Re-examining these intermediate states does not abolish classification; it prevents classification from occluding changes in relations now taking place.

IV. Default Extraction and a Single Position

Once a label stabilizes, it decides in advance for later people which differences should be extracted. Once dangerous compression stabilizes, later people stop differentiating anew and automatically extract familiar differences when they see a label: on seeing “the bottom stratum,” they default to extracting poverty, being oppressed, being without property, and being dominated; on seeing “people from elsewhere,” they default to extracting accent, household registration, instability, and nonlocal relations; on seeing “backward culture,” they default to extracting ignorance, conservatism, and tradition, while downweighting institutional pressures, historical harms, state borders, and economic circumstances; and on seeing “machine of oppression,” they default to extracting control, violence, and deprivation, while downweighting passage enabled by documents, public order, assistance, and protection.

Default extraction is not simple prejudice, but inertia in distinction extraction formed after a compressed image hardens. Prejudice can be a personal attitude; default extraction goes deeper. Explanation no longer returns to the concrete relational field each time or asks anew which differences are gaining weight in this object, but automatically extracts familiar differences along the lines of the old image. When default

extraction occurs repeatedly, explanation ceases to face new relational fields and repeats the same set of distinction-extraction operations on different objects. This is how differentiation bias forms.

Default extraction relies on later people's trust in existing names. Someone newly entering a processing position may never have seen the original materials, yet can receive a completed judgment through archives, reputation, classifications, and short sentences. Here, the label is not choosing differences on its own; it offers users a path that dispenses with differentiating anew. Once this path is repeatedly adopted, users assign relatively high weight to familiar differences: on seeing the bottom stratum, they first ask about wages and domination; on seeing people from elsewhere, they first ask about household registration and accent; on seeing an object of management, they first look at records and risk categories. These extractions may be effective in certain relational fields, but if the current question is no longer examined, the original fit becomes inertia.

Inertia in distinction extraction also affects how questions are asked. If later people accept a label first, their questions often merely seek to complete the existing image—for example, asking only about wages, household registration, or risk categories, without asking about medical history, local relations, and kinship responsibilities. Who frames the questions themselves and which answers are permitted determine whether new materials can acquire weight. Once default extraction forms, even new materials that are mentioned may be placed back into the old image's existing classifications. If local relations, care responsibilities, and institutional eligibility can be described only as surface, secondary, or subordinate differences, they have not actually acquired a role in changing weights. It is concrete interpreters and processing positions that handle matters in this way; the label does not act on its own. Only by identifying the position in explanation into which materials are placed can we judge whether they have actually entered the image and changed the original distinction extraction. Differentiating anew must therefore also include re-examining the questions.

Correcting default extraction does not mean forbidding names. It requires later people to face the materials anew. They need to establish which nodes this event involves, which differences are gaining weight, what existing labels have downweighted, and whether new counterexamples can change judgment. Retain these questions, and the label remains an entry point; cancel them, and the label seals off other entry points in advance.

The family of a worker from elsewhere is not a single position. Interpreters using class theory can extract its labor, wages, housing, debt, and risks. Interpreters using a state image can extract household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and administrative eligibility. Those using an image of local networks can extract accent, ties with people from the same place of origin, exchanges with neighbors, and local recognition. Those using a historical image can extract migration routes, family historical indices, and local memory. The same family displays different differences in different relational fields. Yet after default extraction occurs repeatedly, the family is compressed into a single position: the bottom stratum, people from elsewhere, a mobile population, a backward culture, the vulnerable in the market, or objects of state management.

Each of these designations may capture part of reality, but once any one masquerades as the whole, it occludes other differences. Say only “the bottom stratum,” and household registration, local recognition, national memory, children's school admission, and kinship responsibilities are downweighted. Say only “people from elsewhere,” and labor risks, debt, housing, and capacity for domination are downweighted. Say only “objects of management,” and care responsibilities, the course of migration, community recognition, and historical circumstances are downweighted. Dangerous compression compresses a complex differentiation position into a single position, allowing a person to be understood through only one label.

A differentiation position forms through the joint action of multiple differentiating units within a concrete relational field; it is not a simple sum of identity names. Different materials, nodes, and relational chains change the position of a family of a worker from elsewhere in questions such as unpaid wages, school admission, renting, weddings and funerals, and assistance. Interpreters using any image can extract only part of this and must not rewrite the rest as subordinate. To reopen a differentiation position, interpreters must return to the event now unfolding. Who is handling it, which materials have been submitted, which qualifications are being compared, and which relational chains change the consequences must all be established anew. Doing so does not arrange all differences on an equal footing; it allows differences currently gaining weight to revise the weights fixed by a single label.

V. Historical Processes Must Not Be Compressed into Fixed Labels

Historicization must compress the past; without compression, the past cannot be transmitted. Yet dangerous compression reduces complex historical processes to fixed labels: migration to "from elsewhere," mixed settlement to "unclear boundaries," shared harm to "eternal victimhood," state punishment to "a person who will always be a problem," and family historical indices to "that branch of the family owes something." These labels sometimes preserve certain past differences, but they also cut off processes. If a branch of a family once contributed less money during household division, this may have been because someone was ill, working away from home, caring for elders, or bearing other debts at the time. If history is compressed into nothing but "that branch of the family owes something," later judgments about relationships and marriage, borrowing money, ancestral rites, and land distribution will continue to follow this label. When a local conflict is compressed into "households from elsewhere causing trouble," migration routes, land allocation, old contracts, marital relations, and local mediation may lose their entry points through indices. Once historical labels sever processes, they turn complex past differences into rigid future judgments. The past does not automatically bear down on the present; a compressed image of the past is repeatedly extracted in later relational fields.

Historical materials need to be transmitted through names, stories, archives, and shared memory; otherwise later people cannot approach the past. The problem is that preserving certain indices may also delete the conditions at the time. Once reasons for migration, land allocation, care burdens, debts, and relations of mediation are no longer recorded, later people receive only conclusions such as being from elsewhere, owing something, or being unruly.

When fixed labels are carried into new relational fields, users treat past images as presupposed entry points for present judgment. Relationships and marriage, borrowing money, ancestral rites, and land distribution each involve different materials and relational chains. Yet the same historical name may prearrange who is trustworthy, who bears responsibility, and who should be excluded. These consequences come from later people repeatedly extracting compressed records, not from the past itself acting automatically.

Preserving historical indices must be distinguished from fixing historical conclusions. Place names, contracts, migration routes, divisions of work within families, and local mediation can allow the past to be re-examined. As long as they can still be extracted anew, concrete materials may correct fixed labels. Family stories can likewise allow the past to be re-examined. If names such as being from elsewhere, owing something, and being unruly no longer connect to their processes of formation, only the outcomes of judgment remain. Community members, record keepers, and later interpreters may all participate in this transmission. Theory needs to trace which materials they use, rather than let historical images replace actual positions of

preservation and extraction. Only if records preserve conclusions while severing their antecedents will historical compression constrain new judgments over the long term.

VI. Action Write-Back and the Self-Reinforcement of Images

Dangerous compression does more than misread reality; it reorganizes action according to compressed images. When a person is called part of "the bottom stratum," their ethnicity, locality, family, medical history, debt, and kinship responsibilities may be downweighted, and they may also be required to understand themselves through a class image. They speak of local exclusion, and others say it is merely the surface of class contradictions; they speak of kinship responsibilities, and others say these are merely old family relations; they speak of national memory, and others say it is merely an occlusion of consciousness. These differences have not been directly eliminated from the person, but have lost their entry points into explanation and action.

When a community is called a "backward culture," its institutional pressures, historical harms, state borders, and economic circumstances may be downweighted. External action turns into cultural transformation, and internal defenses are likewise forced to revolve around culture, pushing institutional questions, questions of boundaries, resources, and history to the rear.

When a state is called a "machine of oppression," its protective functions, production of passability, allocation and coordination of public resources, assistance, and border protection may be downweighted. Later people discussing the state then default to extracting control, violence, and deprivation. Dangerous compression not only occludes reality; it also prescribes how later people continue extracting differences.

At a deeper level, interpreters, institutional personnel, or procedures using dangerous compression do more than explain reality. They produce new records, new actions, and new evidence according to their images, then use these consequences to prove the original images. When a person is compressed into an "object of management," institutional personnel treat them as an object of management. After they have been restricted, scrutinized, and excluded, archives and public opinion will in turn show that this person does indeed frequently come into contact with the management system, so the original label appears to have been proved. In fact, users first organize action through a compressed image, then treat the consequences of that action as evidence for the original image.

This reveals the distinction between an image as an explanatory output and an image brought into action. Once users bring a compressed image into action, they produce concrete consequences in reality and form a loop: users undertake distinction extraction according to the image; distinction extraction guides action; action leaves records; and those records in turn reinforce the image.

Write-back occurs first in how matters are handled. Institutional personnel determine actual handling according to management categories; positions within public opinion select materials for dissemination according to existing labels; community members decide whether to approach or avoid someone according to reputation. The image itself has no will. It is these users and the procedures in which they operate that actually bring compression into consequences. Handling at different positions may connect, or it may leave records only within a limited scope.

Action in turn leaves new materials. Someone repeatedly scrutinized accumulates more management records in the archives; someone avoided by a community has less evidence of exchanges; someone forced to defend themselves in terms of culture leaves more cultural expressions. If later people do not ask how these records arose, they may treat results produced by action as proof that the object fitted the label all along. This loop

does not require a centralized controller. Different nodes continuing to use the same image may separately perform extraction, handling, recording, and reinterpretation.

Consequences produced by write-back further change how the object can be seen. Restrictions may reduce their exchanges, scrutiny may increase their management records, and cultural transformation may force their defense to focus on cultural names. These new materials have all actually been left behind, but their formation has already been influenced by earlier images. If later interpreters treat them as original evidence independent of the handling process, they occlude how images participated in the consequences. Tracing the conditions under which records formed is necessary work to prevent the loop from closing in on itself.

Action write-back may also change the allocation of responsibility. When someone is handled solely as an object of management, institutional personnel are apt to exclude care, migration, and local recognition from judgments of responsibility. When a community is understood solely as a backward culture, external actors push institutional and resource questions into the background. Specific people using compressed images thus do more than arrange what is seen; they also affect who is required to explain, bear responsibility, or change.

The conditional character of the loop must be retained. Once users bring images into action, concrete handling may leave records that reinforce the original images, but new nodes, counterexamples, and materials may still interrupt the connection. To interrupt the loop, new materials and counterexamples must be allowed into one of its positions, enabling subsequent users to see that records are evidence but may also be consequences left by earlier ways of handling matters. If institutional personnel re-examine the process that formed a record, or community members add omitted exchanges, later explanation need not close along the lines of the original image. Write-back has real force, but it is not an irreversible automatic determination.

VII. Dangerous Compression in the Class Image

The class image is one of the most typical forms of dangerous compression, but this must be stated clearly: class is neither an underlying entity of society nor a discovered underlying reality. Class entities do not exist. Real differentiating units such as labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, fallbacks, and capacity for domination supply the material basis. The processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing these units form partial explanatory power; the class image is the low-dimensional output of this process. These differences really exist and powerfully change people's lives. Someone lives by selling their labor, earns low wages, carries debt, has unstable housing, works in danger, has no fallback, and is dominated by others. These differences are of course weighty. Opposition to the ontologization of class must not be understood as diminishing the weight of real pressures. Unpaid wages, debt, dangerous work, unstable housing, and the absence of fallbacks still produce heavy consequences. What must be rejected is the use of a low-dimensional projection to monopolize the entire explanation of these consequences.

The class image is so readily seductive precisely because distinction extraction within a limited scope from these real, weighty differences is not fabrication out of nothing. Such limited distinction extraction is not entirely wrong. Yet partial explanatory power comes from real differentiating units and the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them. The class image itself is only a brutal projection of high-weight differentiating units onto axes of economic, labor, property, and domination relations; it is not what society fundamentally is. Precisely because it presents part of the reality extracted, it is more readily mistaken for society itself. Yet the claim that concrete differentiating units and their processing form partial explanatory power differs from the claim that class exists as an underlying reality. We cannot infer from the former that a social entity named class partially exists. Class theory still belongs from the outset to the total-image subsumption direction of Model C; the class image itself does not thereby acquire the

standing of an ordinary limited tool. Here this chapter addresses how projection oversteps its bounds, without anticipating the full account of model structures in other chapters.

Once interpreters forget that the class image is only a brutal projection, they mistake a low-dimensional image for society's underlying reality. They use projection onto economic, labor, property, and domination axes as the explanatory premise for other differences, downweighting household registration, locality, nation, sex, age, medical history, kinship responsibilities, institutional eligibility, historical indices, and community networks. Household registration, local recognition, national memory, sex, age, medical history, kinship responsibilities, and institutional eligibility are thus readily reduced to surface or subordinate matters. Once interpreters using class theory pass this image off as underlying reality, they describe differences that class theory has not extracted as subordinate or secondary matters, forms of occlusion, falsehoods, or displacements. This is what is most dangerous about class theory: it is dangerous not because it is wholly wrong, but because it extracts real pressures and more readily leads people to believe it has explained everything.

The projective relation of the class image also requires distinguishing extraction from naming. Real differentiating units such as wages, labor, property, debt, housing, risk, fallbacks, and capacity for domination can change people's eligibility, choices, and consequences within concrete relational fields. They therefore deserve to be extracted and assigned corresponding weights, and each can also be demonstrated by materials and acquire high weight in different relational fields. Yet projecting them and naming them class does not discover a common entity hidden behind the materials. Once this distinction is erased, interpreters using class theory may require differences of household registration, nation, locality, family, and history all to be reinterpreted along the same axis.

In the concrete arrangement of weights, the danger lies not in continuing to trace wages and debt, but in refusing to let other differences now gaining weight change the image. Wages, debt, and capacity for domination can indeed change circumstances more directly than other differences in certain relational fields. Yet high weight must not be illicitly turned into sole weight. Whenever medical history, household registration, local recognition, or kinship responsibilities regain weight in an event, interpreters must allow them to revise the original projection.

VIII. The Compression Boundaries of Other Images

The class image is not the only image that can overstep its bounds. State, market, and cultural images can also undergo dangerous compression. Concrete materials, nodes, and processing involved in state certification and implementation can form partial explanatory power: a document can change passage through institutions, an archive can change eligibility, a border can change status, and a punishment record can change the future. Interpreters using a state image extract materials and nodes such as documents, archives, borders, eligibility, mutual recognition, and implementation. Tracing these differences can explain how passage, education, assistance, or sanctions occur. Yet once interpreters let the state image masquerade as all of society, they downweight family, markets, localities, communities, national networks, and historical memory. All consequences are described as the will of the state, so that family responsibilities, market conditions, local networks, and historical memory can no longer change judgment. This boundary limits the image's scope of application; it does not deny the actual action of state nodes.

A market image develops around prices, wages, rents, debt, and purchasing power. Concrete differences and their processing can form partial explanatory power and explain some pressures on resources: a family may be evicted because of rent, may not dare to fall ill because wages are unstable, and may be forced to accept

dangerous work because of debt deadlines. Yet such limited explanation cannot automatically explain care, institutional eligibility, local responsibilities, and boundaries of national communities. Once interpreters using a market image let it masquerade as all of society, they downweight family care, institutional eligibility, local responsibilities, boundaries of national communities, and historical indices.

Concrete differences such as language, rites and customs, education, values, and orders of meaning, together with their processing, can likewise form partial explanatory power. What language a person speaks, what rites they observe, whom they recognize as kin, and how they regard marriage, death, education, and responsibility may all change their relations. Yet once interpreters let a cultural image masquerade as all of society, they downweight institutions, the economy, the state, risks, violence, history, and actual interests. Interpreters using a cultural image may extract language, rites and customs, education, and orders of meaning, but must not relegate violence, risks, state implementation, economic conditions, and historical materials to irrelevance.

These three images form different connections among materials. A state image depends on nodes of certification and implementation; documents and archives enter consequences through certification and implementation. A market image depends on relations of prices, wages, rents, and debts; prices and debts change choices through exchange deadlines and the ability to pay. A cultural image depends on language, rites and customs, education, and orders of meaning; language, rites, and customs affect action through relations of recognition, education, and responsibility. The differences they downweight, and the relational chains through which they form consequences, differ. In comparing these images, we should not write them as having the same content. Nor does this comparison include class theory, which belongs to Model C from the outset. Only when users elevate their limited scope of fit into the whole of society do they share the structure of dangerous compression. Their shared risk is not that users have extracted wrong materials, but that they expand the effective scope to all of society. Calibration requires specifying, separately for each image, which nodes its users rely on, which relational fields it fits, and which differences are downweighted. This preserves the partial explanatory power formed by the relevant differentiating units and their processing while preventing users from giving any single image a standing that excludes other explanations. Clarifying these relations limits each image's boundaries of application; it does not establish a list of interchangeable factors.

Explanations concerning nations require particular care. A nation is not a brutal projection in the way class is, nor a subjective imagining, a fictional label, or an appendage of the class image. National communities arise from partially overlapping networks, long-term interaction, shared memory, language, rites and customs, boundaries, and paths of shared responsibility.

Within national networks, members, families, those who transmit things across generations, record keepers, educators, organizers, or disseminators also undertake compression, reducing complex interactions to names, designations, boundaries, responsibilities, and shared memory. This compression is useful. Names connect relations dispersed across language, rites and customs, boundaries, and long-term interaction, and can preserve paths of memory, responsibility, and protection across generations. Community members and later people can use these materials to establish why they are connected to one another. Without names, many responsibilities cannot be transmitted across generations. Without names and boundaries, much shared memory, shared protection, shared responsibility, and shared harm become difficult to transmit. Without shared memory, later people can hardly know why they are connected to certain people far away.

Yet this compression also has dangers. A national community consists of paths of recognition, memory, and responsibility transmitted over time through partially overlapping networks. Such compression may turn real

networks into an essence, a matter of bloodline, and something eternal. Dangerous compression describes them as that way by birth, that way in the blood, and that way forever, thereby downweighting migration, intermarriage, shared life, institutional recognition, changing boundaries, and historical contestation, and depriving materials about the process of a position from which to prompt revision. As long as users can still extract migration, intermarriage, shared life, institutional recognition, and changing boundaries anew, this compression retains historical process. The danger of class is brutal projection masquerading as underlying reality; the danger of the nation is the essentialization, reduction to bloodline, and eternalization of historical community networks. These two dangers differ and must not be conflated.

The fact that national names preserve responsibility and memory does not mean that names can replace community networks. A community's actual efficacy still comes from relations formed through long-term interaction, recognition, protection, harm, and intergenerational transmission. Conversely, treating a name as pure fiction also deletes these actual paths. When shared memory is transmitted, users need to preserve the interactions and responsibilities connected to it as well. If only the name remains, without paths of shared life, protection, harm, and recognition, the name is readily essentialized. If all shared memory is deleted out of concern about essentialization, however, a real community loses its historical indices.

Calibrating compression concerning nations must therefore protect two boundaries at once: it must neither write historically formed networks as innately unchanging essences nor, in opposing essentialization, erase communities into fictional labels or deny their basis in real relations. Users of theory need both to explain which paths of recognition, memory, and responsibility actually exist and to allow new interactions and experiences of boundaries to change weights anew. A safe exposition can explain how compression is useful and how it oversteps its bounds only between these two boundaries.

IX. How Return Channels Are Cut Off

Dangerous compression ultimately cuts off return channels and no longer allows people to reopen images for judgment. Once an image hardens, people stop asking which differences were downweighted, which differences are regaining weight in the current relational field, which nodes have gone unseen, which relational chains were severed, which historical indices were misread, and which counterexamples were treated as noise. They ask only whether the object fits the image: Does it belong to the bottom stratum? Is it from elsewhere? Is it a backward culture? Is it a machine of oppression? Is it an object of management? Once it cannot be reopened, explanation increasingly resembles a closed image. A closed image is more than stubbornness. It turns counterexamples into exceptions, remaining differences into noise, other nodes into irrelevancies, and new relational fields into sites for repeating the old image. At this point, explanation no longer learns from reality. It merely searches reality for differences it has already prepared.

A return channel consists of a set of distinction-extraction operations that can be performed anew, allowing interpreters to question downweighted differentiating units, find materials that never entered the image, supply omitted nodes and relational chains, reread historical indices, and let counterexamples change the original weights. It is not an additionally posited legal procedure, but the capacity of limited explanation to keep learning from reality. The cutoff occurs when concrete positions of use refuse these operations: users of theory call counterexamples accidental, management procedures accept only existing categories, disseminators treat remaining differences as noise, and later people look only for materials that fit the label. At these stages, the image's boundaries are treated as reality's boundaries, and new relational fields can only be interpreted as repetitions of the old image.

Whether a channel remains cannot be judged solely by whether interpreters verbally acknowledge complexity. We must see whether materials can actually enter. If medical history, local relations, kinship responsibilities, historical indices, or new nodes still cannot change handling and judgment after appearing, the supposed openness is merely formal. Only when counterexamples can trigger revision does return have an actual effect. Return channels also depend on whether different nodes can correct one another. Archival records, family members' statements, local reputation, and historical materials may conflict. Open explanation allows comparison among these materials; a closed image accepts only the parts that confirm existing classifications. Rejecting counterexamples is not an act theory performs on its own. It is exclusion carried out by users as they select materials, set formats, and handle objections.

After a channel is cut off, supplementary materials may still be seen, but can acquire only a predetermined standing: medical history is called a personal problem, local relations are called secondary background, and historical indices are called accidental exceptions. Materials have formally entered discussion, but have not actually changed weights. Checking a return channel therefore requires looking at whether materials can change explanation, not merely whether they are mentioned.

X. Reopening and the Next Misalignment

Calibrating dangerous compression does not mean abandoning compression: without compression, there is no judgment. It means reopening the compressed image, beginning with the selections and omissions the current image has already made. First ask what users extracted and downweighted through this image, and list the extracted differences and the weights assigned. Then examine which differences and materials never entered the image, and which entry points for naming, indexing, explanation, and action were obstructed by the ways naming, indexing, theory, or action operated. This sequence of questions is not a uniform set of stages, but a set of questions that can correct one another. If an explanation can still be questioned in this way, it retains the possibility of reopening; if it refuses these questions, it is turning into closed compression.

The question must then be returned to a concrete relational field. Examine which downweighted differences are regaining weight, which nodes and relational chains have still not entered the image or been seen, which relational chain was interrupted by existing labels, and which historical indices were misread. Whether new medical histories, debt deadlines, eligibility materials, local relations, or historical indices are gaining weight at this point may change the original judgment. Adding these contents does not mean paying equal attention to every difference. It allows actual changes to regain a position in explanation.

The quantity of materials cannot tell us whether calibration is complete. If the same label still prearranges their standing, adding many details leaves the return channel unopened. The key test is whether users allow counterexamples actually to enter and produce consequences. If counterexamples can only be renamed noise, chance occurrences, or exceptions, the image remains closed. If they can adjust weights, expand the range of materials, or compel an explanation to rewrite its boundaries, compression returns to a revisable limited image. Effective calibration requires new materials to be capable of actually changing weights, judgments about nodes, or the understanding of relational chains. It also requires interpreters to specify which counterexamples would compel them to revise. This preserves a limited image's capacity to accept correction by reality, rather than preserving unbounded complexity.

Reopening also requires explaining the scope of revision. A counterexample may require only an adjustment of weights within the current relational field, or it may expose a node or relational chain long omitted. One revision cannot justify declaring an image wholly ineffective; nor can the fact that an image was once effective justify refusing every adjustment. A limited explanation's capacity for calibration shows precisely in

its ability to determine from the materials how far revision must go. This chapter stops at the conditions for reopening and at how a long-standing refusal to reopen supplies a prior mechanism for differentiation bias.

If a compressed image is left unopened for a long time, explanation becomes accustomed to repeatedly extracting the same kind of difference while downweighting other differences now gaining weight. After default extraction occurs repeatedly, explanation no longer faces new relational fields, but repeats the same set of distinction-extraction operations on different objects. Differentiation bias thereby stabilizes.

Chapter 24. Differentiation Bias: The Misalignment of Explanation and Reality

I. From Default Extraction to Systematic Misalignment

Dangerous compression is not compression itself. It occurs when users forget that a compressed image is only a low-dimensional output, forget what they have downweighted, treat downweighted differences as nonexistent, and let labels decide in advance what later people should see. Once labels stabilize, default extraction readily occurs in explanation: on seeing “the bottom stratum,” it extracts wages, labor, debt, housing, and risk; on seeing “people from elsewhere,” it extracts accent, household registration, instability, and nonlocal relations; on seeing “objects of management,” it extracts records, risk, order, and costs. These extractions are not necessarily all wrong. The problem is that explanation no longer faces the concrete relational field anew.

Default extraction deserves to be identified because it turns a previously convenient entry point into the starting point of later judgments. That interpreters first see familiar labels and existing records does not mean that other differences have no effect; the question is whether subsequent inquiry can still bring those differences back into the concrete relational field. The visibility of materials is also conditional. What recorders preserve, what users consult first, and what processing positions require all affect what explanation extracts first. Unless these steps are made clear, a familiar image readily replaces the relational position currently occupied by the object.

Consider again the family of a worker from elsewhere. The husband works on a construction site, the wife does casual work at a restaurant, the child has reached school age, the elder's medical records are at a hospital back home, the rent is nearly due, wages are two months in arrears, the social-insurance record has been interrupted, and the family still owes money borrowed from a relative. If an explanation first sees this family as “workers in the bottom stratum,” it may have grasped real differences: unpaid wages, labor risks, housing instability, and debt pressure are all real differences, and they do carry great weight in the problem of unpaid wages. But if, whatever the later problem, explanation extracts differences only along the lines of the “workers in the bottom stratum” image, default extraction begins to recur. When the child seeks school admission, it still sees only wages and labor relations; when the family is refused a rental, it still sees only poverty and a weak market position; when relationships and marriage meet obstacles, it still sees only income levels; when the elder's medical records affect assistance, it still sees only labor circumstances; and when local reputation affects recognition among neighbors, it still sees only the class image.

If default extraction occurs only occasionally, it is still just a single error; if it occurs repeatedly, inertia in distinction extraction forms. Inertia in distinction extraction means that explanation repeatedly extracts familiar differences along the lines of an old image, rather than facing the concrete relational field anew. Once this inertia stabilizes, explanation no longer asks what other differences in this object are gaining weight at this moment. It asks only whether the object can be placed within an image I already know. Differentiation bias begins here: it is explanation repeatedly extracting the differences it knows while downweighting other differences gaining weight in reality. It is not a difference of opinion, but systematic misalignment in distinction extraction, weight assignment, fit to the relational field, nodes, relational chains, and historical indices.

Ordinary accounts understand bias as a matter of attitude: some sympathize with the poor, others dislike them; some trust the state, others dislike it; some value the nation, others are wary of it; some value the market, others criticize it. These certainly affect judgment, but the concern here is not prejudice at this level. Differentiation bias does not mean “I have my position, and you have yours,” nor “all viewpoints have limits, so they are much the same.” It goes deeper. It occurs in how explanation extracts differences, distributes importance, enters relational fields, identifies nodes, traces relational chains, and reads historical indices. Ordinary prejudice can take the form of likes and dislikes, whereas differentiation bias may occur in handling considered fair by those performing it. Even without ill intent, interpreters will bring familiar judgments into different problems if they cease examining the steps of distinction extraction, weight assignment, and fit to the relational field.

An explanation can be sincere in attitude and still exhibit differentiation bias. Out of concern, it may always extract only labor and poverty; out of a sense of order, only documents and risks; out of a wish to protect the community, only boundaries and identities; out of a critical spirit, only oppression and domination. Bias comes not only from ill intent, but also from a well-practiced operation of explanation. The more practiced explanation becomes, the more readily it skips differentiating anew; the more it has a ready-made set of images, the more readily it pulls reality back into familiar images. Differentiation bias is not a single mistaken perception, but an inertia of explanation formed through repeated distinction-extraction operations.

A temporary lack of information does not necessarily constitute bias. When materials are insufficient, those handling matters can acknowledge what is unknown, investigate records further, and leave room for revision. Bias arises when available or already present differences are consistently downweighted and no longer allowed to affect judgment. Different positions can still be compared in terms of their scope of distinction extraction, their reasons for assigning weights, and their treatment of counterexamples. The danger of differentiation bias is not that someone takes a position, but that the position is fixed as the sole entry point, preventing new materials and relational-field conditions from changing the existing conclusion. Prejudice, insufficient information, and differences of position can all impede judgment, but none can substitute for examining systematic misalignment. Those handling matters need to return the question to concrete operations: have the wrong materials been extracted, has the wrong weight been assigned, or has a judgment applicable in one place been carried into another? Identifying this allows criticism to move beyond attitudes and return to revisable steps of explanation.

Differentiation bias can therefore be examined concretely. Have those handling matters explained what they extracted and what they downweighted? Have they identified the materials and rules underlying the judgment? Have they allowed consequences that differ from the existing image the possibility of changing the conclusion? When these points are missing, even a sincere attitude cannot guarantee that explanation is free of misalignment. Whether judgment can be calibrated also depends on whether those handling matters explicitly leave uncertainties open. Insufficient materials can be investigated further, the application of rules can be checked, and existing images can be limited by counterexamples. These different responses free explanation from a false dichotomy between sincerity and bias. Inertia in distinction extraction has not yet closed explanation completely. New relational fields, supplementary materials, and counterexamples capable of changing consequences may still re-enter. Calibration begins precisely when interpreters acknowledge that entry points can reopen, rather than treating the scope of the first extraction as permanent.

II. Bias in Distinction Extraction: Familiar Differences Monopolize the Entry Point

The first step in differentiation bias is bias in distinction extraction. Bias in distinction extraction does not mean extracting a certain kind of difference, but always extracting only that kind. Interpreters using class theory may grasp real pressures by extracting wages, labor, debt, housing, risk, and capacity for domination. Those using a state image may also grasp real consequences by extracting household registration, documents, archives, eligibility, borders, and implementation. Those using a cultural image may likewise offer an account within a limited scope by extracting language, rites and customs, education, values, and habits of life. The error is not that an explanation sees part of reality, but that in every setting it extracts only familiar differences, making reality conform to an old image. Bias in distinction extraction turns one kind of difference into a preliminary filter for every explanation. Interpreters then first ask whether materials can prove a familiar image, rather than first asking which differences and consequences the current relational field actually involves.

Consider again the family of a worker from elsewhere. When wages go unpaid, extracting wages, labor, debt, and risk has force. But extracting only wages and labor relations when the child seeks school admission will overlook household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, the student-registration system, school places, and local policies. Extracting only insufficient income when the wife is refused a rental will overlook local reputation, a nonlocal accent, deposit rules, the landlord's assessment of risk, and relations among neighbors.

Extracting only poverty when the elder needs assistance will overlook where medical records are preserved, how eligibility for assistance is certified, and how the places of household registration and residence provide mutual recognition. Extracting only class circumstances when family historical indices affect borrowing will overlook kinship relations, family memory, the division of the family household in earlier years, and who once cared for the elder. The error of bias in distinction extraction does not lie in seeing part of reality, but in refusing to see other realities anew. Far from ignoring reality entirely, explanation continues to believe it is explaining reality precisely because it has grasped part of it.

The same material can occupy different positions in different problems. Wage records may carry great weight in handling unpaid wages, yet may not take priority in school eligibility or certification for assistance. Whether household registration, medical records, reputation, or exchanges among relatives are extracted depends on current rules and processing positions. Extracting other differences anew does not deny the truth of the earlier materials. What needs adjustment is the order and conditions under which materials enter explanation, so that one kind of real pressure does not repeatedly occupy the entry point and other differences that have already gained weight in the present are not excluded.

Once the scope of distinction extraction is fixed, later materials readily become mere footnotes to the existing image. When the same kind of difference continually occupies the entry point, later materials may be treated as incidental details even when seen. To avoid this, interpreters should restore, one by one, the sources of materials, certification requirements, and relational positions involved in the current problem, rather than substituting familiar categories for fresh identification. Only then can the limits of a partial image be preserved, rather than the image being treated as all of reality. Setting out the distinction-extraction process step by step allows users to see that materials alone do not determine explanation. The steps of extraction, comparison, and weight assignment jointly determine which differences can enter judgments about consequences.

III. Weight Bias: Fixing Temporary Weight in Place

Weight is not a permanent rank carried by a difference itself, but the intensity with which it enters consequences in a concrete relational field. If interpreters omit this condition, they turn a once-effective ranking into a fixed hierarchy across relational fields. Real pressures often make weight bias harder to detect. Precisely because wages, debt, or housing risks do carry great weight, users more readily overlook whether they still occupy key positions in the immediate judgment about eligibility, procedures, or relations. Reassessing weights does not flatten differences; it brings current materials, rules, certification positions, and visible consequences back into judgment together. This preserves the force of explanation within a limited scope while preventing what is temporarily weighty from being written as the highest weight everywhere.

If bias in distinction extraction merely overlooks some differences, it may still be corrected. But once the differences extracted are fixed at the highest weight, the bias deepens. Explanation not only always extracts familiar differences; it also fixes them as the most important ones. Weight comes from concrete relational fields; it is not an eternal underlying reality. In labor disputes, wages, working hours, unpaid wages, and risks of work-related injury carry great weight. In a child's school admission, household registration, residence permits, student registration, years of social-insurance coverage, school places, and local policies may carry more. In relationships, marriage, and elder care, kinship responsibilities, medical history, local reputation, and family historical indices may carry more. Where the boundaries of national communities are concerned, language, shared memory, shared consequences, and paths of responsibility may carry more.

Weight bias occurs if explanation carries the high weight found in an unpaid-wages problem directly into every problem. The family of a worker from elsewhere does indeed face labor and income pressures, but a child's inability to enter school is not necessarily mainly due to low wages. Low wages will worsen the predicament, yet are not necessarily the key node in school eligibility. A rent increase carries great weight, but refusal of a rental may also concern nonlocal identity, deposit rules, local reputation, and the landlord's imaginings about risk. Nor is the effect of the elder's medical records on assistance merely an income problem: it also involves medical records, the places of household registration and residence, the assistance system, and certification nodes. Weight bias mistakes high weight within one relational field for the highest weight in every relational field. This bias is subtle because the differences fixed at the highest weight often do carry great weight. The problem is not that they lack weight, but that they are written as the weightiest everywhere.

Weight bias makes those handling matters mistake one kind of weighty consequence for the sole source of other consequences. A sounder judgment must distinguish which difference is worsening the predicament from which material or rule is determining immediate eligibility. The two may be connected, but cannot therefore be merged into a single permanent ranking. This also requires seeing which positions actually bear the consequences. Income pressures can deepen the predicament, while eligibility restrictions can directly block immediate options. The relationship between them must be explained through materials, rules, and certification procedures. A fixed name cannot be used to erase differences of intensity across relational fields.

Judgments of weight therefore need to explain their grounds as relational fields change. When new documentary requirements, certification results, or relational positions change actual consequences, those handling matters cannot merely restate the original pressures. They must also identify which differences now genuinely occupy important positions in affecting consequences.

IV. Relational-Field Bias: Using a Partial Judgment in the Wrong Field

Relational-field bias calls for clarity about the scope within which an explanation is effective. An interpreter's identification of important differences in a particular problem through an image does not authorize users to carry the same distinction extraction and ranking directly into other problems. Once weights are fixed, explanation carries judgments from one setting into others. Relational-field bias occurs precisely when explanation leaves the setting in which it was originally effective yet still demands that reality conform to it. Use in the wrong field usually occurs not because the original image is devoid of content, but because interpreters fail to check whether the materials, rules, certification nodes, and consequences in the new problem have changed. The original image thus oversteps the bounds of what it could explain. Returning to the relational field does not require starting from zero each time. It requires reconfirming entry points when conditions change: once household registration, student registration, local reputation, or kinship responsibilities have gained weight, explanation cannot simply retain the ranking from the unpaid-wages problem.

In an unpaid-wages problem, limited distinction extraction by class theory may grasp real differentiating units such as labor relations, unpaid wages, the bearing of risks, the width of available exits, and capacity for domination. These differentiating units provide the material basis; the processes of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression form partial explanatory power. The class image is a low-dimensional output and cannot directly explain every problem. In a child's school admission, images of institutionalization and state incorporation of differences are more effective: the key may be household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, school places, local policies, and certification chains. In a problem of local recognition, an image of local networks is more effective: the key may be accent, years of residence, exchanges among neighbors, ties with people from the same place of origin, participation in weddings and funerals, and local reputation.

In relationships and marriage, family nodes and historical indices are more effective. The key may be medical history, kinship responsibilities, family historical indices, local reputation, who has owed something to whom, and who has cared for the elder. If explanation uses the image from the unpaid-wages problem to explain school admission, local recognition, relationships and marriage, and migration memory, it leaves the relational field in which it was originally effective. Use in the wrong field is an important way in which explanations effective within a limited scope move toward an overall misjudgment. Many erroneous explanations are not wholly ineffective: they are effective in their original settings, but overstep the bounds of their effectiveness. A relational field is not an abstract background. It is a concrete state of relations that has already caused certain differences to be extracted and to enter consequences. Only by checking whether the problem being handled concerns unpaid wages, school admission, renting, relationships and marriage, assistance, or local recognition can interpreters judge whether the original image remains in a position where it is effective.

An explanation effective within a limited scope can continue to be used only while its materials and consequences remain supported by the current relational field. Users wishing to retain the original image should explain which segment of relations it can still explain and which new materials require supplementation through other distinction extraction, rather than demanding that reality remain forever in the original setting. Correcting use in the wrong field does not replace one total image with another. It confines the original explanation to the relations it can still explain. The remainder must be identified anew through the materials and procedures of the new relational field, preventing limited force from being mistaken for universal authority.

V. Node Bias: Concrete Processing Positions Are Occluded

Node bias readily portrays differences as abstract forces that directly produce consequences. Once explanation is used in the wrong field, it becomes still easier to overlook the nodes that actually make differences take effect. Node bias means that explanation sees differences but not where they are preserved, who extracts them, who certifies them, or through which nodes they enter consequences. In reality, differences enter eligibility, evaluation, and action only through preservation, extraction, certification, passing-on, or implementation at concrete positions. Records, documents, medical records, judgments, and reputation are not subjects acting on their own. Consequences arise only when school personnel, medical personnel, employers, family elders, landlords, intermediaries, reviewers, or implementers use them within existing rules and procedures.

Nodes are not merely places where differences are preserved. They also determine who can extract differences, who can certify them, and who can make them produce consequences. Node bias also includes recognizing only materials that certain nodes can process while failing to see differences preserved in other relations. The problems of the family of a worker from elsewhere cannot be seen only as “low income.” If explanation says only “these are the circumstances of the bottom stratum,” it will see a grand image but not how differences are preserved, extracted, certified, and implemented through nodes.

The household-registration system can bring residential differences into consequences for school admission. When the child of a worker from elsewhere seeks school admission, the household-registration system, residence permits, social-insurance records, the student-registration system, and school places are all nodes. Yet under local admission rules, the school may review only some of the materials concerning household registration, residence, social insurance, or student registration. Ruptures in the family's migration history, care responsibilities, and actual residential difficulties may not be directly convertible into formal requirements.

Hospital medical records can bring bodily differences into consequences for employment, relationships and marriage, and assistance. When the elder in the family of a worker from elsewhere seeks medical care, hospital medical records, medical-insurance relations, assistance at the place of household registration, and proof of residence are all nodes. Hospital medical records preserve bodily differences; employers must still handle leave, capacity for work, or job-position issues according to their own rules. A corresponding general institutional node is a court judgment, which can bring past events into eligibility reviews and social evaluation.

Local reputation can bring migration and reputation into local recognition, while family elders can bring historical indices into consequences for relationships and marriage, household division, and elder care. When the family of a worker from elsewhere is refused a rental, landlords, neighborhood reputation, intermediaries' records, and deposit rules are all nodes. When relationships and marriage meet obstacles, family elders, local reputation, kinship historical indices, medical records, and exchanges of ceremonial cash gifts are all nodes. These family historical indices and local reputations belong to informal relations and do not automatically enter state archives.

Different nodes may preserve or recognize different materials, and those materials may conflict. Formal institutions do not necessarily preserve family responsibilities, nor does local recognition necessarily amount to formal eligibility. If explanation recognizes only one kind of node, it downweights reality at other nodes. To miss the nodes is to miss how reality takes effect. Making these branches clear can prevent a grand image from occluding concrete responsibilities and positions open to revision.

Examining nodes serves precisely to identify the distribution of concrete responsibility and the positions open to revision; node bias occludes that very distribution. Who registers materials, when they are retrieved, under which rules they are recognized, and who makes the determination: these differences determine which positions can be examined and corrected. If a result comes from documentary requirements, medical-record certification, student-registration records, or local reputation, those handling matters can distinguish whether missing materials, rule restrictions, certification methods, or acts of use brought differences into consequences. They need not compress every result into abstract circumstances. Speaking only of abstract circumstances omits the procedures and actors in actual handling that could be questioned.

VI. Relational-Chain Bias: Paths of Consequences Are Cut Off

Relational-chain bias does not merely mean failing to list a few conditions or consider a few factors. It cuts already connected paths of consequences into unrelated fragments, failing to see how differences connect with one another and intensify, trigger, and transmit consequences. If explanation stops at income, identity, or medical history alone, it cannot see how consequences are subsequently intensified or recast through other positions. Failing to see nodes leads further to failing to see how differences transmit consequences. Low income by itself does not amount to a fixed set of circumstances. Only when connected to rent, debt, medical history, care responsibilities, household registration, children's school admission, and the absence of fallback options does it form weighty circumstances. Nor does nonlocal identity by itself amount to a fixed set of circumstances. Only when connected to accent, household registration, renting, social insurance, school eligibility, local relations, and work risks does it form persistent exclusion.

Within the same family, when wages go unpaid, rent becomes harder to pay; when rent becomes harder to pay, moving may become more frequent. Frequent moves make proof of residence and school eligibility less stable, and the child's admission may consequently be delayed. Care pressures return to the mother, who reduces her working hours, and family income continues to fall. When the elder's medical history entails a need for money, kinship historical indices are raised anew, and borrowing becomes harder. The tighter the debt deadline, the more likely the husband is to accept dangerous work. This is not “many factors”; differences are transmitting consequences. Relational-chain bias does not simply miss one factor. Explanation sees a difference but fails to trace how it connects with other differences to form consequences, thus cutting off the paths of consequences between differences. When tracing relational chains, operations must be attributed to concrete positions: who fails to pay wages, who demands proof, who certifies according to rules, who adjusts working hours, and who undertakes care within the family? Only then can we explain how consequences are transmitted, rather than letting the relational chain move on its own.

Nor is a relational chain a single line of causation. The same material may be amplified, attenuated, or temporarily halted at different nodes; calibration requires looking back at actual paths and branches. When consequences travel along a relational chain, a change in an earlier link does not necessarily determine the final result directly, but may change the materials and options available for processing at later nodes. Each position may alter the direction and intensity of consequences. Once a piece of material has been supplemented, certification may succeed; applying a rule may also restrict a previously viable option. Explaining these relays and retaining intermediate positions does not add scattered details. It prevents a complex path from being misrepresented as a set of consequences caused entirely by a single difference acting on its own, and avoids falsely attributing consequences to a single image.

Examining relational chains also requires distinguishing consequences that have already occurred from conditions that may still change. Interpreters cannot portray a link as the sole cause of every subsequent result

merely because it once worsened a predicament. They should see how materials are passed on, how rules are applied, and which positions can still change the path. Such tracing preserves the intermediate conditions in paths of consequences and prevents a single image from replacing concrete transmission.

VII. Historical-Index Bias: Treating the Past as Automatic or Excluding It

After relational chains are cut off, explanation also misreads how past differences enter the present. Historical-index bias is not an ordinary problem of historical memory. It involves two common errors. The first is historical determinism, which treats the past as a fixed cause, as though old harms, old boundaries, old victories, and old punishments automatically determined the present. The second is the thesis of historical irrelevance, which treats the past as irrelevant background, as though present interests, institutions, or attitudes alone could explain reality. Both views are wrong. Historical-index bias is precisely the failure to see which current events are triggering past differences. Once preserved, past differences do not automatically govern the present. They must be found anew, triggered anew, and assigned weight anew through indices in new relational fields.

Past differences do not return to reality on their own. They are extracted anew by triggering conditions in the current relational field. Excluding the past altogether also causes misalignment. Family members, members of local communities, archive custodians, or institutional processing positions may extract old records, past exchanges, and shared memories anew in current procedures, allowing them once again to change judgments and consequences in concrete events such as borrowing, school admission, relationships and marriage, elder care, eligibility applications, or local conflicts. National memory, local memory, and family history all need to re-enter through concrete relays, materials, and current conditions. Detached from these conditions of interaction, preservation, and triggering, historical communities are mistaken for essences of descent, fictional labels, or automatically continuing forces.

Family historical indices may be triggered by borrowing, relationships and marriage, elder care, or household division. Local memory may be triggered by grave relocation, land disputes, school catchment zoning, or local conflicts. National memory may be triggered by commemorative dates, external pressures, boundary conflicts, educational disputes, or shared protection. State records may be triggered by pre-employment screening, eligibility applications, loans, travel, or border checks.

The migration route of the family of a worker from elsewhere need not matter every day. But when the child's school admission, renting, relationships and marriage, borrowing, or local conflicts arise, it may suddenly gain weight. Where they came from, why they came, how long they have lived locally, whether they have participated in weddings and funerals, whether they have had past exchanges with local people, and whether they have been recognized through place names, accent, or ties with people from the same place of origin will all change present judgments. Nor do family historical indices always carry the same weight: they may be extracted anew in borrowing, household division, elder care, relationships and marriage, and caring for an elder. Local reputation is not an abstract background either. It may be brought back into the current relational field through a neighbor's remark, a landlord's judgment, a school's certificate, or a relative's reminder.

Historical indices need to be identified anew within current relational fields precisely because the same past occurrence may not carry the same weight in different events. The re-entry of historical indices also has boundaries. Even if an episode from the past has been preserved, we must still ask whether it is extracted in the current event, by whom, and on the basis of which materials it is recognized. This calibration prevents history from being written as automatic fate and present handling from being written as wholly without past conditions. Interpreters must neither treat old records as natural destiny nor refuse to consult them because

they belong to the past. They should identify whether a particular person, procedure, or relation is bringing them back into judgment now. Those handling matters must explain what trigger makes old materials relevant again and examine whether they actually enter present consequences through visible nodes. This both reveals the real role of shared memory, responsibility, and local relations and prevents the past from being treated as an untestable abstract cause.

VIII. How Misalignment Forms and Persists

The six forms of bias are not six isolated errors alongside one another. They form a continuous process in which explanation moves step by step from repeated distinction extraction toward misalignment with reality. Repeated distinction extraction first narrows the entry point; fixed weights then entrench the existing ranking; use in the wrong field and the omission of nodes, relational chains, and historical indices gradually stabilize this misalignment. The process unfolds as follows. First comes bias in distinction extraction: explanation always extracts the same kind of difference. Then comes weight bias: that kind of difference is fixed at the highest weight. Next comes relational-field bias: explanation carries that weight into an unsuitable relational field. This is followed by node bias: explanation fails to see the nodes where differences are preserved, certified, and implemented. After that comes relational-chain bias: explanation fails to see how differences connect to form consequences. Finally comes historical-index bias: explanation misreads how past differences are found anew, triggered, and assigned weight in the present. Once this chain has run its full course, explanation moves ever further from concrete objects. At this point it is not entirely without materials; it recognizes only familiar materials. It is not unable to see reality; it sees only the reality it is already prepared to extract. This is the state of differentiation bias once stabilized.

Restoring the six forms of bias to a continuous process does not mean that every problem neatly passes through the same six steps in the same way, nor should the process be arranged as a set of mechanical steps. In different problems, this chain can display different speeds and combinations. Some problems first reveal the omission of nodes, while others first reveal use in the wrong field. An omission at an earlier link facilitates the next: after the entry point narrows, fixed rankings are more readily accepted; after rankings are fixed, use in the wrong field and omitted nodes become harder to see. This mutual reinforcement helps stabilize misalignment, but does not eliminate the concrete positions that must be examined for each form of bias. Whether causal paths have been cut off must be examined in relational chains; how the past enters the present, in historical indices; and who preserves, extracts, certifies, and implements differences, in nodes.

Each link may leave an entry point for calibration: materials can be restored, rankings adjusted, procedures examined, and consequences questioned. Continuity does not mean irreversibility. As long as explanation still allows new materials to change entry points, the chain of misalignment may be interrupted. Interpreters therefore need to ask concrete questions at every point of misalignment: why did the entry point narrow, why was the ranking fixed, in which relational field was explanation wrongly applied, which nodes and relations went untraced, and how was the past misread?

Differentiation bias persists not only because errors go undetected, but also because it can save processing costs in concrete use. See a family and say “bottom stratum”; see conflict and say “class”; see a community and say “backward culture”; see the state and say “machine of oppression”; see market consequences and say “free competition”—and interpreters need not face complex materials anew each time. Through familiar images, interpreters, disseminators, and mobilizers can more quickly supply names, causes, and positions, yet may thereby skip identifying the concrete relational field anew. Labels circulate and spread more readily than complete circumstances. Terms such as “workers in the bottom stratum,” “people from elsewhere,” and

“objects of management” are very short, whereas the wages, household registration, medical history, local reputation, school eligibility, kinship historical indices, and migration memory of the family of a worker from elsewhere cannot easily be fully explained in a single sentence.

Mobilization likewise needs clear causes, objects, and courses of action. Compressed accounts can prompt people to take sides quickly, act, and find enemies or victims. During dissemination, short labels are readily extracted again by later users; the clear designation of objects in mobilization also readily leads to the downweighting of materials that are difficult to incorporate into the existing image. We should recognize that these are practical acts by concrete users, not active powers of choice and action belonging to labels or bias themselves.

Interpreters may also use this effort-saving mechanism to shield existing theories from pressure for revision. Overlooked nodes, relational chains, and historical indices are downgraded to secondary, superficial, or special circumstances, or blamed on insufficient materials, so that the original explanatory framework need not be reopened. Users trade on effectiveness within a limited scope to keep saving effort, and this inertia in distinction extraction is readily mistaken for explanatory power. Saving effort does not necessarily lead to bias. But when it becomes a reason to stop examining materials, the existing image grows more firmly established through dissemination and use. Once an effort-saving explanation is adopted repeatedly, it may leave clues in records, dissemination, and action that facilitate repeated application. If later users simply follow these clues and carry on using it, they will treat the existing image as a completed judgment.

Repeated adoption of an existing explanation may also bias subsequent material collection itself toward familiar clues. If recorders, disseminators, and users of theory preserve or recount only what fits the image, it becomes harder for other differences to enter the next judgment. Materials have not vanished into thin air on their own. Concrete positions of use repeatedly determine which materials can be seen, cited, and assigned weight. Persistent bias also leaves traces that can be examined: certain materials always receive priority in citation, certain problems are always called exceptions, and certain nodes are never questioned. Examining which materials are repeatedly omitted makes effort-saving inertia visible again. Asking exactly who cites, who adopts, and who actually implements brings abstract persistence back to repeated actions that can be examined. These traces allow habits of saving effort to be turned back into judgments open to comparison and revision.

IX. Counterexample Exclusion and the Turn Toward Illusory Explanatory Construction

Counterexample exclusion still retains an important boundary: counterexamples have not yet been rewritten as proof of the existing theory; they have merely been pushed outside explanation. As long as materials can re-enter, bias may still be open to calibration. If interpreters, users of theory, or those handling matters dismiss concrete institutional conditions, local memory, or community responsibilities wholesale as exceptions, they are in effect preventing counterexamples from changing existing distinction extraction and weights. It is these concrete users who exclude them, not the counterexamples themselves that have lost their effect.

Differentiation bias is not yet illusory explanatory construction; it may still be calibrated. As long as explanation is willing to return to concrete relational fields, reassess weights, examine nodes, trace relational chains, and reread historical indices, counterexamples can still change it. If it refuses to do so, however, it begins to exclude counterexamples. At the stage of differentiation bias, explanation first pushes counterexamples away on encountering them, calling them chance occurrences, exceptions, noise, special circumstances, or insufficient materials.

A family is plainly barred from school admission by household registration and the number of school places, yet explanation still says these are merely isolated institutional details and that the essence of the matter is still the family's labor circumstances. A local conflict is plainly triggered by family historical indices, place names, burial grounds, and local reputation, yet explanation still says these are merely old ideas and that the essence of the matter is still economic interests. A national community is plainly sustained through language, memory, shared protection, and paths of responsibility, yet explanation still says these are merely manufactured surface identities. Once counterexamples are pushed away, explanation need not revise itself. In counterexample exclusion, counterexamples have not yet been rewritten as materials supporting the explanation, so entry points for calibration may still reopen. In counterexample digestion, however, they are incorporated into the explanation's own structure, made part of the theory's self-verification, and presented as proof that the theory is correct at a deeper level, bringing explanation into a more closed state. If differentiation bias refuses to let counterexamples change it, it slides toward illusory explanatory construction.

Counterexamples do not serve to force explanation to abandon every judgment. They test whether existing entry points can acknowledge having missed differences that are gaining weight. When counterexamples are allowed to change the ranking of materials, the relevance of rules, or the understanding of relational fields, explanation can remain open. If they are merely kept outside, misalignment deepens. When excluding counterexamples, interpreters may still claim to be preserving only the main judgment. Yet if every nonconforming piece of material is called accidental or secondary, the main judgment ceases to be tested against relational fields and consequences. Only by retaining a place for counterexamples in calibration can effectiveness within a limited scope be kept from turning into a closed conclusion.

For a counterexample truly to enter explanation means that it can change the scope, ranking, or entry points of the original judgment. This does not abandon theory. On the contrary, it keeps explanation open to comparison and revision and maintains its tracing of real consequences. Calibrating differentiation bias does not require explanation to abandon judgment or to treat all differences equally. Without judgment there is no theory; without weights, explanation cannot act. The problem is not that explanation has extracted certain differences, but that it has forgotten it also downweighted others. Calibration therefore restores explanation's capacity to differentiate and to judge anew which differences are gaining weight in the current relational field.

Facing the relational field anew requires establishing which differences enter consequences through which materials, rules, and nodes. Interpreters or users must return to the materials themselves and ask, item by item: do they always extract the same kind of difference, do they fix that kind at the highest weight, and has this explanation been brought into the wrong relational field? Returning to the relational field and reassessing weights bring explanation back to concrete situations, examining the operative weight of different conditions in particular contexts.

Further examination must reach into the mechanisms of transmission. It must ask where differences are preserved, who extracts, certifies, and implements them, how they connect along relational chains and are transmitted into consequences, and which historical indices are currently being triggered. Examining nodes, tracing relational chains, and rereading historical indices serve precisely to establish how concrete differences connect through each link to form consequences, rooting explanation in materials again.

Explanation must also confront the question of whether counterexamples can change it rather than simply being pushed away. These questions are raised not to cancel explanation, but to let counterexamples truly enter it so that it can regain the capacity for calibration. If explanation can still be changed by these questions and counterexamples, it has not yet closed. If it refuses these questions, it will keep sliding along the inertia of

distinction extraction. Only when it no longer merely excludes counterexamples but also incorporates them into its own structure does it enter the more closed state of illusory explanatory construction.

Calibration also requires distinguishing revision from self-negation. When interpreters adjust distinction extraction and weights, they are not declaring every previous judgment invalid. They are redefining the scope of applicability in light of new relational fields, materials, and consequences, so that theory can both make judgments and accept testing by counterexamples and concrete conditions. The practical meaning of calibration is to re-establish a return channel: materials can be supplied, weights reassessed, nodes and relational chains re-examined, and historical indices identified anew according to current conditions. These steps do not guarantee a complete explanation at the first attempt, but they can prevent existing images from closing off the very possibility of revision.

Calibration also requires returning the results of revision to testing against consequences. When new materials, rules, or counterexamples change the entry points of explanation, those handling matters should explain anew which judgments remain valid, which rankings need adjustment, and which questions still need pursuing. Such revision preserves responsibility for judgment while preventing existing images from escaping concrete relational fields merely because they are familiar.

Chapter 25. Illusory Explanatory Construction: Internally Coherent but Distorting Reality

I. From Counterexample Exclusion to Counterexample Digestion

Counterexample digestion first changes the position of materials within an explanation. Someone presenting a counterexample was originally pointing out that a node, a piece of material, or a relational chain does not fit the existing image. If those defending the image rewrite this mismatch as a wrongly framed question, misplaced material, or something awaiting a deeper account, the counterexample no longer requires the original conclusion to give ground. It is instead accommodated within the original main line.

The difference between exclusion and digestion becomes clear here: exclusion leaves materials that do not fit outside the image; digestion turns them into resources for keeping the image intact. Chapter 24 explained that differentiation bias initially responds to counterexamples by excluding them. Counterexamples are called chance occurrences, exceptions, noise, special circumstances, or insufficient materials. Explanation neither truly stops nor returns to concrete relational fields to extract distinctions anew. It merely pushes unsuitable materials away so that the original image can keep operating. But if an erroneous explanation continues to close itself off, it will not stop at excluding counterexamples. It will go further and incorporate them into its own framework, turning them into proof that the original image is correct at a deeper level. At this point, explanation begins to enter illusory explanatory construction. Calibration occurs only when interpreters allow counterexamples to re-enter judgment, change weights, and open up relational chains; renaming by itself cannot replace calibration.

Illusory explanatory construction is neither an ordinary error nor careless nonsense. It often has materials, concepts, causes, enemies, a main line, and a course of action. It can even explain part of reality. Precisely for this reason, it is dangerous. An explanation with no materials from reality at all can hardly sustain itself for long. Illusory explanatory construction can endure because it does grasp certain parts of reality: suffering, oppression, conflict, interests, and the scars left by history. The problem is not that it has seen nothing. The problem is that it allows reality to appear only in the form of the differentiating units it has already extracted.

II. How Limited Materials Are Overorganized

When extracting differentiating units, interpreters also arrange how visible they are. Wages, housing, or documents enter judgment both because they are seen and because certain people connect them to eligibility, responsibility, and consequences. These connections help trace events; yet weights may become fixed at this point if other nodes have not been examined. Weight assignment occurs in concrete relational fields, making a difference easier to record, transmit, and cite. It is not an abstract ranking. A set of differentiating units repeatedly placed at the start of judgment gains explanatory priority. Other differences still exist, but may be treated as supplements only after the conclusion has formed.

Repeatedly extracted differentiating units also gradually become stabilized in the formats of materials. Forms, archives, and existing classifications make a particular difference easier for the next user to see, but cannot prove that it has the same weight in every relational field. While helping with tracing, existing nodes and records may still fix earlier biases as later premises. Overorganization occurs when distinction extraction, connection, and write-back form a closed circuit with one another: a classification left by one judgment becomes material for the next, and the next judgment treats the original classification as an already proven

starting point. This loop gradually gives limited distinction extraction the appearance of a whole. When different nodes repeatedly use the loop, limited judgments acquire authority beyond what the original materials support.

Illusory explanatory construction does not lack differentiating units; it overorganizes a limited set of them. No explanation can extract every differentiating unit in reality at once. Explanation always has to select a portion. It must first see some differences and then judge how much weight they carry in the current relational field. Limited distinction extraction is not itself an error. When a family faces unpaid wages, extracting wages, labor, debt, housing, and risk is necessary. When a child applies for school admission, extracting household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, student registration, school places, and local policies is also necessary. When members of a local community exclude someone, extracting accent, years of residence, neighborly relations, local reputation, and past conflicts may also be crucial. After a set of differences enters an image, one must still ask at which nodes it is preserved, who cites it, and whether it can withstand a change in relational field. This questioning must also return to the procedures through which materials were formed, to establish when they were preserved, who cited them, and whether later judgments changed their weights.

The problem arises at the next step. Having extracted a set of differentiating units, explanation treats that set as the whole of reality. It no longer asks what differences remain unextracted, which differences are gaining weight in the current relational field, or whether downweighted differences are changing the consequences of events. It extracts labor, income, debt, and housing, then writes society as a class image; extracts documents, archives, borders, and implementation, then writes society as a state image; extracts language, rites and customs, and education, then writes society as a cultural image; extracts harm, commemoration, and historical indices, then writes society as a historical image. Each image has a basis within a limited scope: interpreters adopting class theory can extract labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, and capacity for domination; interpreters adopting a state image can extract identification, formatting, registration, certification, mutual recognition, allocation and coordination, and implementation; interpreters adopting a cultural image can extract language, rites and customs, education, values, and habits of life; interpreters adopting a historical image can extract harm, commemoration, historical indices, and community memory. All these differentiating units may be real and weighty.

The danger of illusory explanatory construction lies precisely in the fact that these images are not entirely ineffective. Interpreters extract some real differentiating units and connect them into a seemingly complete explanation. But illusory construction occurs when explanation oversteps its bounds: it no longer acknowledges that other differentiating units remain unextracted, no longer permits downweighted differences to re-enter, no longer examines nodes, relational chains, and historical indices, and no longer lets counterexamples change it. Differentiating units drawn from a limited scope are thus expanded into an image of the whole; broken relational chains are filled in as smooth causality; and unextracted differences are called secondary, superficial, occlusion, noise, or something that has not yet developed to a sufficiently clear stage. Illusory construction does not lack reality. It compresses a small number of real differentiating units excessively, assigns them excessive weight, and connects them excessively, finally passing itself off as the whole of society.

Illusory explanatory construction is easily mistaken for explanation because it has the appearance of material support. It does extract some real differentiating units. It can name wages, debt, documents, archives, borders, language, rites and customs, historical indices, and historical harms. It is not an empty fiction but a lifelike image of the whole. Differences such as wages, documents, language, and historical indices really exist. Listeners therefore readily transfer the truth of the materials to the entire causal line, forgetting that nodes in

between have yet to be traced clearly. The truth of materials proves only that those materials exist; it does not automatically make the entire causal line accurate.

The appearance of causality comes from the arrangement of the story. This smoothness can connect complex reality into an easily told main line, organizing multiple nodes, intersecting relations, and paths not yet fully investigated as the unfolding of one overarching cause. Materials from different positions can be placed in a clear sequence in the narrative, yet the relational chains may not have been traced clearly. Narrative order cannot replace the actual order of transmission. Making a story hang together does not mean that the effects between nodes have been established.

The appearance of certainty can reduce unease. Complex reality leaves people unsure what to look at, what to hate, what to sympathize with, what to exclude, or what to act on. Illusory explanatory construction supplies a definite image, enabling people to know causes, objects, and courses of action quickly. The appearance of certainty can reduce the burden of judgment; shared language can also allow members to affirm one another and rearrange different materials. Both serve organizational functions, yet neither can replace calibration against reality. A vocabulary's stable circulation cannot be treated as proof of accuracy.

The more it resembles explanation, the more readily it replaces explanation; the more it resembles reality, the more readily it occludes reality. Genuine explanation retains entry points for returning to reality. Illusory explanatory construction blocks those entry points, replacing calibration with a sense of completeness.

III. Gap Completion: Explanation Refuses to Stop

The key to illusory explanatory construction lies not in what it has already seen, but in how it handles gaps. Materials from reality are often incomplete: not all nodes have been fully investigated, not all relational chains have been traced, and not all historical indices can necessarily be found. A gap indicates not only insufficient information, but also that materials have yet to find a position within a relational chain. A result has appeared, but the path behind it remains unclear. Someone has been harmed, yet one cannot immediately judge whether that harm came from labor relations, institutional eligibility, local relations, family historical indices, medical history, debt, or the joint effects of several relations. If a result and the path that produced it are mixed together and directly attached to a familiar cause, the work of investigation becomes confirmation of an existing image. The existing main line replaces every unseen intermediary position.

Blanks between nodes are particularly easy to overlook. Documents may already exist without necessarily showing who preserves them, who certifies them, or who refuses to recognize them. Even when a medical history has been recorded, it may not directly explain how that history enters an eligibility judgment. Completion compresses these procedures into seemingly natural causes, making it difficult for later judgments to identify when and where completion occurred. Materials are thus treated as causes, procedures arranged as a natural sequence, and unextracted differences left with only the position of exceptions. A genuine pause requires keeping unfinished parts within judgment, preventing a larger image from hiding them.

A healthy pause must retain the possibility of renewed distinction extraction. It can provisionally acknowledge that no judgment has yet been made, marking a gap as a relational position that needs tracing. This is not evading responsibility; it avoids using a familiar image to answer in advance on the materials' behalf. Stopping does not mean abandoning explanation. Stopping means acknowledging that the differentiating units extracted so far are insufficient, that current weight judgments still need calibration, that some relational chains have not been traced clearly, and that counterexamples may really change the original image.

Closed completion does the opposite: it turns the unknown into the known, and what has not yet been connected into what is already connected. Illusory explanatory construction does not fabricate out of nothing. It refuses to pause at gaps in reality, using familiar images to complete reality. Without knowing the concrete nodes, it assumes an overarching cause; without tracing relational chains, it joins them into familiar causality; without finding historical indices, it writes the past as an eternal cause. Even when counterexamples appear, it does not let them return for calibration, but transforms them into proof that the theory is correct at a deeper level. When this practice is adopted repeatedly, later people see only complete conclusions. It becomes difficult to discover which differences in between never actually entered judgment.

Consider again the same family of workers from elsewhere. Their child's failure to gain school admission may in reality involve household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, the student-registration system, school places, rental registration, the timing of migration, local policies, and the school's implementation practices. If explanation has not traced these nodes, it may use a familiar image to complete the account: an illusory class construction will call this an expression of class oppression; an illusory state construction, a result of state control; an illusory market construction, competitive failure and the consequences of choices; an illusory cultural construction, a problem of ideas about family, educational ideas, or habits of life; an illusory historical construction, the inevitable continuation of past historical indices or historical harms. Once the family's materials are placed in a total image, originally different paths of transmission between nodes are easily compressed into the same kind of proof.

These accounts are not necessarily groundless. The family does have problems of labor and income, is blocked by institutional eligibility requirements, must face the distribution of urban resources, and may indeed be looked down on because of accent, habits, local relations, and migration history. But if explanation places the event directly in a familiar image without tracing how these differences connect concretely, it is not explaining the event. It is using the event to complete itself. Once the gaps are filled, explanation looks more complete, but that completeness has been filled in with familiar images. Reality has not re-entered explanation; explanation has spoken the remaining words on reality's behalf.

IV. Causal-Line Infilling: Making Relations Not Yet Fully Traced Run Smoothly

After gap completion, explanation does something else: causal-line infilling. Causal-line infilling occurs when explanation joins relational chains that have not been traced clearly into a familiar causal line of its own. Relational chains in reality are often not straight lines. A family's difficulties may arise simultaneously from unpaid wages, renting, interrupted social-insurance contributions, a child's school admission, an elder's medical records, historical indices of kinship, local reputation, and migration paths. These differences have sequences, intersections, and breaks between them, as well as points at which they amplify one another.

Unpaid wages make rent harder to meet, and difficulty paying rent in turn affects residential stability. Unstable residence affects school-admission materials, while interruptions in social-insurance records may also change eligibility judgments. The fact that an elder's medical records are back home affects assistance and care arrangements; historical indices of kinship that remain unclear affect borrowing and trust within the family; a poor local reputation may affect recognition by neighbors and opportunities to rent. These relational chains need to be traced patiently. They cannot simply be swallowed by a single line. Healthy explanation acknowledges that relational chains have not yet been traced clearly. Illusory explanatory construction joins relations not yet traced clearly into smooth causality.

Branches in relational chains do not merely add details to a story; they may change the attribution of consequences. Unpaid wages and housing can amplify one another, and housing and school admission may

also affect one another. Yet every connection still needs confirmation through concrete materials and nodes. Arranging them directly into a single line makes some intermediary positions that actually exert effects disappear. Infilling often borrows a familiar subject. When all difficulties are assigned to one grand image, the people and procedures that concretely register, review, refuse, or recognize are hidden. This not only reduces responsibility; it also leaves subsequent correction unable to find nodes to return to.

An illusory class construction connects failed school admission, being refused rental housing, the inability to establish mutual recognition of medical histories, poor local reputation, and historical indices of kinship as subordinate expressions of the class image. An illusory state construction connects these difficulties as unified consequences of state control; an illusory market construction, as competitive failure and insufficient adaptation; an illusory cultural construction, as backward ideas or problems of lifestyle; an illusory historical construction, as the continuation of old harms. This kind of causal-line infilling is not without materials. Its real danger lies in making complex relations too smooth. An excessively smooth explanation often omits reality's most crucial branches. It does not ask how a particular node actually works, which relational chain actually exerted an effect, which difference is gaining weight at this moment, or whether the differences it downweighted have already changed the result. It wants only a line that can be made to hang together. Once that line hangs together, explanation believes its work is done.

Smooth causality also changes the shape of counterexamples. Materials that originally negated only one connection are described as merely failing to see a deeper cause. The relational chain is thus not taken apart; it receives still more infilling. Smooth lines also hide branches of responsibility, covering what is borne at different positions with the same overarching cause. Making an account hang together does not mean tracing it clearly, nor does a complete sequence mean that its nodes have been confirmed.

V. Counterexample Digestion: How Conflict Is Turned into Proof

At the stage of illusory explanatory construction, counterexamples are no longer merely pushed away. They are renamed, repositioned, and transformed into proof that the original image is correct at a deeper level. Renaming first changes a counterexample's identity. Materials that originally pointed to the image's limits are renamed surface phenomena, isolated biases, or evidence not yet mature. Once the name changes, the materials no longer require the original conclusion to give ground. Suppose an explanation claims that all difficulties come from the class image. It encounters the counterexample that people with the same income experience entirely different consequences under different household registrations, local relations, medical histories, and responsibilities to kin. If it merely excludes the counterexample, it calls this an isolated case. If it begins to digest the counterexample, it says that these seemingly different consequences precisely show the class image's deeper domination over other differences.

Repositioning places counterexamples in positions reserved by the original image. Different results no longer mean that the main line has failed; they are interpreted as expressions of that main line at different levels, times, or in different forms. Differences that could originally be compared are thus absorbed into the same conclusion. Suppose an explanation claims that all difficulties come from state control. It encounters the fact that some difficulties come from market rents, local reputation, family historical indices, and community exclusion. If it merely excludes counterexamples, it calls these materials unimportant. Once it begins to digest them, it says that these so-called market, local, and family problems are actually more concealed expressions of state control.

At the deepest point of closure, counterexamples too are turned into proof. The clearer the counterexample, the more readily those defending the image can claim that it reveals a deeper mechanism. The image thus

need not bear failure; it instead obtains new defensive materials from conflict. Even preserved counterexamples may acquire meaning only in positions permitted by the original image, without truly opening new entry points for comparison. Suppose an explanation claims that all difficulties come from cultural backwardness. It encounters phenomena that culture cannot fully explain, such as school admission, interrupted social-insurance contributions, mutual recognition of medical records, housing eligibility, and unpaid wages. When excluding counterexamples, it says that opponents see only the surface. When digesting them, it declares that these institutional and economic problems occur precisely because this culture is ill-adapted to the modern order.

Once renamed, counterexamples can no longer hurt the explanation. The less they fit the original image, the more they are called evidence that the image is correct at a deeper level. Within illusory explanatory construction, counterexamples cease to exert pressure for calibration. Instead, they become materials through which the illusory construction expands itself. The more counterexamples there are, the busier it becomes adding patches; the more patches there are, the more closed the system becomes. At this point, explanation does more than see things wrongly. It has gained a defensive capacity: it no longer fears reality's failure to fit, but can describe even a failure to fit as a fit.

VI. Coherence Does Not Equal Accuracy

As long as renaming suffices without any need to answer how materials change weights, counterexamples lose their comparative function. A coherent explanation can arrange its starting point, causes, enemies, and actions neatly, but these arrangements prove only that its parts can support one another. If every part is produced through the same set of naming practices and write-back, internal consistency cannot establish whether the explanation still makes contact with downweighted differences.

Once gaps have been completed, causal lines connected, and counterexamples digested, explanation develops internal coherence. It looks complete: it has a starting point, causes, objects, conflicts, and solutions. It can explain why the problem occurred, why people failed to notice, why opponents oppose it, why counterexamples are not counterexamples, and why action should unfold in this way. Such an explanation gives people a strong sense of stability. But coherence is not accuracy. Internal coherence shows only that an explanation runs smoothly within itself. Being open to calibration by reality is the condition for explanation to remain valid; calibration against reality is what shows that reality can still change the explanation.

Calibration against reality requires explanation to accept a reordering brought by external materials. New nodes may change weights; unextracted differences may gain weight; results originally treated as exceptions may force relational chains to be reconnected. An entry point for reality is not a modest phrase that leaves room for qualification. It is a concrete position at which revision is possible. One must know which material can change the conclusion, which relational chain remains unconfirmed, and who can bring counterexamples back into the judgment procedure.

The blanks left by completion do not disappear. They are merely placed inside the conclusion, making it harder for later people to recognize that they were once blanks. Once blanks are placed inside a conclusion, tracing anew requires taking it apart to recover the materials, nodes, and procedures one by one. Adding another qualification outside the conclusion is not enough.

An explanation can therefore have complete concepts, smooth causality, clear enemies, and a definite course of action, yet still distort reality. It may organize some real differentiating units tightly while depriving still more differences that are gaining weight of an entry point. It may be adept at handling counterexamples without ever letting them truly change it; adept at describing causality without tracing how concrete nodes

preserve, certify, and implement differences; adept at describing history without asking which present events are triggering past differences anew. The problem with illusory explanatory construction is not incompleteness, but excessive completeness: it is so complete that it leaves reality no entry point.

Healthy explanation leaves entry points open. It acknowledges that the differentiating units it extracts are limited, that current weights are only judgments within the current relational field, that nodes, relational chains, and historical indices still need tracing, and that counterexamples may change the original image. Illusory explanatory construction closes these entry points. It is not incapable of explaining any reality; it no longer allows reality to change it. After colliding with reality, an ordinary error may still retreat and undergo correction. After colliding with reality, illusory explanatory construction writes the collision itself into its proof.

VII. How Different Illusory Constructions Subsume the Same Event

Entry points must lie in concrete materials and procedures to which one can return. They cannot be merely a qualifying phrase expressing humility. Consider again that family of workers from elsewhere: the husband works on a construction site, the wife does casual work in a restaurant, their child has reached school age, the elder's medical records are at a hospital back home, rent is nearly due, wages are two months overdue, social-insurance records have been interrupted, and the family still owes a loan to relatives. This family is not a single label. Multiple sets of differentiating units intersect within it: wages, labor, debt, housing, and risk do carry great weight; household registration, residence permits, social insurance, student registration, and administrative eligibility are also weighty; accent, ties with people from the same place of origin, years of residence, recognition by neighbors, and local reputation also exert effects; responsibilities to kin, medical history, historical indices, care, and romantic relationships and marriage are not external details; migration routes, family memory, and old local events may also suddenly gain weight in a particular event.

Differences within the same family intersect because they acquire weight at different nodes. Unpaid wages may first change residential stability, and housing may in turn affect school-admission materials. Yet care within kinship relations, local recognition, and mutual recognition of medical histories do not necessarily run along the same line. If only one set of differences is selected as the overarching cause, other differences are forced to be rewritten as subordinate expressions. Such rewriting does not simplify the family's experience. It merely makes that experience expressible in only one language. An image's overstepping of its bounds also affects how family members understand one another: when every difficulty is assigned to the same overarching cause, members' responsibilities, constrained positions, and available exits at different nodes can no longer be judged separately. Concrete materials can show both the image's strength within a limited scope and its boundaries. If local reputation changes opportunities to rent, this does not automatically negate the weight of labor and income. If social-insurance records affect school-admission eligibility, this does not mean that family relations and historical indices lose their effect.

How does illusory explanatory construction handle this family? It does not fail to see the family altogether. It sees, but permits the family to be explained in only one way. Interpreters adopting class theory do extract labor and income. Yet the illusory class construction treats a limited image drawn from economic, labor, property, and domination relations as the whole of society itself, describing unpaid wages, the child's school admission, local recognition, the elder's medical records, household-registration restrictions, historical indices of kinship, and migration memory as subordinate expressions of the class image.

Interpreters adopting a state image do extract documents and implementation. Yet the illusory state construction expands formatting, certification, mutual recognition, allocation and coordination, and

implementation into the sole image for explaining the whole of society, describing all these difficulties as results of state control and institutional oppression. Interpreters adopting a market image do extract rent, competition, and capacity to consume. The illusory market construction expands prices, competition, and capacity to consume into the sole image for explaining all social consequences, describing all these difficulties as competitive failure, consequences of choices, or insufficient adaptation.

Interpreters adopting a cultural image do extract language, rites and customs, and ideas. The illusory cultural construction expands language, rites and customs, education, values, and habits of life into the fundamental cause of every circumstance, compressing income, household registration, medical history, school places, and local exclusion into habits of life, educational ideas, or cultural backwardness. Interpreters adopting a historical image do extract old wounds, memory, and enduring boundaries. The illusory historical construction miswrites the renewed triggering of past differences as the past's absolute rule over the present, writing current difficulties as the inevitable continuation of past historical indices, historical harms, or old boundaries.

No form of illusory construction begins without materials. Rather, interpreters expand limited materials into a closed image. But when these explanations no longer allow other differentiating units to enter, no longer permit nodes and relational chains to be retraced, and no longer let counterexamples change the original judgment, they begin to turn into illusory constructions. Illusory explanatory construction has not failed to see the event. It uses a familiar image to supply the event's missing causes. It does not refuse to look at its object; it allows that object only to prove the image of the world it has already prepared.

Illusory class, state, market, cultural, and historical constructions differ in content but share a mechanism. They all begin with validity within a limited scope; all expand a limited set of differentiating units into an image of the whole; all complete reality at its gaps; all digest counterexamples into proof of their own correctness; and all produce new materials through action to reinforce themselves. Validity within a limited scope must remain connected to concrete relational fields. Once detached from those fields, it cannot automatically acquire weight for the whole. Only by preserving both the scope of validity and the procedures that formed it can one prevent a limited judgment from passing itself off as carrying weight for the whole in the next relational field.

A shared mechanism does not cancel differences in content between images. Labor and income; documents and implementation; prices and competition; language together with rites and customs; harm and memory—each pair brings different materials into judgment. The problem is that each image may elevate its own position of distinction extraction into the sole entry point. A shared mode of closure does not erase differences in the materials users extract through different images, their scopes of validity, or the consequences they produce. If different interpreters all complete gaps, reinforce their accounts when counterexamples arise, and retrieve materials after action, surface differences in position cannot hide the same closed procedure. Comparison should focus on how they handle nodes and relational chains, not on their respective slogans. To judge whether an explanation enters illusory construction, one should examine whether its users elevate limited materials into an unrevisable image of the whole and then use it to complete gaps and digest counterexamples. Which set of names they adopt is not itself a sufficient criterion.

VIII. How Action Write-Back Produces Self-Verification

Illusory explanatory construction is not merely a cognitive error. It organizes action; action produces new materials; and those materials reinforce the illusory construction. Illusory construction does not stop at explanation. Through action, it writes back into reality, then takes reality after write-back as proof of itself. But materials after write-back are not purely new reality. They are reality already shaped by actions organized through illusory construction. The consequences produced by those actions cannot directly be taken as neutral proof that the illusory construction itself is correct.

The key to write-back is that action leaves materials that can be cited again. An eligibility judgment, a risk record, or an act of exclusion may change the conditions under which the person concerned later obtains resources, trust, and passage through procedures. If later judgments see only the record, they will treat a shaped result as an original state. Action therefore needs to be traced at several positions: who makes the determination, which node preserves it, who extracts it in the next procedure, and how it affects new eligibility and risks. If even one part is omitted, write-back is easily described as a natural consequence. Once shaped consequences become records, the next person judging may take them as the person's original characteristics. Reviewers must bring the contents of records together with their conditions of formation back into judgment, identifying which person or institution set the threshold, which procedure preserved the result, and how later people extract it anew. Otherwise, procedures leave only results, preventing users from seeing how action shapes materials.

The defense and resistance of those excluded may also be renamed. Conflict originally produced by thresholds is described as instability in the object itself; insufficient materials caused by breaks in records are used to prove that raising thresholds is reasonable. If a group is interpreted as a dangerous object, those handling it will treat it as such. New conflicts produced by exclusion, surveillance, provocation, and forced self-defense will in turn be taken as evidence that “it really is dangerous.” This is not reality proving the illusory construction. The illusory construction first participates in producing reality, then retrieves the consequences it produced to serve as evidence.

A locality that regards all incoming families as unstable risks keeps raising thresholds in renting, school admission, neighborly relations, and job opportunities. This makes it harder for the family to become stable. When it does move frequently, have intermittent social insurance, and struggle to enroll its child, the local explanation says: Look, they really are unstable. An institution that sees certain people mainly as management costs likewise adds obstacles involving documents, review, assistance, and passage through procedures. The more obstacles there are, the harder it becomes for those concerned to establish continuous records; the fewer continuous records they have, the more readily the institution says that their materials are insufficient, their risks higher, and that relaxing requirements for them would be inappropriate.

Market explanations, cultural explanations, and illusory historical constructions also produce similar write-back. Attributing every failure to insufficient adaptation shifts low wages, long working hours, rental pressure, and debt deadlines onto individual choices. Attributing difficulties to backward ideas turns institutional thresholds, economic pressure, and local exclusion into educational problems. Writing present conflict as the inevitable continuation of old harms forces even new interactions to be understood along the lines of those old harms.

Action write-back makes illusory explanatory construction more stable. It no longer merely explains existing reality; it begins to participate in producing reality. It arranges people, resources, trust, eligibility, boundaries, and punishments according to its image. Action leaves records, conflicts, failures, exclusion, resistance, and new fears. Explanation then retrieves these new materials as proof that it was right all along. At this point,

illusory construction has formed a loop: it extracts a small number of differentiating units and organizes them into an image of the whole; organizes action according to that image; action changes reality; and it extracts the changed reality anew. It thus looks increasingly true. Write-back is not one-way accumulation. New materials must still be extracted anew by people, institutions, and procedures before they can enter the next round of judgment. Precisely for this reason, calibration must return to the nodes that preserve and transmit materials, rather than examine only the final conclusion.

IX. The Appeal of Illusory Explanatory Construction

If illusory explanatory construction were simply an error, it might not endure so long. It also meets several real needs. Complex social relations cause unease; a definite image enables people to orient themselves quickly and believe that the real cause has been found. An enemy provides a focus for responsibility. When responsibility is too dispersed, a clear enemy also provides a focus for anger, fear, and discontent. A course of action establishes a sequence of actions, telling people what to transform or eliminate, whom to mobilize or obey, whom to struggle against, whom to punish, and what to wait for. Together, these arrangements can turn complex relations that cannot be dealt with immediately into instructions for action that can be disseminated.

People sharing the same image use the same vocabulary, identify the same enemy, and tell the same causal story. They also affirm one another as a community. Shared language allows members to affirm one another and incorporate different materials into the same vocabulary. Such affirmation has real social effects, but cannot be taken to mean that the image has passed calibration against reality. Once vocabulary is fixed, heterogeneous materials may instead be forced into the same direction of interpretation. Equally important is the security of being exempt from revision. If counterexamples can be renamed, users need not bear the pressure of pausing, checking evidence, and changing direction, while the existing community can more readily maintain agreement. As long as the original image can digest every counterexample, the pressure to revise disappears.

Certainty, enemies, a course of action, community, and the security of exemption from revision make illusory explanatory construction more than an intellectual failure: it also serves concrete social functions. Precisely for this reason, its need to return to reality for calibration is all the greater.

X. Dismantling Illusory Construction and Restoring Entry Points for Reality

Calibrating illusory explanatory construction does not mean adding patches to a closed image. It means allowing excluded reality to re-enter explanation. Patching is not calibration; patches may make an illusory construction more closed. Dismantling illusory explanatory construction means recovering the differentiating units that have been overorganized, taking apart causal lines that have been made smooth, releasing digested counterexamples, and examining biased materials produced by actions organized through illusory construction.

Recovering differentiating units does not mean listing all differences equally. It means re-examining which differences were extracted in concrete relational fields and how they were assigned weight, why they gained weight, and which differences were downweighted before and after the result formed. This avoids writing weight as a fixed ranking.

Such examination must enter substantive relations. Beyond labor, income, debt, and housing, are household registration, medical history, local relations, responsibilities to kin, and community recognition also exerting effects? Beyond documents, archives, and implementation, are market rents, the family's provision of a safety

net, local reputation, and historical indices also changing consequences? Beyond language, rites and customs, and ideas, have institutional eligibility, resource distribution, the bearing of risks, and the width of available exits been downweighted? Relations not yet established must also be retained. Incomplete tracing does not mean that a relation does not exist. The approach is to mark positions still needing to be traced, allowing new materials to change current weights, rather than set those relations aside and ignore them.

Taking apart infilled lines requires returning to nodes one by one, investigating where the explanation completed a gap, where it assumed an overarching cause without tracing nodes, where it joined relations into smooth causality without tracing relational chains, and where it wrote the past as an eternal cause without finding historical indices. Who preserves a piece of material, who certifies it, and in which procedure it is cited: these concrete positions can explain how results form better than an elegant account of overarching causality. Dismantling also requires establishing who has the ability to change how records are read. If materials can be cited only along existing classifications, even preserved counterexamples may lose their effect again before entering judgment. This is also why calibration must examine materials and procedures together.

Releasing counterexamples does not mean treating every objection as valid. Counterexamples must point to concrete differences, nodes, or relational chains and explain how they force the original image to change distinction extraction and weights. This requires examining which counterexamples should have changed the explanation but were called noise, occlusion, a failure to awaken, insufficient information, or proof of correctness at a deeper level. Examining write-back requires distinguishing new materials from materials shaped by action. Records are not transparent windows; how a record was formed may itself become a difference in subsequent judgment. One must establish what actions the explanation organized, whether those actions produced new biased materials, and whether the explanation retrieved the new materials left by action as proof of its own correctness.

These questions are not intended to cancel explanation, but to let it regain entry points for reality. The result of calibration need not be another closed total image. It can retain a limited scope, provisional weights, and relations not yet traced clearly, while specifying what materials would prompt revision. An explanation that counterexamples can change is not yet completely closed; one that counterexamples cannot change has already begun to turn into an illusory construction. Explanation cannot extract all of reality, but it must know what it extracted, what it downweighted, where it completed gaps, where it made relational chains run smoothly, where it turned counterexamples into self-verification, and where it produced new biased materials through action. Only in this way can explanation avoid becoming trapped by its own completeness.

XI. Moving into Model C and Complexity-Based Conflation

Keeping entry points for reality open allows judgment to continue within a limited scope, but unfinished work cannot be described as complete. Excessive certainty ends comparison prematurely; excessive uncertainty prevents comparison from beginning. The former refuses to acknowledge that other differences may change the conclusion; the latter refuses to acknowledge that any difference can form a testable distinction. Faced with either direction, one must return to concrete materials and relational chains to see whether counterexamples can still move judgment forward. Judgment can point to concrete differences; at the same time, it must specify which counterexamples, nodes, or relational chains would prompt its revision. Acknowledging limits still allows choices; retaining complexity does not place every explanation on the same level.

Limited judgment must still specify the objects, materials, and conditions of comparison. It can offer provisional distinctions within its present scope, but must also retain an account of which new material would change weights. This does not flatten all relations. It keeps judgment traceable, refutable, and revisable within a limited scope. Illusory explanatory construction closes entry points for reality through excessive certainty; complexity-based conflation may remove the conditions for comparison through excessive uncertainty. Here, only the boundary between these two directions is marked. When they enter Model C, why neither can be reduced to the other, and how calibration rejects both extremes will be addressed together in Chapter 26.

Chapter 26. Model C, Complexity-Based Conflation, and Explanatory Calibration

I. Class Entities Do Not Exist; Class Theory Belongs to Model C from the Outset

What this book denies is neither concrete differences such as wages, labor, property, debt, housing, risk, domination, responsibility, and available exits, nor statistical classifications made for particular purposes. What it denies is compressing, projecting, and naming these differences, then reifying the resulting classification into a class that exists prior to concrete relations. Such a class does not constitute a natural community; it does not automatically possess unified interests, a unified consciousness, unified responsibility, a unified capacity for action, or a historical mission. Classifications can exist, and similar economic pressures can exist. The class entity whose existence this book denies does not exist.

The class image must first be distinguished from class theory. A class image is formed when high-weight differentiating units such as labor, income, property, debt, housing, risk, available exits, and capacity for domination undergo low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming along axes of economic, labor, property, and domination relations. The real differentiating units involved provide the material basis; the processes of extracting them, assigning them weight, connecting them, and compressing them form partial explanatory power. The class image is the low-dimensional output of this process. It can present some of the circumstances extracted, but it is not society itself, still less a subject that judges and acts on its own.

The class image is readily mistaken for an entity precisely because class theory and its interpreters compress multiple, not entirely identical relations into a recognizable name. The name allows people to recognize certain shared circumstances quickly, but it also occludes how differences are preserved and recast at different nodes. When two people with similar incomes face different consequences because of household registration, medical history, caregiving responsibilities, or local recognition, the image cannot replace tracing these differences. The image's ease of recognition and dissemination comes from compression; it does not exist prior to compression.

This distinction also preserves the proper target of criticism. Criticizing class theory does not mean denying unpaid wages, housing pressures, debt, or relations of domination. Those differences can force any explanation to adjust. What the criticism rejects is compressing a set of differences capable of producing consequences into the name of an entity, then using that name to replace inquiry into other differences, nodes, and relational chains. Conflating the two makes it easy to misrepresent criticism of the total image as denial of real harms.

The structural appeal of Model C comes from the ability of interpreters who adopt it to extract materials from real suffering. Unpaid wages, debt, and housing instability force people to seek quick, certain answers; interpreters who adopt a total image may use this to name harms, connect materials, and divide friends from enemies. This appeal does not prove the total image correct. Critics must still face the consequences it captures. If they ignore those consequences, their own arguments against the total image will also lose their grounding in real materials. The most dangerous feature of Model C is not fabrication of materials out of nothing, but the ability of interpreters who adopt it to grasp real suffering and then compress that suffering into a total image that refuses revision. Overdue wages, approaching rent payments, debts falling due, and unstable labor relations do indeed simultaneously change a family's capacity to wait, room for negotiation,

and residential stability. These consequences are not illusions. Precisely because they are weighty, a closed explanation can readily appropriate them as evidence.

An entirely ineffective account is unlikely to develop into an illusory explanatory construction. It has no materials to retrieve and can hardly demand that people act according to it. Model C's power of closure comes from interpreters who adopt it first extracting a part of reality and then turning that part into the sole entry point. Thereafter, differences it has not extracted cease to be regarded as materials requiring renewed comparison. Instead, they are required to prove that they ultimately still belong within the total image.

Class theory is a typical instance of Model C. Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract real differentiating units such as labor, wages, property, housing, debt, risk, available exits, and domination, and can identify their high weights in certain relational fields. The reality and real-world efficacy of these concrete differentiating units neither prove the existence of class entities nor give class theory the standing of Model A, Model B, or an ordinary limited tool. Class theory's basic structure is Model C from the outset. It does not first exist as an ordinary limited model and become Model C only when overused. Its ability to extract a set of weighty differentiating units does not change its basic structure: from the outset, it expands distinction extraction within a limited scope into a total image, compresses the complex differentiation network into a total class image, prearranges the explanatory positions of other differences, and uses this image to monopolize explanation.

Extraction, weight assignment, compression, naming, ontologization, and demotion are operations performed by class theory and the interpreters who adopt it. Class theory presents this image as society's underlying structure and uses it to decide what is fundamental, what is superficial, and what is merely occlusion or displacement. The class image is the result of these operations. This cannot be reversed into a claim that the image itself sees differences or itself expands them into what society fundamentally is.

Thus, within class theory's closed account, nation, family, locality, religion, culture, historical indices, institutional eligibility, medical history, accent, kinship responsibilities, and community recognition are assigned positions as occlusions, appendages, displacements, or surface layers of class relations. Interpreters who adopt this theory no longer begin by asking: Do these differences enter into consequences through different nodes? Are they gaining weight at this moment? They hand the answer to the total class image in advance. This is precisely total-image formation; it cannot count as ordinary limited explanation.

II. Model C's Ontologizing Closure

Limited explanation necessarily extracts distinctions and necessarily downweights certain differences. It need not pretend to see everything, but it must state what it has extracted, what it has temporarily downweighted, and which counterexamples would force it to revise. Compression is not itself an error. Dangerous compression occurs when compression forgets what it has downweighted and refuses to let counterexamples rearrange weights, nodes, and relational chains. Model C is the extreme form of this danger: it erases the boundaries of limited distinction extraction and disguises the image's boundaries as those of reality.

Explanations that adopt Model C refuse this responsibility. Interpreters who adopt it present the results of their distinction extraction as reality's underlying structure and a crude projection as what society fundamentally is. Downweighted differences thus cease to pose a problem. Once a model is presented as underlying reality, limitation is shifted onto reality. If materials do not fit, the question is no longer what the explanation has downweighted. Instead, reality is said not yet to have revealed the truth, the people concerned not yet to have recognized their circumstances, or relations still to remain at the surface. This allows the

theory to wait forever for another layer of proof without having to answer for counterexamples that have already appeared.

Model C's ontologization is more than a theoretical declaration; it substantively changes how questions are asked. What should have been an inquiry into which differences produced this result through which relational chains is rewritten as a question of how this result displays the established structure. The former allows materials to change the explanation; the latter requires materials to supply the proof needed by the established structure. Once the boundaries are hidden, distinction extraction no longer answers for its omissions.

This self-exemption has direct practical consequences. Explanations that adopt Model C no longer need to explain why they extract only labor, property, or domination relations in a particular event, nor acknowledge that household registration, medical records, local recognition, kinship responsibilities, or national memory may change the consequences. Interpreters who adopt Model C can describe unprocessed materials as secondary, not yet manifest, or proof of a deeper total image. Explanation thereby acquires a capacity for closure.

III. Model C's Two Mechanisms

Model C contains two mechanisms that move in opposite directions but serve related functions. Total-image subsumption closes explanation through excessive certainty: a limited image produced through distinction extraction is elevated into society itself, while other valid explanations are demoted or canceled. The erasure of distinctions between explanations cancels judgment through excessive uncertainty: it illicitly substitutes the claim that society cannot be effectively explained for the fact that society cannot be exhausted and explanation is necessarily limited, then places valid models, limited models, erroneous models, and junk models on the same level. Only when complexity-based conflation uses complexity as grounds for canceling valid comparison does it constitute this mechanism for erasing distinctions between explanations.

Total-image subsumption prevents comparison from leaving the established image; the erasure of distinctions between explanations prevents comparison from beginning at all. The former co-opts counterexamples; the latter treats them as proof that no judgment can hold. The two mechanisms cannot be reduced to the same psychology, the same historical process, or the same method of argument. Both destroy the conditions for comparison, revision, and calibration.

Ordinary acknowledgment that society is complex and explanation limited does not constitute Model C. What is limited can still be effective, and compression is not necessarily dangerous. The question is whether distinction extraction preserves channels for comparison and revision. Healthy explanation must reject both total-image subsumption and the erasure of distinctions between explanations. Otherwise, it is either locked within a single image or abandons judgment amid infinite complexity.

Opposing Model C therefore does not require establishing a symmetrical 'counter-total image.' If critics say only that every generalization is dangerous, they will cast limited distinction extraction itself as suspect and end up alongside complexity-based conflation. This chapter demands a more difficult position: putting forward judgments that can be compared while openly stating which materials could revise them.

These two forms of overstepping also often borrow each other's rhetoric. Defenders of a total image can use 'reality is extremely complex' to explain any unprocessed materials and thereby postpone calibration. Complexity-based conflation, in turn, can misrepresent the demand to oppose a total image as abandonment of all judgment. Distinguishing the two prevents criticism of the total image from sliding into the thesis that judgment is impossible.

IV. The Mechanism Chain of Model C: Total-Image Subsumption

The structure of Model C in its total-image subsumption form can be unfolded through six interconnected operations: extraction of a limited set of differentiating units, fixation of weights, total-image formation, demotion of other differences, counterexample digestion, and mobilization for action. This is not a history of class theory gradually transforming from an ordinary model into Model C. It is the unfolding of class theory's basic structure as Model C in concrete arguments, institutions, and actions.

The starting point is distinction extraction within a limited scope. Abstractly speaking, extracting a set of differences from potentially infinite differences can itself be effective. Labor, wages, property, debt, housing, risk, and relations of domination can indeed enter into real consequences. When wages are overdue, labor relations, contracting chains, project timelines, and debt deadlines may immediately gain weight. This establishes only that the operation of distinction extraction must be tested against the event. It does not follow that class theory here is Model A or Model B.

Next comes the fixation of weights. Class theory presupposes that differences carrying great weight in certain relational fields universally carry the highest weight. It no longer asks whether overdue wages, a child's school admission, refusal of rental housing, or assistance for an elder are directly determined by the same set of differentiating units. Nor does it allow household registration, student registration, medical-record preservation, local reputation, or kinship responsibilities to gain weight anew in different events. Weight is thus written as a prior hierarchy instead of an intensity generated within a concrete relational field. Fixing weights also occludes the conditions under which weights change: changes in project timelines, contracting chains, residential circumstances, document validity periods, mutual recognition of medical records, and caregiving responsibilities may rapidly move previously peripheral differences to the center. Interpreters who adopt a total image need not deny these changes. They can prevent the changes from altering their original judgments simply by naming them in advance as derivative forms of the same root cause. This is the fundamental difference between fixed weights and weights within relational fields.

Then come total-image formation and demotion. Class theory and its interpreters compress the extracted differences into a class image and use that image to prescribe the ultimate form of social relations. On this basis, other differences are demoted: nation can be described as class occlusion, family as an apparatus of reproduction, local recognition as an expression of structure, and religion and culture as ideology. Such accounts need not deny the existence of each difference. Demotion is already accomplished simply by denying their independent explanatory power in advance.

Counterexample digestion and mobilization for action follow. When people with the same income encounter different consequences because of household registration, medical history, local recognition, or kinship responsibilities, interpreters who adopt class theory do not treat this as pressure for calibration. They rename the counterexamples as a deeper unfolding of the total image. Finally, organizations, institutions, and actors identify friends and enemies, allocate eligibility, deal with communities, rewrite history, or remodel families according to the total image. The new materials produced by action are then preserved and retrieved as proof that the total image was correct all along.

These six steps support one another. Fixed weights make it easier for the total image to expand; total-image formation makes demotion appear natural; demotion, in turn, leaves counterexamples without a place to enter calibration; and action write-back supplies materials to the closed structure. The connections in this six-step chain also show that Model C does not merely 'explain too much.' It has an order for processing materials: first fixing certain differences as the universal center, then allowing the remaining materials to appear only in subordinate forms, and finally turning whatever does not fit into proof. This order does not disappear because

individual interpreters occasionally retain details. What matters is whether those details can genuinely change the standing of the total image. Differentiating units within a limited scope can themselves enter into and explain real consequences. Only when they are used to cancel the renewed extraction and comparison of other differences does the danger of Model C become apparent.

V. Model C and Illusory Explanatory Construction

Illusory explanatory construction is not devoid of real materials. It organizes limited materials into an image of the whole that refuses revision. Model C is its strong form, because organizations, institutions, and actors who adopt it act according to this account and leave records that can be extracted again in the future, thereby forming write-back. Action write-back, in particular, must not be described as something Model C accomplishes on its own. Concrete acts of naming, recording, mobilization, processing eligibility, and making arrangements for communities are always performed by institutions, organizations, and actors. Model C designates the closed structure through which these actions acquire direction and legitimacy in relation to one another. Restoring concrete subjects makes it possible to investigate how the structure enters real procedures, while avoiding the reduction of structural criticism to a question of personal moral character.

When organizations, institutions, and actors assign friend or enemy status, eligibility, and responsibility according to the total image, newly created records are very likely to be retrieved again as materials for the theory's self-verification. Evidential closure does not mean an absence of debate. A closed structure can absorb large quantities of material, generate intricate debates, and even allow limited adjustments to details. What it refuses is to let materials change the total image's standing. Debate then takes place only within the image: which phenomena prove it more convincingly, and which strategies are better suited to realizing it, rather than whether the image has downweighted differentiating units that are changing consequences.

The family of workers from elsewhere need not be introduced in full every time to show how this closure works. When wages are overdue, labor relations and contracting chains may indeed carry great weight. When rent is coming due, deposits, income, landlords' risk judgments, and residential stability may all enter into consequences at once. Within Model C's closed structure, these differences cannot enter calibration. Instead, they are required to return to the same total class image, as surface forms of that image in different domains rather than materials whose weights need reassessment.

Likewise, when a child enters school, household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, student registration, available school places, and local policies may bear more directly on the event. When an elder needs assistance, medical-record preservation, mutual recognition between the place of household registration and the place of residence, kinship responsibilities, and institutional eligibility gain weight in turn. These materials are all required to return to the total class image. Local reputation, accent, neighborhood relations, historical indices of kinship, national memory, and community responsibilities may also be treated in the same way.

Counterexamples thus lose their proper function. They should force interpreters back to the relational field to ask anew what nodes have preserved, which relational chain has transmitted consequences, and which differences were previously downweighted. Yet closed explanatory procedures that adopt Model C digest counterexamples into self-verification: the harder a piece of material is to incorporate directly, the more it is said to show the total image operating at depth. Reality does not enter the explanation; reality is forced back into the same explanation.

VI. How the Erasure of Distinctions Between Explanations Cancels Comparison

The erasure of distinctions between explanations is not another error outside Model C. It is the mechanism at the other extreme through which Model C cancels comparison. Comparison does not require every explanation to use the same materials. It requires interpreters to be able to state which consequences they answer for, which materials have temporarily been placed outside the relational-field window, and when materials outside that window would constitute counterexamples. An account that fails to delimit the question yet demands that every account explain the whole has not raised the standard. It has merely made the standard impossible to meet.

Complexity-based conflation often begins with correct reminders: society is indeed complex, no explanation can exhaust reality, and any limited relational-field window may leave out differences. The problem arises when it turns these reminders into an unlimited burden of proof. As long as an explanation does not simultaneously account for nation, state, family, medical history, local relations, wages, debt, market, and historical indices, it is judged one-sided and therefore invalid.

This demand appears more rigorous, but it actually cancels comparison. A limited explanation can answer only for the key relational chains of a particular event; it cannot prove that it covers all of society. If the ability to explain everything is made a condition of validity, every explanation will fail, leaving only the conclusion that 'they are all much the same.' Complexity-based conflation does not deepen calibration. It removes calibration's starting point altogether.

Genuine calibration asks: Which differentiating units has this explanation downweighted? Has it omitted nodes? Has it cut off relational chains? Has it misread historical indices? These questions are not intended to stop judgment, but to make it revisable within a concrete relational field. An unlimited burden of proof, by contrast, rejects any provisional judgment because it demands that every judgment first complete an impossible account of the whole.

VII. Healthy Complexity Does Not Belong to Model C

Healthy humility requires interpreters to state the conditions for revision clearly: which materials suffice to support a provisional judgment, and which counterexamples, once they appear, must lead to a rewritten conclusion. It acknowledges explanation's limits without using them as a reason to evade judgment. It is willing to specify which event it is addressing, which differentiating units are gaining weight, which materials have not yet been traced clearly, and which counterexamples may change the conclusion. It retains judgment, makes explanatory boundaries public, accepts counterexamples, and takes responsibility for revision. It also preserves the possibility of withdrawal, revision, and renewed comparison.

Nor does healthy humility turn revisability into arbitrary vacillation. It does not overturn all judgments whenever a new piece of material appears. It examines what the material has actually changed: weights, nodes, relational chains, or the relational field itself. This gives revision a direction and allows limited judgment to continue bearing consequences without closing itself off. Calibration sustains precisely this kind of judgment, for which responsibility can be taken and which can be revised, rather than canceling comparison in the name of complexity.

Complexity-based conflation turns humility into a refusal to compare. It need not examine whether household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, student registration, and available school places directly change consequences in a school-admission event. Pointing out that wages, debt, family relations, and local reputation also exist is enough for it to say that any judgment within a limited scope is

merely one-sided. In this way, key differences have not been added to the analysis, yet judgment has already been forced to stop.

Respecting complexity must not flatten all differences either. It requires interpreters to acknowledge, in every event, that materials remain unextracted and to explain under which conditions those materials would change the judgment. Such revisability differs from abandoning judgment. It is precisely how limited explanation remains responsible.

VIII. The Two Mechanisms Move in Opposite Directions but Serve Related Functions

Model C's two mechanisms also create escape routes for each other. If critics counter the compression of a total image only by saying 'reality is complex,' its supporters can say that the critics have offered no judgment open to comparison. If one counters complexity-based conflation only by proposing a larger image, one falls back into subsumption. Calibration must retain both concrete judgments and boundaries that can change, so as not to shuttle between the two extremes.

Model C's mechanism of total-image subsumption and its mechanism for erasing distinctions between explanations move in opposite directions, yet undermine calibration at the same point. The former does not allow other differences independent explanatory power and swallows counterexamples into the total image, subsuming calibration. The latter does not allow valid distinctions to be established between explanations and turns counterexamples into evidence that all explanations fail, canceling calibration.

Consider again the existing materials concerning the family of workers from elsewhere. When a child enters school, household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, student registration, available school places, and local policies may bear more directly on the event than other differences. When wages are overdue, labor relations, contracting chains, project timelines, debt deadlines, and risk-bearing may enter into consequences first.

When rental housing is refused, deposit rules, income, local reputation, accent, landlords' judgments, and neighborhood relations may work together. When an elder needs assistance, medical-record preservation, conditions for mutual recognition, kinship responsibilities, and institutional eligibility may be more crucial.

Through total-image subsumption, interpreters who adopt class theory pull these different relational fields back into the total class image in advance. The erasure of distinctions between explanations, in turn, invokes the sheer quantity of materials to refuse to explain which set of differences bears more directly on the current event. Neither mechanism has truly returned to the event. Calibration requires that return: it neither forces every question into one image in advance nor refuses comparison because materials are numerous.

IX. Calibration Must Return to Concrete Relational Fields and Relations

Calibration must return to concrete relational fields, differentiating units, weights, nodes, relational chains, historical indices, write-back, and counterexamples. These are not a fixed checklist, but entry points through which explanation can once again be examined against materials, procedures, relational positions, and real consequences. Calibration neither forces every question into a total image in advance nor refuses comparison because materials are numerous.

Calibration begins by delimiting the question and the relational field. Unpaid wages, school admission, renting, assistance, romantic relationships and marriage, migration, boundaries of national communities, and historical indices are not the same question. They involve different nodes, relational chains, preserved

materials, and consequences. Delimitation does not shrink reality; it makes an explanation aware of which part of reality it is tracing.

The relational-field window must also be constrained by materials. If it is too narrow, differences already operating along relational chains will be mistaken for background. If it expands without limit, it falls into the mechanism that erases distinctions between explanations by canceling valid comparison in the name of complexity, leaving no judgment a place to stand. Delimiting the question is not arbitrary cropping. It establishes provisional boundaries according to the nodes, materials, and consequences already implicated in the event, with readiness to adjust them when counterexamples appear.

Delimiting the relational field also means distinguishing the roles of the same material in different events. Household registration may directly restrict eligibility in school admission, act indirectly through conditions for mutual recognition in assistance, and not necessarily lie on the main relational chain in an unpaid-wages event. Without this distinction, interpreters can readily misrepresent a piece of material's real weight as its fixed domination over all events.

In an unpaid-wages event, contracts, wage slips, construction-site records, contracting chains, project timelines, and debt deadlines may form the principal entry points. In school admission, household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, student registration, available school places, and local policies may bear more directly on the event. Renting and assistance, in turn, bring deposit rules, medical records, conditions for mutual recognition, kinship responsibilities, local reputation, and institutional eligibility into different relational chains. These differences cannot be arbitrarily spliced into a list. Whether they gain weight depends on actual consequences within the event.

Without a delimited question, the mechanism of total-image subsumption can pull all events back into the established image. The mechanism that erases distinctions between explanations by canceling valid comparison in the name of complexity, in turn, declares all events incomparable. The relational field deprives both forms of overstepping of their excuse: it requires interpreters to specify a concrete state of relations instead of replacing the event with a grand name.

Comparison must also distinguish 'being downweighted' from 'not yet having gained weight.' The latter does not necessarily mean omission; a difference may simply not yet have been triggered by an event. The former means that, within an explanation, a difference's weight, visibility, opportunity to enter comparison, or access to explanatory standing is compressed, restricted, or excluded. These states must not be conflated. Whether a difference has actually entered into consequences, whether an explanation acknowledges or traces it, whether its current weight is relatively low, and whether it has been excluded from explanation all require separate judgments. The problem with Model C is precisely that it often directly demotes differences not absorbed by the total image to the surface level. Healthy explanation preserves the possibility that they may gain weight anew, while not misrepresenting that possibility as a current conclusion.

Nor must a downweighted difference disappear entirely before it deserves examination. It may not yet have produced visible consequences, even though it has already been preserved at nodes and is accumulating along relational chains. Calibration must recognize this possibility without elevating all materials that have not yet gained weight into the current center. This is precisely why the relational-field window must be limited yet capable of adjustment under pressure from counterexamples.

Calibration must also compare what different explanations have extracted and downweighted in the current event. Labor, debt, housing, and risk can form one set of entry points; household registration, documents, archives, and institutional implementation form another. Local relations, accent, neighborhood recognition,

and community boundaries, as well as kinship responsibilities, medical history, historical indices, and care arrangements, may also change consequences. Arranging these names into lists of equal length does not complete comparison. Explanation must still follow the concrete event and trace how each difference enters into consequences.

After a family experiences unpaid wages, labor relations and debt deadlines may gain weight first. Once rent payments break down, rental nodes change in turn. If residential instability affects a child's school admission, household registration, residence permits, student registration, and school places acquire new positions. When medical records cannot be mutually recognized, the preservation of medical history and institutional eligibility may become constraints in turn. Differentiating units change weight along nodes and relational chains; they do not obey a total image fixed in advance.

Comparing explanations therefore does not mean finding class theory a place in an ordinary toolbox. Some differentiating units extracted by class theory may have explanatory value within a limited scope; class theory itself remains Model C. Calibration compares whether concrete differences, nodes, and relational chains actually change consequences. It does not give class, state, market, nation, or family a share of society apiece.

Weight is not a rank that a difference carries by nature. It is the intensity with which the difference enters into consequences within a concrete relational field. When wages are overdue, low income may occupy the center. Contracts, wage slips, construction-site records, and coworkers' testimony can preserve and certify differences involving labor. Overdue wages may reduce the capacity to pay rent.

When a child enters school, household registration, residence permits, years of social-insurance coverage, and student-registration nodes may bear more directly on the event. Administrative records, school systems, and local policies process household registration and student registration. Residential instability may make school-admission materials difficult to maintain, and interrupted social-insurance contributions may change eligibility judgments.

When an elder needs assistance, medical-record preservation, institutional eligibility, and kinship responsibilities may change the result in turn. Hospital medical records, medical-insurance systems, hospitals in the place of origin, and assistance procedures in the place of residence process medical history. How medical records are preserved may affect whether assistance can be certified.

Historical indices of kinship may affect borrowing and caregiving responsibilities. Neighborhood relations, landlords' impressions, networks of people from the same place of origin, and community reputation preserve local recognition.

A node is not an abstract dot. One must explain which differences it has processed and how it has brought them into consequences. Relational chains change the forms and weights of differences in transmission and seldom exhibit smooth linear causation.

Reassessing weights, examining nodes, and tracing relational chains cannot substitute for one another. If one says only that a difference is weighty without knowing where it is located or who certifies it, the judgment cannot be grounded in real procedures. If one merely lists nodes without tracing transmission, materials remain on a list. If one traces only a single chain without reassessing weights, partial causation is readily misrepresented as the entire cause. Together, the three constrain explanation's impulse to expand arbitrarily.

These three checks can therefore distinguish explanatory power from the imposing sound of a name. A grand name may encompass many materials without explaining at which node those materials are formatted or how they change eligibility along relational chains. Conversely, an apparently small record, condition for mutual recognition, or instance of local recognition must not be downweighted for lacking a grand name if it sits

precisely at a gateway to consequences. Using only a total image swallows these changes; the mechanism that erases distinctions between explanations by canceling valid comparison in the name of complexity abandons the effort to trace them.

Calibration must also examine historical indices. Past differences do not automatically govern the present. They must be located and extracted anew through current events, memory, archives, institutional records, local reputation, or community boundaries. A piece of kinship history may ordinarily be inconspicuous, yet it gains weight when a family borrows money. Memories of migration may become materials for judging stability and trustworthiness in school admission, renting, or neighborhood conflicts.

Examining historical indices can prevent two opposing simplifications: presenting the past as forever determining the present, and treating any past as irrelevant background. Neither investigates mechanisms of preservation. Family memory, medical records, local reputation, religious recognition, or national commemorations change people's eligibility, responsibilities, or risks in the present only when they are extracted anew, certified, and transmitted at concrete nodes.

Old local events, national memory, religious recognition, and community responsibilities do not bear on all events with the same intensity either. Only when nodes preserve them anew, certify them, or transmit them within particular relational fields can they change present consequences. A historical index is not a total image that hands the present over to the past. It requires asking in what form, through whom, and along which relational chain the past returns to this moment.

Finally, counterexamples must be allowed to enter explanation. If a counterexample shows that an important set of differentiating units has been downweighted, interpreters must extract those differences anew. If it shows that a judgment of weight was miscalibrated, they must reassess weights. If it shows that the relational field was wrongly delimited, they must return to the event. If it shows that nodes or relational chains have not been traced clearly, they must follow up with the tracing still needed.

Counterexamples also matter because they force interpreters to acknowledge that consequences may arise from intersections not previously seen. A counterexample does more than add a new factor. It may show that the same differentiating unit is reformatted through different nodes, or that a relational chain previously cut off is in fact still operating. Such reopening can change an explanation more than adding a footnote beside an existing image. Total-image subsumption prevents counterexamples from entering calibration. The mechanism that erases distinctions between explanations by canceling valid comparison in the name of complexity uses counterexamples to declare every judgment a failure. Calibration rejects both treatments.

X. Calibration Is Not Compromise, nor Does It Reserve a Place for Class Theory as a Tool

Calibration's rigor lies precisely in allowing uneven conclusions. In one event, labor relations may bear more directly on consequences than local reputation. In another, local recognition, student registration, or medical-record preservation may change a judgment originally inferred from income and debt. There is no need to favor any one domain, nor is an even distribution sought. Consequences, nodes, and relational chains determine the direction of comparison. As long as a total image can still decide the answer in advance, such an uneven judgment cannot genuinely occur.

Explanatory calibration rejects moderate compromise. Nor does it list class, state, market, nation, family, culture, and history in turn and then say they all have some truth to them. Compromise places different explanations on an equal footing without answering which differentiating unit is changing consequences at

this moment, which node has preserved key materials, which relational chain has been cut off, or which counterexample would suffice to change the judgment.

Calibration can establish that certain differentiating units extracted by class theory carry high weights in the current event. This judgment concerns concrete differences; it does not retain the total class image. In unpaid-wages cases, labor relations, contracting chains, project timelines, and debt deadlines may need to be traced first. This does not mean that the class image acquires the standing of an ordinary limited tool, still less that class theory can be placed alongside Model A and Model B and freely selected according to the event. Class theory remains Model C. Likewise, household registration, medical records, local recognition, kinship responsibilities, or historical indices gaining weight in another event gives no reason to allot a share to every grand concept. Calibration does not retain the class framework and then add other variables. It requires a return to the concrete relational field each time, to judge which differentiating units, nodes, and relational chains actually change consequences and to let counterexamples revise that judgment.

It is precisely these two illicit substitutions that calibration rejects. One account appears to acknowledge that labor, wages, housing, and debt carry great weight in certain events, then immediately demands that the class image be retained as the overall framework, with household registration, locality, family, or nation added to it. This is still not calibration. It decides the total image for the event in advance, allowing only some differences to be added or removed at its edges. Calibration does not accept an arrangement in which the center is fixed first and materials supplied afterward.

Another account lays all materials out flat: labor relations, household registration, medical history, local recognition, kinship responsibilities, and national memory are all present, so each is said to be equally important. This too evades judgment. Differences can coexist without entering into consequences at the same intensity within the same relational field. Calibration neither gives them an eternal ranking nor refuses to rank them. It asks which are changing eligibility, risk, responsibility, and action space.

Calibration can neither remove class theory from its position as Model C nor establish any other grand concept as the permanent center in advance. It addresses how concrete differences are preserved by nodes, transmitted through relational chains, and certified by institutions, and how they change existing judgments when counterexamples appear. This work does not provide a common answer for every domain, but requires every answer to state its materials and boundaries.

XI. Bringing the Theory Together and the Responsibility of Application

This restriction also allows theoretical criticism to reach concrete consequences: instead of asking who holds the sole key, it asks what kinds of naming, recording, and handling are pushing people into which differentiation positions and what materials they leave that can be extracted again in the future.

Such self-limitation does not reduce Social Differentiation Network Theory to a neutral list of tools. It still advances the judgment that social consequences require tracing differentiating units, weights, nodes, relational chains, historical indices, and write-back within concrete relational fields. But it does not allow this judgment to subsume any event in advance. A theory's strength should come from its capacity to be moved by materials, not from its refusal to let materials change it.

Limited explanation cannot do without simplification. If simplification occludes key differences and forgets its own distinction extraction and what it has downweighted, it forms dangerous compression. Once dangerous compression stabilizes, distinction extraction, weights, relational fields, nodes, relational chains, and historical indices develop differentiation bias in relation to real consequences. Once that bias closes itself

off through gap completion, causal-line infilling, counterexample digestion, and action write-back, it forms an illusory explanatory construction. Model C's total-image subsumption and erasure of distinctions between explanations are two opposing forms of overstepping along this chain. The former conflates differentiating units effective within a limited scope with the total image, subsuming other valid explanations. The latter illicitly substitutes equal failure for limitation, canceling comparison, judgment, and calibration. They should neither be reconciled through compromise nor reduced to each other. Maintaining the responsibility of limited explanation lies precisely in rejecting both extremes.

Social Differentiation Network Theory, too, must not on this basis claim to be a new underlying reality or total image. It must not reject counterexamples or demote concrete relational fields, nodes, and relational chains to illustrations of what it already knows. In every analysis, it must face the same questions: What has been extracted? What has been downweighted? Which consequences have not yet been traced clearly? Which materials would force it to change? If it loses these constraints, it too will degenerate into a new Model C.

What application retains is this responsibility, not a scheme and a set of answers that precede the question, nor a reproducible template or formula. Application is therefore also a test of the theory's limits. If, when faced with concrete materials, a theory can only repeat existing names and cannot explain why the materials gain weight at this moment, how nodes process them, or which counterexamples might bring about change, it has not truly entered reality. Conversely, a concrete question need not provide proof that a particular theory is forever correct. It requires only that interpreters answer for the judgments they make.

Different domains do not reveal problems in the same order. Some problems first appear between caregiving responsibilities and medical-record preservation; others, between household-registration eligibility and available school places; still others, between labor records, contracting chains, and debt deadlines. The responsibility of application is to begin from their respective contradictions and consequences, rather than turn any domain into an exercise in the same set of concepts.

Application requires taking on calibration anew in different questions: how differentiating units gain weight, how weights are misjudged, which nodes preserve key differences, which relational chains are transmitting consequences, which historical indices are triggered anew, and which counterexamples require explanation to change. Pasting a theory directly onto reality, or using concrete domains to provide self-verification for this book, departs from this responsibility.

This way of entering reality neither allows a total image to answer for the event in advance nor stops judgment on grounds of complexity. Only when a theory can still explain its boundaries, accept counterexamples, and revise its distinction extraction in concrete questions does it remain within its own limits.

Chapter 27. Family: Preservation, Responsibility, and Historical Indices in Kinship Networks

I. Family Cannot Be Swallowed Up by a Fixed Image

The father works on a construction site away from home, and his wages are two months overdue. The mother does casual work in a restaurant and has to rush back to their rented home in the afternoon to pick up the child. The child has reached school age, and a residence permit, social insurance, a rental contract, and student-registration materials must be ready. The elder back home is in poor health, with medical records and health-insurance arrangements still at the hospital in the county town. Rent is due at the end of the month, and an old loan from a relative has not been fully repaid. Just then, the young adult proposes moving out. The parents say the family is going through a hard time and that doing so would mean neglecting the family.

All these matters extend beyond the scope of what is "internal to the family." Unpaid wages affect rent and the child's school admission; the elder's medical care affects leave from work, transport, and who can advance the money. The personal bonds left by the loan will be brought out again the next time someone asks for help. Moving out seems to be a housing arrangement, yet it connects to care, property, judgments around the dinner table, and whether one can return for help in the future. Familial affection, property, care, control, and personal wishes are all at work. None is sufficient on its own to pass judgment on this family.

In these events, relations of kinship, care, property, memory, and responsibility continually preserve, extract, certify, transmit, and write back differences, and the order of the family network changes accordingly. To understand a family, one must first examine how the matter at hand brings these relations into play, and which relations have not yet been voiced. One person holds a property deed, another has transfer records, and another retains only the everyday facts of long-term care. A record's being visible does not mean it has already gained equal recognition.

Nor will this family's predicament resolve itself simply because all the materials have been assembled. The residence permit, social insurance, rental contract, and student-registration materials each serve a purpose, but they cannot answer the questions concerning the elder's medical records, borrowing from relatives, or care arrangements. If the father's wages remain unpaid, the time when the mother rushes back to their rented home to pick up the child, whether the child can stay and attend school, whether the elder can receive care, and whether the young adult will still have somewhere to turn after moving out will all become new questions of responsibility in different people's hands. Family relations thus preserve not only what has happened, but also what remains unresolved, leaving it at the entry point to the next allocation and dispute.

II. Family Is a Network for Preserving Differences, Not an Undifferentiated Whole of Warmth and Affection

Describing family as a natural community most readily occludes the differences long preserved within it. In this account, familial affection, blood ties, care, and responsibility seem naturally given: parents should love their children, children should care for their elders, siblings should help one another, and relatives should honor personal bonds. The problem is that a family is not a community without differences. It is precisely where many differences are preserved longest, in the greatest detail, and in forms hardest to escape.

Who was favored from childhood, who was called considerate, who was said to be a disappointment, who left early to earn a living, whose education cost the family more, who received more support on marrying, who once cared for the elders, who failed to repay a loan in full, and who was thought to have gained an unfair advantage in the division of the household: these differences may go unmentioned for years, but they do not disappear as a result. They remain in the family network in different ways.

Written documents are not the only places where differences are preserved. Property deeds preserve ownership, household registration booklets preserve kinship relations and institutional connections, medical records preserve bodily conditions and care arrangements, IOUs preserve debt relations, and transfer records preserve traces of financial contributions. Yet the family's ways of preserving differences extend far beyond these. Remarks repeatedly made by elders, messages passed among relatives, seating at the dinner table, the order of visits to relatives at New Year, who is called into the kitchen, who can speak at family meetings, and who is assumed to look after the children all preserve weights within the family over the long term.

When someone is called "filial," "inconsiderate," "unreliable," "capable," "heartless," "good at managing a household," or "neglectful of the family," these are not ordinary evaluations. They circulate through the family network and take effect again in borrowing, care, romantic relationships and marriage, household division, and crises. Once a reputation forms, it affects how others trust that person, make demands of them, exclude them, or push responsibility onto them. Preservation does not guarantee fairness. Matters repeatedly raised readily retain weight, while care and wrongs suffered for which there are no documents and no one to testify may remain downweighted for a long time. This is precisely why family can offer support and also impose constraints.

A family has boundaries of its own, but it is not an undifferentiated whole of warmth and affection. This is not to portray family as a cold machine. Quite the contrary: in a crisis, it is precisely through this mechanism of preservation that a family provides support. When someone falls ill, family members may advance money, stay at the bedside, look after the children, and contact doctors. When someone loses a job, the family may provide a place to stay, money for food, connections, and time to wait. Yet family is also a finely woven network for preserving differences. It preserves side by side love and favoritism, care and absence, help and unresolved responsibilities, as well as shared life, differences in past property allocations, differences in past care, and traces of responsibility. In another event, the same mechanism of preservation may turn into demands, blame, shame, and constraint. Family protection and oppression often come from the same network.

III. Family Is a Network for Allocating Responsibility, Not Merely a Private Sphere

The expression "private sphere" seems to respect personal life, yet it readily occludes the allocation of responsibility within the family. Responsibility for elder care does not naturally fall equally on every child. Staying at the bedside, taking leave, advancing money, making hospital trips, signing documents, and contacting relatives in caring for the sick are not naturally shared equally. In borrowing, who makes the request, who guarantees the loan, who repays it, and who is said to be obliged to help all depend on differences long preserved within the family. All may be children of the same parents, yet one is considered wealthy, another nearby, another softhearted, another unfilial; one is thought to have had more education and therefore ought to be considerate, while another is said to have received the family's help before and now owes something in return. These judgments are not mere feelings. They are concrete allocations of responsibility. Such allocations alter people's room to act. Whether someone can leave the city or change jobs, divorce or refuse to lend money, take an elder to hospital or keep a child with them may all be changed by family responsibilities.

A daughter works away from home; after her father falls ill, relatives may say that, although she lives far away, she is his daughter and must still come back to see him. A son earns little, yet is assumed to be responsible for hospital trips because he lives nearby. A daughter-in-law has no control over family property, yet is required to provide care. A young adult wants to change jobs, but the family says the elder is unwell and the children need looking after, so they cannot go upsetting things. Family responsibility is not abstract morality. It enters commuting, shift schedules, income, housing, marriage, and physical depletion.

Family responsibility does not remain within the family alone. Whose signature the hospital requires, whether the workplace approves leave, whether wages allow someone to stop working, whether health insurance reimburses expenses, and whether relatives can advance money all enter this allocation of responsibility. Here, family is not an enclosed space but a relay node connecting institutions, markets, hospitals, and kinship networks to the individual.

Who is assigned responsibility also changes, in turn, whether that person can accumulate income, maintain a place to live, and retain choices within marriage. These consequences are not incidental circumstances outside responsibility, but actual traces it leaves on work, housing, and the body. A caregiver who adjusts shifts to fit hospital schedules may lose wages. Someone required to stay at home may lose the opportunity to change jobs or move elsewhere. Someone who refuses to take on responsibility may consequently be reevaluated the next time money is borrowed, the household divided, or romantic relationships and marriage considered. Once the allocation of responsibility enters these concrete arrangements, it changes how long someone can wait, how far away they can go, and how much risk they can bear.

Alejandro Portes discusses how relational networks can both provide resources and give rise to exclusion and excessive demands. James S. Coleman discusses how obligations, expectations, information channels, and relations within and outside the family form concrete resources. This book does not replace the differentiation network with "social capital," nor does it reduce family to class reproduction.

If family is seen only as a private sphere, these chains of responsibility will be missed. Someone's refusal to lend money is not simply a matter of a cold disposition; debt deadlines may already be pressing on them. Someone's unwillingness to provide elder care is not simply selfishness; they may already have provided long-term care, with their body and work tied down by it. Someone's moving out is not simply a pursuit of freedom; it may be an attempt to escape the order around the dinner table, control across generations, and traces of responsibility repeatedly extracted.

Family certainly includes private life, but it is not simply a matter of private choice. Through nodes of kinship, care, property, memory, and responsibility, family continually changes a person's actual position.

IV. Family as a Relay Node

Many things that seem to happen inside the family are in fact external institutions, market pressures, local relations, and kinship responsibilities entering personal life through family nodes. Caring for the sick may connect a family to hospitals, health insurance, medical records, transport, leave from work, and wages. A child's school admission may, under local rules, connect to household registration, student registration, rental materials, and school places, while also being affected by family care and the capacity to provide fallback support. The housing property, property arrangements, rent, relatives' evaluations, local reputation, and future care to which romantic relationships and marriage, borrowing, and moving home connect fall across the distinct domains of formal institutions, market transactions, and informal relations; they cannot substitute for one another. Family is both a domain of analysis and a relay node through which external differences enter personal life. It is through this channel that society outside the family comes to bear on the individual.

Family members' actual circumstances are rarely determined by the family alone. They also depend on how the family connects to external nodes. When a worker from elsewhere is owed wages, the matter originates in labor and market relations. Once wages stop, rent, the child's school admission, the elder's medication, the couple's working hours, and debt deadlines are all affected together. Through family relational chains, unpaid wages enter housing, education, care, and marriage.

When an elder becomes seriously ill, what appears to be a problem of care likewise connects to medical records, health insurance, the distance to the hospital, transport costs, time spent attending the patient, workplace leave, wage deductions, and relatives' signatures. Who stays at the bedside depends not only on who is free, but also on who can take leave, advance money, and communicate with doctors, who has a position from which to speak within the family, and how past responsibilities for care are remembered. Family members are therefore not facing two entirely separate sets of problems. Wages, rent, household registration, and school and hospital procedures interact, within the same event, with who can speak up, who must go back, and who is expected to take on responsibility.

Nor do romantic relationships and marriage concern only two people. A family evaluates someone's romantic or marriage partner through housing property, household registration, education, work, medical history, local relations, kinship responsibilities, and expectations of future care. Parents may say they are concerned for happiness, while what they actually extract is future risk, property arrangements, local reputation, the family's social standing, and relatives' evaluations. Romantic relationships and marriage connect an emotional relationship to two family networks.

Borrowing begins with an amount of money but does not stop there. From whom the money is borrowed, who asks, who acts as guarantor, who knows about it, who will bring it up later, and who gains a say through the loan all enter the relational chain. Debt enters family memory, becoming a trace of responsibility that can be extracted again in the future. Family and the outside world have never been two mutually isolated spaces. External pressures come to bear on individuals through family, while differences preserved within the family also enter school, hospital, market, local, and state nodes.

V. Authority to Extract Differences and Interpretive Authority within the Family

Differences preserved from the family's past do not enter the event at hand on their own. Elders, parents, those who control housing property, those who have contributed money, long-term caregivers, relatives who pass messages, or institutional procedures concerning hospitals, schools, household registration, and housing property may all raise a past experience, record, or responsibility anew and give it greater weight in the present. Those with greater authority to extract differences and greater interpretive authority can often influence which parts of the past are presented as grounds for what someone ought to bear.

"We helped you back then," "You were the most favored as a child," "You did not look after the elders," and "Moving out now means neglecting the family" are not ordinary remarks. Those who say these things are extracting differentiating units, assigning weight, interpreting the past, and pushing responsibility toward concrete people.

Once responsibility falls on someone, their room to act changes too. One person gives up work shifts to stay at a bedside; another is assumed to make hospital trips because they live nearby; another controls property but does not provide everyday care. These arrangements continue to affect income, housing, marriage, and physical depletion.

When a household is divided, both the name on the property deed and who contributed money matter. Yet if only one person can turn the family's past into a version everyone recognizes, that person holds not only materials but interpretive authority. They can make some differences weigh more and others less. A daughter who has long cared for the elders may not have her name on the deed. A son who has worked away for years has sent money home; if no records remain and he is described as "never having been at home," his contribution may be downweighted. The contributions of both may thus be downweighted. Authority to extract differences and interpretive authority are not always in the same hands: those holding documents may not control reputation, and caregivers may not be able to speak at family meetings.

VI. Household Division: Family Historical Indices Come into View Together

When a household is divided, differentiating units long preserved within the family emerge together. Houses, land, money, elders, siblings, marital relations, ordering by seniority, divisions of labor by gender, who is at home and who is away, who is thought to have contributed much, past care, past loans, and children's education all receive renewed weight assignment. Matters that can ordinarily go unspoken become difficult to keep silent about when the household is divided. Who received a little more, who a little less, who cared for the elders, who did not return, who earned money away from home, who worked at home, who received support on marrying, and whose education cost more are all placed in new narratives.

Some say they spent years at home caring for the elders and therefore deserve a larger share. Others say they earned money away and sent it home, so they should not be described as having contributed nothing. Household division most readily triggers family historical indices. Past labor, care, financial contributions, favoritism, absence, forbearance, and what is owed are reinterpreted. Some differences left from the past, previously held only in memory, become grounds for allocating property and responsibility when the household is divided.

Someone says a brother received money when he married and should not now receive an extra share of housing; someone else says a daughter has married into another family and should receive no housing share. What matters here is not just how much property there is, but who can interpret the past as grounds that can gain recognition. Each statement extracts different differentiating units and downweights others.

The allocation left by household division does not remain confined to that moment. It does not end family relations; it writes them anew. Who receives the house, who is said to have gained an unfair advantage, and whose care was not counted may all be raised when an elder falls ill again or relatives borrow again. The new arrangements have already begun to alter the terms of the next dispute. New outcomes of household division become historical indices in the next round of elder care, borrowing, and reputation among relatives. Who is thought to have benefited unfairly, who is thought to have been wronged, who stayed silent during the division, and who turned hostile at a crucial moment are all preserved.

VII. Elder Care: How Responsibility Is Reallocated through the Past

When elder care comes down to concrete handling, distance, income, housing, gender, working hours, bodily condition, past closeness and distance, sibling relations, elders' favoritism, medical resources, and institutional eligibility are extracted together. Who lives near the elders, who has more freedom over their time, who has a steadier income, who is considered more filial, who received the elders' help before, and who has a poor relationship with them may all change the allocation of responsibility. Elder care concerns not only who is capable now, but also who is thought to have incurred responsibilities in the past. In the family described earlier, the elder's medical records remain at the hospital back home. What is actually extracted is not merely the illness, but distance, the ability to take leave, transport costs, and who provided more care before.

Among siblings, the arrangement is rarely just an equal division of shifts. Present conditions and past history are often joined in assigning responsibility. Someone living nearby is assumed to make more hospital trips; someone with stable work is required to contribute more money. Someone favored since childhood is said to owe something in return; someone who quarreled with the elders in the past may be called unreliable. A daughter may be considered more attentive; a son may be considered to have a more formal responsibility. These judgments are often packaged as filial piety, but they are more than ethics. They reorganize distance, income, divisions of labor by gender, differences in past care, elders' favoritism, and reputation among relatives into actual responsibilities.

In such a process, family protection and oppression appear together. Some receive care through family; others are forced by family to give up work, marriage, migration, and personal life. Care cannot be summed up in a word about filial piety. Making hospital trips, taking leave, advancing money, looking after children, and bearing losses at work fall on different people and produce different forms of exhaustion and different available exits. Some receive support through this, while others are fixed in the position of those who should always take on responsibility in the future.

Family can keep elders from being abandoned entirely by institutions and markets; it can also make one member bear unseen depletion over the long term. To understand elder care, one cannot ask only who is filial or only who has money. One must examine which differences the family network extracts in this event, who interprets them, which nodes certify them, and along which relational chain responsibility is transmitted to concrete people.

VIII. Borrowing Money: How Debt Becomes a Trace of Responsibility

Borrowing can suddenly make family responsibility heavier. Who has money, who is stable, who owes a favor, who received family support before, who is considered obliged to help, and who is considered unreliable are all extracted anew. Borrowing brings out reputation among relatives, differences left from the past, personal bonds, social standing, marital relations, sibling ordering, elders' evaluations, and expectations of future mutual help. An IOU may be only one of the nodes. Even if no one habitually mentions the money that the family described earlier owes its relatives, it will reappear when rent, school-admission materials, or the elder's medical care becomes an issue. Differences are also actually preserved by relatives' memories, messages, evaluations, and the looks exchanged at every later gathering.

Borrowing changes who has a say in the family. Those who provide money may later have greater standing to speak; those who borrow may find it harder to refuse demands; guarantors may be drawn into new responsibilities; and relatives who know about the matter may extract it again in the future. The outcome of

handling a loan may be preserved by relatives as "I helped you back then," as "He never fully repaid it afterward," or as "He embarrassed everyone that time."

Once debt enters the family, it often ceases to be merely an amount. It enters reputation among relatives, evaluations of romantic relationships and marriage, reasons given for household division, and responsibilities for elder care. Someone who borrowed money may later be expected to speak in a more deferential tone. Someone who fails to repay may long be called unreliable. Someone's refusal to lend may be preserved as coldness or disregard for familial affection. What forms after a loan is not merely a creditor-debtor relation. How relatives pass messages, who knows about the guarantee, and who mentions the past at gatherings all change how easy or difficult it will be for someone to refuse later demands. These relational traces often outlast the amount itself.

Borrowing most readily triggers family historical indices. Who received money before, who failed to repay, who helped whom, who failed to lend a hand in difficult times, and who once received family support are all brought out again. Borrowing thus becomes a setting in which the family network preserves and writes back traces of responsibility.

IX. Caring for the Sick: How Bodily Events Enter the Family Network

Illness is first a bodily event. Once it enters the family, it rapidly connects to institutions, markets, kinship, and historical indices. Medical records, health insurance, hospitals, bedside attendance, leave from work, advances of money, relatives' signatures, time spent caring, travel distances, lost income, and arrangements for children at home all enter the relational chain. Who stays at the bedside depends not simply on who is free, but on who is considered obliged to take responsibility, who can take leave, who can communicate with doctors, who has money to advance, whose word carries weight within the family, and who has left traces of responsibility for care in the past. An elder's serious illness first brings medical records, health insurance, hospitals, and travel distances into play; next, who takes leave, advances money, stays at the bedside, and contacts doctors; then differences left from the past among siblings: who received more family support before, who lives near home, who has a good relationship with the elder, who was favored by the elder, and who was absent.

Illness changes more than the body. It reallocates responsibility along family relational chains. One occasion of bedside attendance may be extracted again years later; one absence may also be preserved as material for later judgments of someone's reliability. Who signed at the hospital, who advanced money, who merely posted a few remarks in the relatives' group chat, and who actually took leave to keep watch through the night all enter family memory. Care for the sick is especially liable to be psychologized: someone unwilling to continue caring is called cold; someone who breaks down is said to be in a bad mood; someone proposing a paid caregiver is called heartless. Illness makes facts of care particularly easy to preserve and particularly easy to omit. Some leave signatures, payments, and medical records; some leave nights of keeping watch and journeys back and forth; others leave only accounts circulating among relatives. These different materials may later support one another or conflict.

Emotions certainly exist, but they cannot stand in for working hours, lost income, medical expenses, medical records, health insurance, divisions of labor among relatives, gender expectations, and past traces of responsibility.

X. Moving Out, Romantic Relationships, and Marriage: How Private Choices Enter Family History

Moving out is often described as a private choice, yet within the family network it touches responsibility, care, property, social standing, power across generations, and local reputation. A young adult who moves out may be called independent or neglectful of the family. Particularly when wages are overdue, an elder is unwell, and debts to relatives remain unpaid, moving out will not be understood merely as a housing arrangement. The family asks where the rent will come from, who will care for the elder, what arrangements will be made for the children, whether the family home still counts as a fallback for that person, what relatives will think, whether they will return at New Year, and whether they will still help when something happens. These questions connect a housing choice to a network of responsibility.

The same applies to romantic relationships and marriage. A family evaluates someone's romantic or marriage partner through housing property, household registration, education, work, medical history, local relations, kinship responsibilities, and expectations of future care. Romantic relationships and marriage involve feelings as well as economic arrangements; they are the mutual extraction and renewed weight assignment of differentiating units between two family networks. Whether a woman continues to care for elders in her natal family after marriage may affect both networks. Whether a man is willing to live near the woman may likewise affect housing property, elder care, local reputation, and relatives' evaluations. A person's medical history, debts, family relations, parents' health, and siblings' circumstances may all be extracted anew in romantic relationships and marriage. Family evaluations in these matters often appear as concern, yet risk judgments, property arrangements, expectations of care, and local reputation may all lie behind that concern. Concern about housing, romantic relationships, and marriage may offer real protection, or it may place the burdens of future care, housing-property arrangements, and local reputation on someone in advance. These relations must be examined separately if those bearing risk are not to be labeled outright as people who neglect their families.

Beyond asking whether two people love each other, families also judge whether the two networks can bear the consequences each brings to the other. Moving out, romantic relationships, and marriage therefore cannot simply be written as individual choices. They reorder family networks in housing, property, care, social standing, and future responsibilities.

XI. Nodes: How Family Preserves and Certifies Differences

Household registration booklets, property deeds, medical records, IOUs, and transfer records preserve different facts in family events. A household registration booklet connects to kinship relations and household-registration position; a property deed to ownership; medical records to bodily condition and care arrangements; IOUs and transfer records leave traces of debt and financial contributions. Once these documents enter household division, elder care, borrowing, or care for the sick, they affect whose account is accepted and who is required to bear responsibility. Their role is therefore not limited to preserving materials. Documents also have unseen boundaries: a property deed records ownership but not necessarily years of care; medical records document illness but not necessarily whose working hours were sacrificed; transfer records state amounts but not necessarily why someone has never been able to refuse relatives' demands.

There are also positions of preservation and certification beyond paper. Past events repeatedly recounted by elders, messages among relatives, seating at the dinner table, arrangements for ancestor worship, weddings, and funerals, who can speak at family meetings, and who is called into the kitchen all leave certain

evaluations behind. Reputations such as "filial," "unreliable," and "neglectful of the family" are raised anew in crises. An occasion of bedside attendance, a signature, or an advance of money, just like an absence, may become material for later judgments of responsibility.

Facts preserved at different positions often conflict. A property deed may name one person while another has provided long-term care. Transfer records can prove a financial contribution without necessarily recording who rushed back to the rented home every day to pick up the child. Medical records can prove an elder's poor health but cannot prove who took leave to keep watch at night. Silence, too, preserves differences: some matters are not repeatedly narrated but forbidden to be narrated. Family conflicts often do not lack facts. The difficulty is that different facts are preserved at different positions, with different people and procedures deciding whether to recognize them. Such conflict does not mean that all accounts are beyond comparison. On the contrary, it calls for asking what each piece of material can and cannot prove, and who is downweighted because materials are absent. Only by placing documents, memory, reputation, silence, and actual care back within the same event can one see why a particular version is recognized as fact, and what it excludes.

XII. Relational Chains: Family Problems Are Not Factors Set Side by Side

A complete relational chain becomes visible when unpaid wages enter the family. The father's unpaid wages first put pressure on rent. Pressure on rent changes whether the family can remain in the city. Once housing becomes insecure, the child's school admission and care arrangements must be reorganized. Whether the child is sent back home in turn affects the elder's health, care by relatives, school eligibility, and the couple's working hours. Changes in working hours affect income, which then affects debt deadlines and whether dangerous work is accepted. Unpaid wages in the market enter housing, education, care, migration, and marriage along family relations.

Other events, too, are transmitted through their respective entry points. Illness moves from medical records, health insurance, hospitals, and travel distances into leave from work, advances of money, and bedside attendance. Romantic relationships and marriage move from emotional relations into two families' arrangements concerning housing property, care, and reputation. Borrowing moves from amounts into guarantees, messages, having a say, and later traces of responsibility. There is no need to elaborate each again here. The point is that consequences do not stay where they began: they are passed on, amplified, or downweighted through different positions in kinship, care, property, markets, and institutions.

If family problems are written as a set of factors placed side by side, relations are severed. What must be traced is how a matter crosses different positions, where it changes responsibility, and where it returns to another person's room to act.

XIII. Family Historical Indices and Write-Back: Bringing the Past into Play and Generating New Differences

The past within a family does not disappear because it goes unmentioned for a time. It may remain in household-division agreements, IOUs, medical records, and transfer records, or in elders' accounts, reputation among relatives, and a silence people avoid addressing. Only when a new event occurs do these preserved differences have an opportunity to re-enter the present. Whether the past gains weight does not depend on how important it "inherently" was. Some retain records, some are willing to testify, and some have accounts that relatives or institutional procedures accept. Others, despite providing long-term care, have left no materials that can gain recognition. Household division, elder care, care for the sick, borrowing, and romantic relationships and marriage thus bring not only present allocations, but a renewed reading of past labor, absence, favoritism, help, and what is owed.

Historical indices do not automatically decide who is right or who should bear responsibility. People in the present still choose which record to trust, whose testimony to accept, and how to handle a debt or an episode of care. These acts of handling in turn leave new materials, changing which parts of the past can be extracted again later. When the results of handling the allocation of family responsibilities, care, lending and borrowing, romantic relationships and marriage, and conflicts are preserved and become differences available for later extraction, family write-back has already formed and may become new family memory. Its formation does not have to wait for actual extraction in the future. After an event ends, its handling results may enter documents, memories available for renewed extraction, reputation, or designations. Silence, looks, and ordinary continuing effects do not automatically constitute write-back. This does not deny that silence can preserve differences within concrete relations that carry them. Only when these contents are identified anew, extracted, or assigned weight in subsequent allocations of responsibility does the content of write-back re-enter actual consequences.

Family members preserve the past in concrete circumstances while continually leaving new differences behind. When the results of handling present actions are preserved as differences available for renewed extraction, they may change the historical indices that can be extracted in the future. Absence from care for the sick leaves the evaluation "He is unreliable." Once family members preserve the results of someone taking on care, however, different subsequent directions open up. The same preserved undertaking of care may later be extracted as grounds for demanding a return from others or reducing one's own responsibilities. It may give that person a say in the future, or, conversely, fix them as the long-term bearer of responsibility: "From now on, it should always be you who handles this."

In contrast to taking on care, the handling of refusals and exits likewise leaves distinct consequences for responsibility. Refusing to bear responsibility in response to family demands changes how the family network performs distinction extraction concerning that person in the future. The outcome of choosing to move out may be preserved by family members as neglect of the family, or as finally becoming independent. Refusing to lend in response to a loan request may bring exclusion later, but it may also force the family to recognize that person's boundaries anew.

Boundaries and exchanges within the family are rooted in relational networks. Borrowing becomes a trace of responsibility in later romantic relationships and marriage, household division, and reputation among relatives. Conflicts over romantic relationships and marriage change trust and risk judgments between two family networks. Household division, too, becomes a historical index for the next round of elder care. Household division is just one concrete example of how family handles responsibility; its logic is not confined to the division of property. Across different kinds of family responsibility, fair allocation may

reduce lingering differences in the future; downweighting someone's contribution may instead generate deeper conflicts.

Family write-back shows that family is not simply determined by the past. Write-back is not merely recording what happened. It changes who is more readily believed next time, who finds it harder to refuse, and who is expected to take on what again. If an act of handling downweights the facts of care, only when that result is preserved and extracted anew in subsequent handling will the downweighted result enter later allocations of responsibility. Relatives do not necessarily spell out these old matters every time, but may raise them anew in a single evaluation around the dinner table, at family meetings, when borrowing, or when seeking medical care. Thus, what seems in the present to be no more than a concession, refusal, or silent response becomes a trace of responsibility if its result is preserved as a difference available for later extraction. When these contents are extracted, interpreted, or assigned weight anew in subsequent handling, they may once again restrict or expand someone's room to act. Within events, family continually preserves, extracts, interprets, and writes back, and the relational network changes accordingly.

XIV. How Family Is Compressed into Fixed Images

Conflicts within the family are often quickly compressed into a single explanation. Some see only familial affection and care, so forbearance, sacrifice, and taking on excessive responsibility are also said to be what one ought to do. Some see only private choice, and rent, elder care, debt, and available exits disappear from the account. Psychologization produces the same compression: those unwilling to provide care are called cold, those wanting to move out rebellious, and those refusing to lend heartless. Feelings are real, but they cannot replace inquiry into responsibility, property, power, and past differences.

Class theory can extract real differentiating units that may carry high weights, such as property, wages, labor, housing, debt, educational opportunities, and resource buffers. The unpaid wages, rent, school-admission materials, and medical expenses of the family described earlier are indeed connected to income and labor relations. Yet this capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope cannot recast class theory as Model A or Model B, nor can it change class theory's basic structure as Model C: total-image subsumption. Class theory itself is Model C: total-image subsumption.

When class theory and interpreters who adopt the total class image use the real weight of these differences to reduce care, favoritism, medical history, reputation among relatives, the order around the dinner table, local recognition, and emotional responsibilities to appendages of that total image, family is subsumed. It is not the class image itself that performs compression, demotion, and subsumption. The class image is an explanatory image formed through low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming. Familial affection, private choice, and psychological feelings do not have to be excluded. The problem is that once they are used as the sole answer, they decide for people what may be seen and what need no longer be asked. It is within this compression that concrete family responsibilities and preserved differences are occluded.

Take time to listen to words used within the family. "Selfish," "cold," "rebellious," and "immature" sometimes describe feelings and sometimes downweight other differences. They make debt deadlines, long-term care, housing-property arrangements, and who has standing to interpret the past cease to be seen. Tears, silence, quarrels, avoidance, and anger all occur within the family, but family relations cannot all be recast as individual psychology.

XV. Comparison and Explanatory Calibration within the Family Relational Field

Family is indeed complex. In household division, property, past care, and ordering by seniority may gain weight. In elder care, bodily condition, residential distance, income, divisions of labor by gender, and past traces of responsibility are extracted anew. The relations brought into play on these two occasions differ, and the weights of the various conditions shift accordingly. Likewise, borrowing, care for the sick, romantic relationships and marriage, and moving out each involve different records, relatives' evaluations, and institutional eligibility. Acknowledging these differences, acknowledging that any concrete explanation may omit something, and maintaining theoretical humility do not prevent judgment.

The real problem arises when someone uses the coexistence of familial affection, interests, tradition, institutions, and markets within the family as an excuse to abandon comparison, asserting on that basis that every explanation is equally limited and that counterexamples cannot require a theory to revise itself. Only then, when complexity is used to cancel valid comparison, revision in light of counterexamples, and explanatory calibration, does it constitute Model C: erasure of distinctions between explanations. Complexity itself does not belong to Model C.

Judgment remains possible within concrete relational fields. Comparison does not require an answer that takes charge of everything. It requires, in the face of the disagreement at hand, clarity about whether each explanation can account for these differences, what exactly it omits, and which counterexamples would force the existing account to change. This means specifying which differentiating units have actually been extracted, which records and relations are making them gain weight, which materials support the claim that these differences have indeed entered consequences, and along what paths the consequences are being transmitted.

Calibration must therefore stay close to the relations brought into play by the concrete event. One must first identify what the event at hand has preserved, who can extract the past anew, whose account is recognized by documents, reputation, or family meetings, and on whom responsibility has fallen. Familial affection brings care, property records can explain part of an allocation, and institutional eligibility also alters room to act. No single line can replace the other relations.

Wages, labor, housing, debt, and resource buffers are real differentiating units that may carry high weights. Yet class theory, as Model C: total-image subsumption, cannot use their real weight as grounds for reducing care, favoritism, medical history, silence, and relatives' evaluations to appendages of the total class image. This compression and subsumption are performed by class theory and interpreters who adopt that total image, not by differences such as wages, housing, or debt acting on their own. An explanation of family therefore cannot become a fixed checklist. Each event requires renewed examination of which relations are present, how records are raised, and which responsibilities are deferred or passed on. The same kinship designation may, in different acts of handling, bring protection or turn into pressure.

After an act of handling ends, the consequences of allocating responsibility continue. Who advanced money, who stayed at the bedside, who remained silent during household division, and who refused a loan request: as long as the results are preserved as differences available for renewed extraction, traces of responsibility have already formed. They do not have to wait until actual extraction in the future to become traces of the past. Only when they are later identified anew, extracted, or assigned weight do they re-enter actual consequences. Family can provide somewhere to turn, and it can also impose constraints. Both outcomes must be judged through how concrete responsibilities are allocated, how the past enters the present, and how the present writes back into the future.

Chapter 28. Local Society: Local Recognition, Relational Nodes, and the Generation of Positions

I. Locality Is Not Background

Someone lives in a city and rents a home in a residential neighborhood; a child goes to a school to apply for admission, an elder goes to the hospital for treatment, a vendor sets up a roadside stall, and a worker from elsewhere works on a construction site. If we look only at where things happen, locality is easily written as background. Concrete life presents a different picture. The same person is a familiar face back home but may become an outsider in the city; recognized among people from the same place of origin, they may go unrecognized at the community service counter. After several years in one neighborhood, the neighbors know when the person's child gets out of school. In another neighborhood, they become a stranger whom nobody knows. Their body has not changed as a result. Landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, or schools extract or downweight different kinds of difference in events involving renting, registration, interaction, and school admission. Which materials they believe also changes the person's local position.

Nor can locality be written as merely an administrative division. Subdistricts, communities, school catchment areas, places of household registration, and places where residence permits are processed certainly matter, but local society is not identical with these boundaries. Someone may comply with administrative documentation requirements yet remain a stranger among neighbors; they may also be familiar to neighbors and accepted by a landlord yet fail to gain institutional recognition because of missing materials. Still less can locality be written as the expression of a class image in a particular area. Income, occupation, rent, job opportunities, and resource buffers gain weight in local society, but local society cannot be compressed into a local version of the class image. Whether landlords, neighbors, community personnel, school personnel, or people from the same place of origin recognize, exclude, or remember someone, or whether that person's materials cease to be preserved and retrieved, depends not only on income and occupation but also on how these people handle leases, registration, testimony, reputation, and everyday contact.

Landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, schools, people from the same place of origin, and local businesses each preserve, extract, assign weight to, certify, transmit, or write back differences on the basis of contact, records, and procedures. They interact as finite carriers, forming networks of local relations. Accents, acquaintances, and length of residence can serve as entry points; landlords, agents, neighborhoods, communities, schools, and networks of people from the same place of origin may also serve as entry points, as may local rumors, memories, reputation, and resource channels. These are far from an exhaustive list: differentiating units in local society are potentially infinite. Understanding locality requires asking how landlords, neighbors, community personnel, schools, local businesses, or people from the same place of origin recognize and remember someone in concrete events, whether they are willing to bear witness for that person, and how they suspect, exclude, or accept them. It cannot stop at deciding whether a locality is a society of acquaintances, an administrative area, or a cultural community.

These differences are not selected by "locality" itself. Only when landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, and schools encounter leases, residences, accents, registration, or everyday conduct do they give some of these differences greater weight and bring them into consequences of trust, suspicion, acceptance, or refusal. In judging local relations, one must not treat a city, community, or subdistrict as an already completed community. One must examine whether concrete interactions can connect materials, evaluations, and

consequences, bringing analysis back to people, records, and procedures rather than letting place names, space, or networks act on their own or bear real consequences in their stead.

II. Local Recognition Is Not Feeling but Certification of Position

"Outsider" is not a natural identity. Someone who is not treated as an outsider back home may become one upon entering the city. People from the same place of origin do not see them that way, yet a community service counter may still treat them as part of the population from elsewhere. Even after ten years of residence, a person may have gained recognition among neighbors while remaining in an outsider position in certain institutional materials. This position is not something carried within the body. Rather, in concrete events, landlords, neighbors, community personnel, schools, coworkers, or people from the same place of origin extract, assign weight to, and certify differences on the basis of materials and interactions. Accent, the address on an identity card, household registration, rental contracts, social insurance, residence permits, a child's student registration, workplace, a landlord's evaluation, familiarity among neighbors, and ties with people from the same place of origin thus participate in the generation of positions.

Being a local is likewise not an identity defined by an inherent essence. A position enjoying greater recognition forms only through the continued remembering, testimony, and certification by residents, landlords, local businesses, schools, community personnel, relatives, or others involved in long-term interaction. Someone with local household registration may have weaker local relations after a long absence. Those living in a new district where neighbors do not know one another may also lack recognition among acquaintances. When a bad reputation weighs too heavily, landlords, neighbors, local businesses, or others involved in long-term interaction may still refuse to bear witness for, introduce, or accept the person. Locals and outsiders are not two fixed populations; they are different positions of recognition generated by multiple finite nodes on the basis of materials, interactions, and procedures.

People often explain local recognition through a feeling of warmth, a sense of belonging, or ties among acquaintances. These feelings do exist, but they cannot adequately explain its real effects. Local recognition directly affects real positions and cannot be treated as sentimental decoration. A person's name, face, accent, residence, work, family, past conduct, and degree of reliability may be preserved and certified at local nodes. Landlords, neighbors, schools, local businesses, or community personnel each hold only some of the materials. The landlord can prove that the person lives here; neighbors know what the person is usually like; community personnel have seen them; the school knows that the child really lives nearby. People from the same place of origin know where the person comes from and whether they are reliable; nearby businesses know whether the person has ever owed money. These certifications need not be formal, yet they still affect whether someone can rent a home, obtain a certificate without difficulty, or borrow money. They also affect whether a child's admission materials are believed and whether anyone will speak for the person when a conflict arises. Position forms through whether these limited certifications can connect with one another; it is not decided once and for all by place of origin or the body.

Recognition involves both the process of being seen and certification that can be called upon. Local recognition is not accomplished all at once. A person may first be seen, then known, then remembered, then have others bear witness for them, then have others vouch for them, and only finally gain standing to speak locally in certain events. A local position is not an identity affixed to someone; it is generated through repeated appearances, repeated visibility, repeated evaluation, and repeated certification. When the same person enters different localities, their differences are reordered. Back home, kinship relations, village evaluations, past experiences, and their parents' reputation may weigh more. In the city, rental contracts,

continuity of social insurance, landlord filings, the child's school, and community registration may weigh more. On a construction site, labor contractors, coworkers, people from the same place of origin, and wage-settlement records may weigh more. No single resident, landlord, staff member, or person from the same place of origin can complete certification of position in one act. Positions are generated and adjusted only as the limited judgments of different people connect across the nodes of renting, registration, school admission, work, and interaction. The weight of such a position changes with events, but this does not mean that birth, place of origin, experiences of migration, or historical communities are all fictions. This chapter discusses only the positions of recognition occupied by locals and outsiders in concrete local networks. New testimony, interactions, or materials can still adjust existing evaluations.

III. How a Family of Workers from Elsewhere Enters Local Networks

After entering local relations, this family of workers from elsewhere faces another set of problems. The father works on a construction site away from home, and his wages are two months overdue. The mother does casual work in a restaurant and has to rush back to their rented home in the afternoon to pick up the child. The child has reached school age and needs a residence permit, social insurance, a rental contract, and student-registration materials. The elder's medical records and health-insurance arrangements remain at the hospital in the county town back home. Rent is due at the end of the month, and money borrowed earlier from a relative has not been fully repaid. The young adult wants to move out, but the parents say that the family is going through a hard time and that doing so would mean neglecting the family.

When the scope of observation shifts to renting, schools, communities, construction sites, and ties with people from the same place of origin, neither responsibilities within the family nor the market and state institutions suffice to encompass the entire situation. Local position also depends on how specific people act and how procedures handle materials: whether the landlord cooperates with filing, whether neighbors know that the family really lives here, whether the community recognizes this rental relationship, and whether the school believes that the child has long lived nearby. Whether people from the same place of origin can introduce the family to more stable work, and whether local relations between coworkers and labor contractors can help recover overdue wages, also enter into the consequences. If the family moves because it cannot afford the rent, the child's admission materials, the mother's working hours, the father's position on the construction site, ties with people from the same place of origin, and care among relatives will all be rearranged. In the city, this family is not an abstract migrant population. Landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, school personnel, coworkers, labor contractors, and specific people from the same place of origin variously observe, extract, evaluate, register, certify, or refuse on the basis of wages, rent, accent, length of residence, leases, registration, school materials, and existing evaluations. The handling undertaken by multiple people and procedures, each limited in scope, jointly affects this family's position of local recognition. No single person can determine it at will.

Nor does this family inhabit only one local network. Relatives back home, hospital records, creditors, and village acquaintances preserve or relay kinship relations, medical records, debts to relatives, village evaluations, past experiences, and local reputation. Landlords in the city, schools, community personnel, coworkers, agents, and neighbors preserve or handle renting, work, social insurance, community registration, school materials, and neighborhood evaluations. Specific people from the same place of origin, intermediaries, and labor contractors also bring evaluations from back home, accents, places of origin, and degrees of reliability into the city. Wages, rent, the child's school admission, and elder care in the city in turn determine whether the family returns home, continues to stay in the city, or can still maintain relations in both places. Local society is not a network enclosed within one location. Relatives, landlords, schools, community

personnel, coworkers, intermediaries, and labor contractors relay evaluations, handle materials, and leave records across the place back home, the city, circles of people from the same place of origin, communities, schools, and construction sites, recasting local positions back and forth. The outsider's position is not generated by one place alone, but through repeated extraction, certification, and write-back at multiple finite nodes.

Mark S. Granovetter examines differences in how relations bridge information. Robert J. Sampson, Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls provide specific empirical evidence on neighborhood cohesion and collective intervention. The latter research is limited to 343 neighborhoods in Chicago in 1995 and its research variables; it does not extend to all local communities.

These local relations have not recast the family's existing difficulties as another set of problems internal to the family. What is traced here is how wages, renting, registration, school admission, and job referrals pass in their different ways through landlords, schools, coworkers, labor contractors, and people from the same place of origin, becoming local consequences of remaining in the city or being forced to leave. The place back home, the city, the construction site, and circles of people from the same place of origin are not mutually enclosed backgrounds either. Specific people, materials, and exchanges recast the same family's situation in different localities. Connections across places change how local consequences are transmitted; they do not cancel the family's own responsibilities, care, or historical differences.

IV. Authority to Extract Differences and Interpretive Authority in Locality

The difficulties that families from elsewhere face in the city often lie not in a complete absence of materials but in those materials' lack of local certification. They have a rental contract, yet the landlord does not cooperate with filing; the child really lives nearby, yet the neighbors do not know the child; the social-insurance record is a few months short, and the school service counter does not accept an explanation; wages really are overdue, yet the labor contractor is better connected locally. Differences in local society do not appear automatically. Whether the same person counts as an acquaintance, is reliable, or is entitled to be looked after depends on who extracts and interprets differences and who certifies them. Many local difficulties arise because the facts of everyday life cannot readily be turned into materials that can gain recognition.

Authority to extract differences, interpretive authority, authority to bear witness, and certification authority must not be conflated into a single kind of power. In concrete affairs involving people, a landlord or neighbor may first notice a residence, lease, or daily routine. People from the same place of origin evaluate whether someone is reliable, while coworkers know whether wages really are overdue; those people and coworkers may explain the person's reliability and the course of the wage arrears. Local relatives may explain whether the person is one of their own. The landlord can prove that the person really lives here; neighbors know what the family is usually like; some people are willing to bear witness, while others refuse. Community personnel judge whether materials comply with requirements, schools handle proof of residence and eligibility for admission, and service counters then process the matter according to materials and procedures. These accounts extract differentiating units, assign weight, interpret positions, and certify relations within local networks; they are therefore not ordinary opinions. Local power appears not only in who has money, housing, or a formal position, but also in who has standing to bear witness for someone. The fact and duration of residence, the stability of work, whether a child has long lived here, whether someone has caused trouble in the past, and whether they are reliable all require someone to attest to them. Once proof enters the local network, it participates in the generation of positions.

Local recognition and administrative certification are often misaligned. Neighbors know someone well, yet institutional materials may still contain no trace of them. Someone whose materials meet the requirements may still be a stranger in local relations. Recognition within a circle of people from the same place of origin may not gain community recognition. It is precisely the lack of alignment among formal certification, recognition among acquaintances, spatial familiarity, assurances from people from the same place of origin, and reputational evaluations that makes local relations complex. Even when a landlord knows perfectly well that a tenant lives there, they may still refuse to file the rental. Even if a school knows that a child has long lived nearby, missing materials may prevent it from completing certification. When extraction, interpretation, testimony, and certification fail to align, facts of everyday life may fail to become administrative outcomes.

Exclusion does not always take the form of open expulsion. Not filing, not bearing witness, not offering reminders, not making introductions, not explaining, or not vouching for someone all gradually narrow that person's local position. Refusal or silence in concrete events on the part of landlords, neighbors, community and school personnel, agents, people from the same place of origin, and others involved in long-term interaction may turn someone already familiar into a stranger again. Administrative certification can draw procedural boundaries, but it cannot replace the familiarity, testimony, or refusal of landlords, neighbors, schools, and people from the same place of origin in their respective positions.

V. Renting: The First Node of Local Recognition

In some areas, admission years, and categories of school admission, a rental contract, filing, or residence registration may form part of the application materials, and whether the landlord cooperates may affect whether the relevant materials can be formed. Rent, deposits, agents, neighborhood relations, and local reputation, by contrast, are market or informal conditions within a composite situation. The two must be understood separately. One must not write familiarity among neighbors or a landlord's attitude as a uniform administrative rule across all places. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

The nodes in renting are not the house itself. Whether the landlord renews the lease or files it, whether an agent relays an existing evaluation, whether neighbors confirm the fact of residence, and whether community personnel can register it on that basis are what allow the contract, deposit, and residence to enter a child's school admission, work arrangements, and residential stability along subsequent relational chains. Market pressure is real, but the consequences of renting cannot be compressed into a single result of price. Unpaid wages affect rent; rent affects renewal; renewal and filing in turn change registration and school-admission materials. Each link has a concrete handler and may change the direction.

VI. School Admission: The Misalignment of Local Recognition and Administrative Certification

A child may in fact walk from a rented home to the school gate every day; neighbors have also seen the child, and the restaurant owner also knows that the mother must pick the child up in the afternoon. Yet whether this long-standing fact of everyday life can enter administrative certification depends, in some areas and particular admission years, on local policies and the category of admission. Under specific policies, some of the materials concerning household registration, residence, social insurance, renting, or student registration may enter the review, and the availability of places may also affect the arrangement; the specific items do not all appear at once. Although the parents' working hours and the degree of familiarity among neighbors are real circumstances of everyday life, they are only informal conditions and are not formal admission requirements. An explanation from the community or cooperation by the landlord has procedural significance only where policy expressly provides for it or where the formation of the actual materials requires it. Accordingly, within the scope in which the corresponding material requirements apply, if the landlord does not cooperate with filing, the social-insurance record is several months short, or the rental contract does not meet the requirements, it is difficult for this actually existing everyday life to enter administrative certification. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

Conversely, even when a family's materials fully comply with the requirements, this may not bring acceptance by the people around them at the same time. The child may be able to apply for admission without difficulty, yet in the eyes of neighbors, the landlord, or parents of classmates, the family may still be regarded as "only here temporarily." The misalignment between local recognition and administrative certification is most visible in school admission. Even when the school knows that the child lives nearby, that does not mean the child's materials can pass smoothly. And when the materials pass review, that likewise does not mean that neighbors, the landlord, parents of classmates, or other people in everyday interaction have already accepted the family within their relations.

The school-admission situation therefore cannot be reduced to a binary of whether the materials are complete. The child's and parents' everyday residence, the landlord's filing, neighbors' testimony, the school's handling of the materials, and community certificates may fail to connect in reality. In the composite situation described in this book, household registration, residence permits, social insurance, contracts, student registration, and available places do play a role, but they by no means amount to eligibility that automatically delivers results. All materials must pass through concrete service counters, personnel, and procedures before they can enter an outcome. What is outlined here is the internal mechanism of this misalignment of recognition, not an admission policy generally applicable everywhere.

VII. Neighborhood Recognition and Spatial Nodes

Neighborhood recognition need not be written on paper, yet it affects a sense of safety, the handling of conflicts, and everyday care. Whether neighbors know you, know your routine, are willing to help keep an eye on a child, speak for you in a conflict, or see you as a temporary tenant rather than a long-term resident will all change your local position. Neighborhood recognition can also turn into exclusion. Accent, daily routine, children crying or making a fuss, occupation, overdue rent, and the use of shared spaces can all enter local evaluations. Once neighborhood reputation turns bad, renting, children's playmates, communication with the community, and the everyday sense of safety will be affected.

Local space is not an empty container. The entrance to a residential compound, a school gate, a market, a construction site, a corridor, and a community service counter can become spatial nodes because neighbors, local businesses, landlords, parents, staff, and people who repeatedly pass through observe, remember, record, relay, or bear witness there. They remember who comes often, who has lived there how long, who knows whom, who has had conflicts, and who can be found. The same everyday route may accumulate familiarity or leave negative evaluations after a conflict. The mother picks up the child at the school gate every day; the restaurant owner knows what time she must leave; neighbors have seen her returning with groceries in the corridor; the landlord knows how long the family has lived there. These scattered appearances gradually form local familiarity. Overdue rent, a noisy child, or a conflict in the corridor may likewise lead neighbors, local businesses, landlords, or staff to form and relay negative evaluations. These differences enter local recognition only when specific people can identify, remember, bear witness to, or handle matters on their basis. Space itself does not automatically preserve, evaluate, or certify anything; it merely provides a site where activity and observation repeatedly intersect.

VIII. Networks of People from the Same Place of Origin: Protection, Opportunity, Debt, and Evaluation

The father found work on the construction site through people from the same place of origin. Once his wages go unpaid, he faces more than the employer. The intermediary, labor contractor, coworkers, and specific people from the same place of origin also evaluate how he responds. If he makes too much trouble, these people will reassess whether to continue introducing him to jobs. If he remains silent, the unpaid wages will enter the family's rent and the child's school-admission problems.

For people from elsewhere living in an unfamiliar place, relations with people from the same place of origin are often an important relay network, but they are never a one-way protection network. The interactions of intermediaries, coworkers, labor contractors, relatives, acquaintances, and specific people from the same place of origin connect evaluations, opportunities, debts, and responsibilities. These relations can provide protection and opportunities, but they can also transmit debts, responsibilities, and negative evaluations. When specific people relay evaluations among work, housing, lending and borrowing, and information, they may create opportunities—for example, by introducing jobs or housing, providing channels for borrowing money, passing on information, or warning of risks. They bring trust from back home into the city, which may protect someone. But their evaluations, refusals, and relaying can also create new constraints, transmit restrictions, and produce exclusion. After someone has owed money, broken trust, fought, or run away, these people relay evaluations among themselves, carrying a bad reputation in the city back home or bringing an old evaluation from home into the city. In making introductions, lending and borrowing, and relaying information, they draw on histories from the same place, accents, kinship relations, past evaluations, village reputations, and shared experiences.

The effects of these relations are not completed by an abstract network acting on its own. The network of people from the same place of origin is only the relational structure through which these consequences pass; it does not evaluate, disseminate, constrain, or exclude autonomously. Whether to continue introducing work, provide a loan, vouch, bear witness, or maintain contact is still decided by specific people. Their relaying and refusals are what make evaluations enter subsequent opportunities and relations through existing connections. Transmission across places does not flatten differences. Every introduction, refusal, act of lending or borrowing, or evaluation must be examined in terms of who, in what event, called up which past materials. Whether an old evaluation can take effect still depends on whether a specific person from the same place of origin extracts it anew in the current event.

IX. Local Relational Chains: How Differences Transmit Consequences

Lining up accents, acquaintances, landlords, communities, and schools does not yet explain local relations. Differences transmit consequences along networks of residence, work, family, schools, communities, and people from the same place of origin. Unpaid wages entering local networks is a typical relational chain. Unpaid wages first put pressure on rent payments and then affect whether the landlord renews the lease. Once residential stability is interrupted, the residence permit, community registration, landlord filing, and familiarity among neighbors may all be affected, and the child's school-admission materials will become unstable as well. Whether the child can continue to stay in this place in turn affects the mother's working hours, whether the family continues to live there, and whether relations with people from the same place of origin can be maintained. What is traced here is whether the testimony, filing, registration, evaluation, and handling of materials by specific people can remain continuous; it is not a reexamination of family responsibility itself. A change of residence, interruption of filing, break in community registration, invalidation of school materials, or neighbors' no longer bearing witness may all break this continuity, causing someone to become a stranger in the local network again.

A rental contract concerns more than a place to live. It may also connect to a residence permit, community certificates, applications for school admission, an explanation of social insurance, and whether the child can remain. If the landlord does not cooperate with filing, a gap may appear in the child's school-admission materials. If the community does not recognize the fact of residence, the school may also refuse to accept the application. Renting thus enters educational consequences along a local relational chain.

Accent also enters trust. In some local events, people in interaction extract the sound difference of an accent and assign weight to it. In negotiating rent, finding work, neighborhood conflicts, evaluations of romantic relationships and marriage, and market transactions, a person may thereby be identified as an outsider. The result is not necessarily always negative: an accent may also connect to a network of people from the same place of origin and bring help. The key remains this: in the concrete relational field, who extracted the accent, what weight did they assign to it, and which relational chain did they connect it to?

Relations with people from the same place of origin also enter debt and work. When someone finds work on a construction site through such relations and wages go unpaid, pursuing the wages means facing more than the employer. It also means facing the intermediary, labor contractor, reputation among people from the same place of origin, and the prospect of finding work again. Specific people from the same place of origin can provide opportunities; they also preserve traces of responsibility through memories of lending and borrowing and their relaying of accounts to one another. If someone breaks trust, the next attempt to find work, borrow money, or rent a home may be affected. Following these concrete relays shows that locality is not only a place; it is also a relational network through which consequences are transmitted by people, materials, and procedures.

The point of a relational chain is not to arrange factors in a list, but to explain how the handling at one node changes the materials and choices available at the next. Unpaid wages, lease renewal, filing, registration, school admission, job introductions, and lending and borrowing are relayed through different people's hands. When continuity is broken, the position of local recognition also changes. A relational chain can pass help onward, but it can also amplify risk. Analysis must trace the handler, materials, and consequences at every link while preserving the possibilities of interruption, branching, and correction. It must not write the preceding link as an inevitable determinant of the following one.

X. Local Historical Indices and Local Write-Back

Landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, school personnel, local businesses, and people from the same place of origin preserve the past through memories, records, or reputation. These past materials include length of residence, neighborhood evaluations, community records, rental disputes, reputation among people from the same place of origin, length of time a shop has operated, local rumors, and past conflicts; they are not limited to personal memory. Current events such as renting, school admission, lease renewal, or bearing witness cause specific people to extract length of residence anew. How long someone has lived here is no longer merely a duration. Whether neighbors know the person, whether the community is familiar with them, whether the school believes that the child has lived here for a long time, and whether the landlord is willing to renew the lease may all be affected by it. Length of residence thus becomes a basis of local recognition. A rental dispute will become material for agents' and landlords' judgments the next time around. In a later rental, when a landlord, agent, or neighbor raises overdue rent, damage to the home, or neighborhood conflict anew, distrust forms.

They remember, record, or relay these events, and the related evaluations circulate through neighborhood reputation. A neighborhood conflict will later give the family a reputation for being troublesome. Even without a formal record, a new local position may be affected as long as specific people extract the evaluation anew. When school admission, assistance, renting, or conflict handling occurs again, schools and community personnel may also call up records of community registration, proof of residence, complaints, volunteer participation, and neighborhood disputes. The records themselves need not be grand. Once schools, community personnel, landlords, agents, or the parties to a conflict call them up again, their weight rises in the corresponding event. At the same time, a community certificate successfully processed once will establish a relationship between the family and the community that can continue to be used. A child's failure to enroll will change whether the family continues to remain in this place. A landlord's assistance with filing can also become a basis for later mutual claims.

In situations involving job-seeking, borrowing money, renting a home, or romantic relationships and marriage, intermediaries, relatives, coworkers, or other people from the same place of origin remember and relay who introduced a job, who has owed money, who ran away, and who keeps their word. When specific people extract evaluations anew in a current event, they may bring opportunities or produce exclusion. A network of people from the same place of origin is only the relational structure through which evaluations are transmitted; it does not preserve the past on its own. An instance of someone from the same place of origin borrowing money and not repaying it will become a risk judgment in future job introductions and lending and borrowing.

If local historical indices explain how the past re-enters the present, local write-back explains how the present becomes a local past that can be extracted in the future. Local relations are not static background. The handling, refusals, assistance, and evaluations of landlords, agents, neighbors, schools, community personnel, and people from the same place of origin in renting, school admission, work, borrowing money, neighborhood conflicts, and community interaction leave records or reputations that may be called up in the future. A historical index is not a destiny imposed automatically by the past. Past residence, disputes, registration, borrowing and lending, or evaluations must be extracted anew by landlords, agents, neighbors, community personnel, or people from the same place of origin in a new event involving renting, school admission, job-seeking, conflict, or testimony. Current handling, refusal, testimony, or assistance likewise leaves records or reputations that may be called up later. Write-back does not mean becoming fixed. Later

interpretations, supplementary materials, renewed testimony, or new interactions may still change the weight of an old evaluation in a current event.

XI. How Locality Is Compressed into a Fixed Image

The most common erroneous explanation of locality compresses it into a fixed image. The first compression turns locality into geographic background. A place itself cannot explain why the same person is trusted here and suspected there, why a home can be found here but a rental cannot be filed there, or why an accent connects to help from people from the same place of origin here but to exclusion there. Locality is a network for handling relations, not background. The second compression turns locality into administrative divisions. Administrative divisions can explain some institutional boundaries; subdistricts, communities, school catchment areas, places of household registration, and places where residence permits are processed all change consequences. Yet local society is not identical with administrative divisions. Within the same administrative area there are different networks of neighbors, landlords, agents, people from the same place of origin, schools, and reputation. Writing locality only as an administrative division makes informal certification and acquaintance nodes disappear from view.

The third compression occurs when interpreters who adopt class theory compress locality into a local version of the class image. Differences such as income, rent, occupation, and resource buffers do matter in local society, and interpreters who adopt class theory can extract these selected real differences. But in local questions, a typical expression of Model C is to demote accents, length of residence, neighborhood recognition, local reputation, community certificates, ties with people from the same place of origin, local silence, and past conflicts all to appendages of the total class image. Locality cannot be subsumed by the total class image. Extracting differences such as income, rent, labor position, and resource pressure cannot by itself explain why a landlord does not file, why a neighbor does not bear witness, why community personnel do not offer more explanation, or why people from the same place of origin no longer introduce work. Real resource pressure cannot be ignored, but interpreters who adopt class theory cannot swallow local recognition, local testimony, local reputation, and spatial familiarity. The fourth compression turns locality into local color, nostalgia, or local culture. Dialects, snacks, old streets, festivals, the bustle of everyday life, local culture, customs, and local memory all matter, but they are only entry points for local differentiating units, not the whole of local society. Locality is not a collection of dialects, snacks, old streets, and festivals. What an analysis of local society must actually examine is recognition, exclusion, certification, reputation, relational chains, and write-back.

Landlords, neighbors, local businesses, school personnel, community personnel, and people from the same place of origin can provide help, testimony, and opportunities. The same people and procedures can also refuse, spread negative evaluations, or interrupt relations. Mutual assistance, bad reputation, belonging, and unfamiliarity are formed through concrete interactions and the records they leave. Any image occupying the whole of the explanation will flatten local society.

Each of the four fixed images has some material basis, but none can occupy the whole. The geographic image presents place; the administrative image presents institutional boundaries; interpreters who adopt class theory can see wages, rent, and resource pressure; the cultural image presents local color and customs. Once an interpreter uses any one of these images to occlude testimony, silence, reputation, filing, and the transmission of relations, locality is compressed into a single explanation. In particular, one must not write the limited explanatory capacity formed through real differentiating units and their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression as evidence that class entities exist within a limited scope. Class entities do not

exist. When class theory raises some real differences into a total image, it remains Model C: total-image subsumption; it cannot be reduced to Model A or Model B.

XII. Calibration and the Boundaries of Explanations of Locality

Local society is indeed complex. Accents, acquaintances, administrative processes, schools, markets, and networks of people from the same place of origin may coexist. To conclude from this that locality cannot be judged, or to assume that all explanations are more or less the same, may look cautious but in fact cancels analysis. Judgment must return to concrete events and see how specific people extract, preserve, certify, and transmit different kinds of materials. When renting, rent, the contract, the landlord, filing, and neighborhood evaluations may carry greater weight. In school admission, residence permits, social insurance, rental materials, available school places, and community certificates may carry greater weight. The review of available places and different materials depends on concrete policies and circumstances; it is not a fixed checklist everywhere.

When the analysis turns to a neighborhood conflict, the conflict itself may raise the weight of differences such as length of residence, local reputation, mutual familiarity, and testimony. When it enters relations among people from the same place of origin, place of origin, accent, past borrowing and lending, job introductions, and evaluations of reliability may gain weight in turn. Such differentiation and possibilities arising from concrete circumstances also run through seeking work, borrowing money, evaluations of romantic relationships or marriage, and processing community certificates.

In these concrete stages, landlords, neighbors, community personnel, school personnel, local businesses, and people from the same place of origin act on the basis of records, reputation, testimony, or procedures to preserve materials and carry out certification. For people situated at these nodes, what they encounter is by no means a simple binary of acceptance or rejection. There are many possible forms of handling. Someone may be seen and known, have others bear witness for them and vouch for them in some settings, and yet be suspected, excluded, or included at other nodes. Each of these forms of handling has an independent real effect. Past differences may gain weight again in a current event when the person concerned raises them anew. Current handling, refusal, or evaluation leaves records and reputation that can be called up in the future, allowing consequences to be transmitted between nodes through specific people's handling and through materials.

The object of calibration is therefore not an abstract "locality" but an explanation in a concrete event. Analysis must determine which key differences each explanation extracted and what it downweighted, which local nodes it traced and which it occluded, and which local relational chains it cut off. It must also test which explanations refuse to recognize counterexamples and what kind of counterexample would require an existing explanation to be revised.

These ordinary limited explanations—geographic, administrative, cultural, acquaintance-based, and market explanations—must each state what they extract, which actors and consequences they omit, and accept counterexamples into judgment. A geographic explanation can use spatial conditions to explain part of a distribution, but it cannot swallow concrete local relations. An administrative explanation can explain procedural differences, but it cannot swallow the testimony, reputation, and silence of landlords, neighbors, and people from the same place of origin. A cultural explanation cannot attribute exclusion, resource channels, and conflicts of certification wholesale to customs. An explanation in terms of a society of acquaintances cannot occlude institutional boundaries, market pressure, or the position of outsiders. A market explanation likewise cannot erase the concrete effects of institutional limits, local relations, and informal

certification. For example, even complete compliant materials may not bring testimony or acceptance from neighbors; acquaintance relations alone may likewise be blocked or interrupted by rent prices and administrative review. These concrete counterexamples question and challenge the specific inferences that assume materials alone can obtain testimony or acquaintance relations alone can bypass prices and procedures. They do not automatically invalidate all the effectiveness of these ordinary limited explanations within their own boundaries merely because a counterexample appears.

In terms of its model character, class theory is entirely different from these ordinary limited explanations. Interpreters who adopt class theory can indeed extract some real differentiating units, such as income, rent, labor position, housing, debt, risk, and resource pressure. But class theory belongs from the outset to the direction of Model C: total-image subsumption. It can neither be reduced to Model A or Model B nor become an ordinary limited model because it has extracted real differences within a limited scope. Its limited explanatory capacity comes entirely from the real differentiating units it extracts and the processes of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression; it is not owed to the total class image and does not mean that class entities really exist within a limited scope. Nor can it use the total image to swallow accents, length of residence, local recognition, community certificates, ties with people from the same place of origin, or local memory.

Making explanatory boundaries public, acknowledging omitted actors and consequences, and allowing counterexamples to revise a judgment are forms of healthy caution; they do not belong to Model C. Only when complexity is used to cancel valid comparison and all explanations are written as equally ineffective does the erasure of distinctions between explanations arise. Social Differentiation Network Theory itself likewise cannot replace concrete explanations or be elevated into a new exclusive total image. It requires only that we concretely trace how differences are extracted, connected, transmitted, and written back. This chapter stops at the calibration of explanations at the level of locality. The questions of nation and community require separate discussion.

Chapter 29. Nation and Community: Long-Term Interaction, Shared Memory, and Boundary Generation

I. A Nation Must Not Be Swallowed by a Fixed Image

It is easy to speak too hastily about nations. At the mention of a nation, some people think of descent, ancestors, language, customs, and shared origins. Others turn to state registration, identity cards, household registration, policy classifications, and administrative identification. Still others write the nation directly as class occlusion, regarding it as a false community formed when class contradictions are concealed. Another account writes the nation as a pure victim, as if the community consisted only of harm and humiliation. Interpreters who adopt these images have each extracted certain real differences. The problem arises when users give any one image a monopoly on explanation, allowing it to occupy the place of the national community itself.

Closeness of ancestry does not automatically generate shared language, shared memory, shared protection, or demands of responsibility. The state can identify, name, register, manage, or protect certain positions within national communities, but administrative fields cannot replace a community. Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract differences in labor, property, power, and resources, and can point out that national narratives may be used by those in power; they cannot, however, demote the national community to a class illusion. Differences of region, language, social stratum, religion, way of life, political position, and generation also exist within a nation. A community's real existence has never depended on its members being completely alike. A national community may form through long-term interaction, multiple layers of relaying, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. Migration routes, marriage networks, family education, local communities, commemorative rituals, and external pressure are all common entry points through which differences enter this network, not a closed list. The reality of a nation does not depend on a fixed essence; it lies in whether differences can be preserved over time, translated, extracted, certified, and brought into consequences through nodes and relational chains.

II. A Nation Involves Interaction Through Multiple Layers of Relaying, Not Direct Interaction Among Everyone

A nation is a network of long-term interaction; it does not require every member to know every other member. Once a community grows in scale, no one can meet all its members directly or engage directly with all of them in conversation, mutual assistance, or conflict. Differences are relayed through multiple layers of nodes, allowing the community to continue. Family members preserve forms of address, ancestral memories, and experiences of boundaries. Members and recorders of local communities preserve accents, rites and customs, marriage networks, burial grounds, and local history. Schools preserve language norms, institutional classifications, and formal accounts; markets preserve mutual translation, trading customs, relations of trust, and contact across groups.

A child hears his grandmother repeat certain place names at the dinner table, takes examinations at school using standardized written language, is recorded under a particular ethnic category on a form, and translates for his elders at the market. He is not encountering repeated versions of the same content. Family, school, market, and state registration extract, format, or downweight different kinds of difference in their respective

ways, subjecting his position within the community to simultaneous handling along several relational chains. Rituals and commemorations preserve harm, protection, heroes, failures, and shared shame. Migration networks preserve routes, places to settle, relations of mutual assistance, and external pressure. Marriage networks bring boundaries into kinship evaluations and long-term responsibility.

Abstract classification, too, can place many people in the same classification field, yet need not involve interaction that can continue. A real community usually requires relational chains, nodes of preservation, mechanisms of mutual translation, demands to bear responsibilities together, and memories that those who come later can extract anew. Members of a nation who have never met may nonetheless become involved in interconnected consequences through relaying at the nodes of family, locality, language, school, rites and customs, marriage, commemoration, migration, market, and state. Such connection does not guarantee solidarity, still less eliminate conflict, but it differs from an abstract sameness of category based only on sharing a name.

III. A Child in a Small Border Town

In a small border town, several languages may be present at once: older people bargain in one language at the produce market, young people take examinations in another at school, government service counters use standardized written language, and weddings and funerals preserve yet another set of forms of address and rites. Schools use uniform teaching materials, while families still teach children the stories of their forebears. When a commemorative date arrives, some attend public ceremonies, some light lamps at home, and others remain silent. These are not the background to questions concerning nations. They are the concrete relational fields in which differentiating units concerning nations are preserved, extracted, certified, and written back.

What the child hears from his grandmother is not a complete history, but recurring place names, a few sentences that must not be forgotten, a name connected with the loss of kin, an escape, and an experience of being protected by others. He may not fully understand, yet these words have already left differences at the family node that can be extracted later. The school requires him to write history according to its teaching materials, enter an ethnic category on forms, and answer questions in a uniform language. It also provides channels to examinations, further schooling, opportunities in the city, and public expression. School does not merely suppress family memory, but it does recast a complex community into forms that can be managed, graded, and registered.

At the market, the child translates for his parents and older people. On commemorative dates, he hears public accounts during the day and relatives' memories at night. When romantic relationships and marriage come under evaluation, relatives remind him which names must not be forgotten and which relationships will provoke comment. If conflict breaks out at the border, he may also be required to declare a position. The same position within a national community is thus repeatedly extracted, downweighted, translated, certified, and written back through family, school, market, commemoration, romantic relationships and marriage, state registration, and conflict. It neither grows fully formed from bloodline all at once nor is decided once and for all by a registration field; it gradually acquires real weight along multiple relational chains.

The temporal sequence in the small town also matters. First, at home, the child hears fragments about migration and being protected; later he learns institutional classifications at school, then repeatedly practices negotiation across languages at the market. Commemorative dates and discussions of romantic relationships and marriage extract anew the names he heard earlier, while border conflict may change the weights of these differences within a short time. Traces left by an earlier node become materials that a later node can use, revise, or reject.

More concretely, the grandmother chooses which names to repeat, teachers decide which answers earn marks, staff at service counters confirm institutional status according to form fields, and stallholders and border traders decide in each transaction whether to switch languages. Relatives reaffirm or relax boundaries in discussions of romantic relationships and marriage; ritual organizers arrange who stands at the front and whose names are read out. The community does not operate on its own apart from these people. It is their individually limited, potentially conflicting actions that give differences different weights and make the child bear concrete consequences concerning further schooling, trust, romantic relationships and marriage, and declarations of position.

IV. How a National Community Preserves Differences

A form of address may preserve an order of seniority; a place name may index migration; a story may preserve an experience of being harmed or protected. Language preserves not only vocabulary but also kinship relations, forms of politeness, a sense of shame, jokes, taboos, prayers, and judgments about life. Language is not the sole essence of a nation, but it is often an important node of community. The continuity of a national community depends on the preservation of differences. These differences do not exist only in books; they also enter language, forms of address, place names, stories, rites and customs, burial grounds, markets, schools, family education, commemorative rituals, and state registration.

Family education allows migration, war, famine, humiliation, protection, flight, marriage, taboos, and kindness received to leave traces across generations. These do not necessarily enter formal history, yet may gain weight again on commemorative dates, in conflicts, in choices about romantic relationships and marriage, or in language disputes. Rites, customs, and commemorations preserve shared rhythms: when to gather, how to mourn, how to offer blessings, which names are read out, and which harms must not be forgotten all make community memory available for repeated extraction. Villages, neighborhoods, small border towns, temples, markets, burial grounds, and monuments are likewise not passive spaces, but nodes at which differences can be seen, remembered, and certified.

State registration is another powerful node. Household registration, identity cards, school forms, policy classifications, language education, local autonomy, cultural protection, and administrative boundaries may all change the institutional visibility of a national community and its consequences. After registration, a language may enter the curriculum, certain rituals may receive protection, and people able to connect with policy provisions may gain standing to represent others. At the same time, complex internal differences may be compressed into a uniform label, while marginal members whose registration is unclear may find it difficult to obtain resources. The state can format differences pertaining to national communities, but it cannot exhaust the community networks that precede or lie beyond registration.

This formatting also changes modes of preservation in turn. School procedures may bring a language into the curriculum. Families may explain their origins anew for registration, further schooling, or migration. Organizers of rituals and commemorations may also adjust forms of preservation in accordance with protection or registration procedures. Some thereby gain the conditions for public transmission, while others fall at the margins of a label because of accent, mixed marriage, or missing documents. Preservation has never meant sealing up the original unchanged. Every act of telling, registration, teaching, or commemoration may preserve one part and rewrite another, leaving new entry points for the next extraction.

Family members decide which language children speak at home, and people at the market continue to use familiar forms of address for regular customers. People and organizations that maintain burial grounds, organize stories, or carry out protection procedures enable inscriptions, place names, and elders' memories to

continue. These everyday actions give preservation continuing carriers and show that the same difference takes different forms at different nodes.

V. Who Can Extract Shared Memory, and Who Can Interpret Boundaries?

Shared memory does not speak automatically, nor do boundaries harden on their own. Organizers of commemorative activities decide which names enter public rituals: there are always nodes responsible for extraction, naming, interpretation, and certification. Defining an event as a shared harm, naming a particular act as betrayal, judging that someone does not sufficiently belong to "us," deciding what to commemorate and what to leave unspoken, and deciding who speaks for the community are determinations of standing that go beyond differences of opinion. They assign different weights to memories, draw boundaries, and distribute demands of responsibility to specific members.

The standing held by concrete actors within the network differs. Elders may interpret ancestral stories, those who educate children within families choose which words to pass on, religious figures interpret rituals and taboos, and local elders explain burial grounds, place names, marriage, and kinship boundaries. Schools and teaching materials provide formal accounts; state registration formats a complex community into institutional categories; intellectuals and writers organize scattered memories into texts that can circulate. Witnesses to disasters, migration, protection, and conflict may also acquire strong interpretive authority. Power within national networks therefore appears not only in the possession of resources, but also in the standing to interpret the past, certify responsibility, and delineate boundaries.

Interpretive authority is not held stably by any single node. Young people may reject elders' accounts; local memory may not fully coincide with teaching materials; women's experiences may be downweighted in public commemorations; and representatives may overlook the memories of marginal groups. Struggles over shared memory themselves change the community: certain harms become public, while other experiences retreat into the family; certain names become representative, while other members become difficult to see. Acknowledging the national community as a real network also requires acknowledging certification, downweighting, contestation, and revision within that network.

VI. How Demands to Bear Responsibilities Together Are Extracted

Members of a national community, families and those who transmit things across generations, recorders, educators, organizers, and participants in commemorative activities do more than preserve memory: they also put forward demands to bear responsibilities together. This is not an inborn obligation deduced from the name of a nation, still less does it mean that as soon as someone belongs, they are naturally obliged to meet every demand the community makes. The pressure of responsibility usually forms in concrete events. Shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, and experiences of boundaries are extracted anew, bringing certain differences that previously carried less weight into present consequences. Demands of responsibility have relational sources and must also have boundaries; they cannot expand without limit in the name of community.

External insults may extract shared humiliation, protection, and pressure to respond, while boundary conflicts may rapidly give demands for shared defense greater weight. Prohibitions on the use of a language, or attacks on burial grounds, monuments, schools, and religious sites, may likewise assign renewed weight to shared protection. Dangers during migration, mutual assistance during disasters, and protection under pressure also become grounds for later demands to bear responsibilities together. These events cannot create a community

out of nothing, but they can push long-preserved differences into the foreground along existing nodes and relational chains.

Family members, local communities, school procedures, religious organizations, and people and organizations providing protection may all put forward or transmit demands. Those who make demands command different capacities for certification and different resources, so the weight of their demands differs accordingly. The same statement, "Everyone should bear responsibility," imposes different costs on members facing the pressures of care, schooling, poverty, or mixed marriage. Whether a demand is valid also depends on whether those to whom it is addressed can respond, refuse, or propose alternative ways of bearing responsibility.

Demands to bear responsibilities together can protect people and can also oppress them. They can give members support in danger, but may also force individuals to accept a single narrative, downweight internal dissent, or bear obligations beyond their relational positions. To judge whether a demand is valid, one cannot consider only whether it is made in the name of the nation. One must also ask: which memory has been extracted, who extracted it, which nodes certify it, along what relational chains the demand travels, who bears the burden, and which counterexamples and internal differences call for calibration. The reality of a community cannot provide advance justification for any boundless demand of responsibility.

VII. Bridging Nodes: Why Differences Do Not Immediately Become Boundaries

The appearance of differences does not mean that the boundaries of national communities must harden. Bridging nodes within the network allow many differences to coexist over time. Bilingual people sustain translation between languages, and intermarried families allow kinship relations to cross certain boundaries. Market transactions maintain everyday contact among people with different rites and customs; shared schools allow children to learn about one another within the same institutional space; and mixed communities allow ways of life gradually to adapt in streets and markets. Kin across localities, migration routes, border traders, translators, and experiences of shared defense may also reconnect relational chains that were previously dispersed.

The child translating for his parents in the small border town is a tiny bridging node. He has not eliminated differences; he merely allows them still to pass through. He understands his grandmother's speech and can write the script required at school. He knows the silences in family commemorations and the standardized accounts used in public rituals. When bridging works, different languages can be translated into one another, different rites and customs can accommodate one another, historical memories that do not fully coincide can temporarily coexist, and marriage networks still leave room for negotiation among kin. Connections between communities do not require their members to become the same kind of people.

Once bridging nodes come under suspicion or attack, are severed, or are forced to declare a position, differences become more likely to turn into hard boundaries. In ordinary times, trade can take place in markets, people can coexist in schools, and local mediators can still speak. After conflict arises, translators may be regarded as holding suspect positions, intermarried families may face pressure from both sides at once, and previously overlapping networks of life may be forced to choose sides. Whether differences enter into consequences of exclusion cannot be judged only by comparing how large those differences are. One must also examine whether mutual translation continues, whether bridging works, and whether everyday relational chains still allow members to maintain multiple connections.

VIII. How Boundaries Harden

The boundaries of national communities do not arise directly from abstract definitions. The generation and hardening of boundaries are consequences that call for explanation; they carry no inherent legitimacy. While languages remain mutually translatable, forms of address, jokes, rites, and stories still have a chance of being understood. After mutual translation fails, misunderstandings accumulate, forms of address become insults, stories can no longer be shared, and differences may acquire greater weight. Shared memories, too, may fail to gain mutual recognition: the harm remembered by one side is denied by the other, and the sacrifices commemorated by one side are mocked. The past then re-enters the present through historical indices.

When demands of responsibility cannot extend further, boundaries are redrawn as well. When the same event occurs, some consider protection necessary, while others regard it as none of their concern; some understand it as shared humiliation, while others recognize only victimization within a limited scope. Once the joint bearing of responsibilities goes unrecognized, the existing "we" may shrink or split. Pressures such as external insults, expulsion, prohibitions on language use, and deprivation of commemorative space do indeed rapidly draw a normally loose community tighter. Yet what these pressures extract is still memory, experiences of protection, and boundary differences preserved within existing networks.

Boundary hardening cannot be summed up in the phrase "collective emotion." What pushes differences toward different consequences may be school procedures, state registration, and enforcement procedures, or local mediators, family members, and people and organizations carrying out language prohibitions, attacks, exclusion, or protection. Sometimes these actions amplify one another; sometimes they cancel one another out. Only by tracing who made which decisions, and how those decisions passed to the next node, can one adequately explain why soft boundaries became real exclusion. Those expelled, members whose romantic relationships or marriages are obstructed by boundary evaluations, and students prohibited from using their language bear boundary hardening as a contraction of their concrete action spaces.

The breakdown of bridging nodes makes these processes harder to buffer. Once bilingual people, intermarried families, mutual translation in markets, shared schools, mixed communities, and kin across localities cease to play their roles, differences that were once negotiable may become lines at which one must declare a position. Boundary hardening can sometimes provide necessary protection; sometimes it also produces exclusion, misrecognition, and new illusory explanatory constructions. Explaining how boundaries form does not amount to acknowledging every boundary as reasonable. Analysis must also examine which real harms have been extracted in this formation, and which internal differences and still-existing bridging relations have been downweighted.

IX. National Community and Internal Differences

Acknowledging that a national community really exists must not be turned into the claim that a nation is completely homogeneous internally. Differences of social stratum, gender, region, language, religion, political position, and generation may coexist within a community. Under external pressure, "solidarity" may become a demand carrying high weight, while women's circumstances, differences between rich and poor, local conflicts, internal domination, and young people's dissent are downweighted. These differences do not disappear because the community faces an external threat; it may simply be temporarily difficult for them to enter public accounts.

Nor can the existence of internal differences prove, conversely, that a national community is false. The reality of a community does not require its members to have the same interests, memories, or positions on every

issue. It depends on whether long-term relational chains, shared memory, recognition and boundaries, demands of responsibility, and the capacity for write-back can be extracted in concrete events and change consequences for members. A community can be deeply divided internally and still form real connections through external harm, shared protection, or disputes over commemoration. The same member may also move closer to or farther from the community's center in different relational fields.

Calibration must resist two kinds of compression at once: one swallows internal differences because it sees the community, while the other abolishes the community because it sees internal differences. The former readily treats the voices of representatives as the voices of all members; the latter demotes relations that can be transmitted across generations and enter into consequences to mere fiction. More reliable judgments should trace concrete nodes: which differences find expression, which members can participate in certification, which responsibilities are distributed unequally, and which dissenting views are preserved or cleared away. The national community is a real network, and real networks must always remain subject to calibration through internal counterexamples.

X. How National Communities Write Back to the Past and to Individual Positions

National communities depend heavily on the preservation of past differences. Migration, war, humiliation, protection, alliances, turning away, disasters, heroes, failures, language bans, boundary conflicts, and shared commemorations may ordinarily be scattered across language, stories, place names, burial grounds, festivals, family education, school teaching materials, local rumors, and state archives. These pasts do not continue automatically. They acquire present weight only when located and extracted anew through historical indices in new events.

A language dispute may extract memories of prolonged suppression; a boundary conflict may bring ancestral experiences of victimization back into judgment; a dispute over commemoration may evoke shared humiliation and shared protection; and a choice about romantic relationships or marriage may trigger boundary evaluations preserved in kinship networks. A historical index is not history itself, still less the past's automatic domination of the present. Different nodes can extract different parts of the same past and give them different weights. Some memories become public, some circulate only within families, and others may remain silent for a long time.

If the results of present handling are preserved by members, families and those who transmit things across generations, recorders, educators, organizers, or institutional personnel as differences that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. Preservation does not guarantee that they will take effect in the future. Conflict may change the next generation's understanding of boundaries, and protection may become grounds for later demands of responsibility. Turning away may leave lasting distrust, while adjustments to registration or the cancellation of commemorations may form new shared memories. Individual positions change in this process as well. A person's declaration of position in a dispute, silence, protection, romantic relationships or marriage, or identity registration may all be preserved and reevaluated by these specific people. Those involved thus not only inherit the past but also continually leave new pasts.

Only when specific people or procedures identify, extract, interpret, or assign weight to these contents anew in later events does the content of write-back take effect again, bringing today's determinations into tomorrow's eligibility, risks, recognition, and action spaces. It is not the abstract noun "community" that accomplishes write-back. Family members tell children about experiences of protection; local community members and commemorative organizers preserve names; school procedures handle public accounts;

registration personnel adjust identity records; and marriage and kinship networks preserve who once stepped forward to mediate.

Deleting a name, rejecting a certificate, or interpreting silence as turning away also narrows the recognition and action space available to the person concerned later. Versions left by different nodes may not agree. What future events extract is then not a single past, but competing historical indices. Someone remembered as a protector may acquire standing to speak; someone remembered as having turned away may encounter distrust when seeking help, pursuing romantic relationships or marriage, or when public representatives are selected. If new testimony, mediation, or shared cooperation emerges later, old evaluations may also be recalibrated. Write-back can reinforce positions while also preserving the possibility of changing them.

XI. How a Nation Is Compressed into Fixed Images

The image of a bloodline essence writes the nation as a natural, eternal whole defined by descent, occluding language, education, migration, shared memory, demands of responsibility, and experiences of boundaries. The image of state registration treats classifications on forms as the community itself. Interpreters who adopt this image can see institutional consequences, yet may overlook long-term interaction before and beyond registration. Interpreters who adopt the pure-victim image can extract real harms, but if they write the community as an eternal victim, they downweight internal domination, differences among members, harms inflicted on others, and the possibility that members, organizers, or narrators within the community produce illusory constructions. Fixed images also erase actors from the account, as if "the nation" itself remembered, demanded, excluded, or suffered harm. One then need no longer ask which registration officer handled the fields, which elder downweighted dissent, which organization chose what to commemorate, or which members refused to harm others. Restoring actors to the account does not mean reducing consequences to individual intentions. What must be traced is how individual decisions draw on institutional, kinship, language, and ritual nodes to acquire force beyond the individual.

Real and weighty differentiating units such as labor, wages, employment, property, debt, housing, risk, relations of domination, and the width of available exits provide the material basis. The processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them form partial explanatory power. The class image is only the output of this process after low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming, and derives its explanatory appeal from this. Yet the "class" formed from these differences is not a social entity, a natural community, or an underlying structure. Class theory is Model C: total-image subsumption. It elevates a limited image into society itself, demoting language, rites and customs, shared harm, shared protection, migration memory, experiences of boundaries, commemorative rituals, and demands of responsibility to materials subordinate to the total class image. The partial explanatory power described above cannot change this Model C structure.

Grouping people in similar circumstances into the same class image can form an abstract sameness of category. It cannot thereby generate sustained interaction or interaction that can be relayed, shared memory, mutual recognition, demands of responsibility, and a long-term capacity for write-back. Belonging to the same abstract category does not mean belonging to the same network. Model C in the other direction uses complexity to cancel judgment, placing valid models, limited models, erroneous models, and junk models on the same level and producing an erasure of distinctions between explanations. The two mechanisms work in opposite directions, yet both destroy comparison, revision, and calibration. Acknowledging the complexity of nations, the limits of explanation, and the need to attend to counterexamples does not belong to this erasure of distinctions. The move into Model C occurs only when complexity is used to cancel valid comparison.

XII. The Limits of Explanations of Nations and Calibration Through Events

A nation involves language, history, registration, internal differences, and external pressure; it truly cannot be exhausted by a single image. Acknowledging the limits of explanation does not amount to canceling judgment, still less does it mean that all explanations are equally ineffective. If the complexity of a nation becomes grounds for refusing to establish which differences enter consequences, which nodes play a role, and which relational chains are transmitting pressure, apparent caution slides toward the erasure of distinctions between explanations. A healthy acknowledgment of limits always preserves comparison: it makes its own boundaries public, accepts counterexamples, and allows materials to force revisions to an earlier judgment, keeping analysis from oscillating between total images and the erasure of distinctions between explanations.

Judgment and calibration must return to concrete events. Just as the border-town child described earlier bears different weights between family, service counters, and markets, the relational structures that emerge within the same community in different situations are not the same. A language dispute may give greater weight to language nodes, schools, family education, state policy, and shared memory. In a boundary conflict, shared harm, shared protection, external pressure, state enforcement, and local networks may transmit consequences more directly. Disputes over commemoration implicate historical indices, public space, state recognition, and demands of responsibility. Disputes over romantic relationships and marriage may unfold along kinship networks, rites and customs, local evaluations, and experiences of boundaries.

Different settings, such as state registration, schooling, migration conflicts, or external insults, involve situations of different scope. Different events require different relational-field windows; the same set of weights cannot cover all questions concerning nations.

Once the event has been identified, valid comparison requires assessing which key differences an explanation has extracted, which nodes and relational chains it has traced, and what it has downweighted. It must explain how differences are preserved, translated, certified, and written back: which differentiating units are extracted by whom, which nodes preserve or certify them, and along what relational chains consequences travel; which historical indices gain weight again in the present; and which community evaluations are being preserved by members, recorders, organizers, or procedures for renewed extraction in the future. When existing evaluations are retrieved, interpreted, or assigned weight anew in the present, interpreters must also explain who thereby receives protection and who pays the price for being downweighted or forced to declare a position. Testing an explanation consists precisely in examining whether it is willing to revise its judgments on the basis of materials when confronted with concrete counterexamples, such as bridging nodes that remain effective, divided opinion within the community, or a mismatch between state registration and networks of life.

Among ordinary limited explanations, an explanation in terms of bloodline can address certain kinship accounts, but it must not swallow long-term interaction networks. An explanation in terms of state registration can account for institutional positions, but shared memory and demands of responsibility beyond registration must still be retained. A cultural explanation can extract language, rites, and customs; if it writes a nation as a static display of customs, it oversteps its own boundaries. A narrative of victimization can preserve real harms, but it cannot dismiss internal differences, internal domination, or the community's risk of illusory construction. These ordinary limited explanations must all make their boundaries public and accept counterexamples.

Interpreters who adopt class theory can indeed extract differentiating units such as resources, labor, and domination from concrete materials. The partial explanatory power thereby formed belongs to these differentiating units and the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, compressing, and testing them; it does not come from the class image itself. The class image remains only a low-dimensional output of

Model C. Class theory does not belong among the ordinary limited explanations discussed here that can accept counterexamples. Demoting the national community to class occlusion is precisely the line that class theory and its interpreters must not cross. No image can occupy the place of the community itself.

Explanations of nations must ultimately uphold both reality and non-essentialization. Reality requires acknowledging the community consequences formed through long-term interaction, multiple layers of relaying, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. Non-essentialization rejects the confinement of differences among members within total images of descent, registration, culture, victimization, or class; at the same time, it does not permit non-essentialization to be used to deny the community's real existence. Demands of responsibility must be traced to their relational sources and kept within boundaries. History can enter the present only through historical indices. Nor can boundary generation be directly converted into legitimacy. Only by proceeding according to these standards can we understand how a community is established, how its members, organizers, and related procedures provide protection or cause oppression, how community relations split, and how they are revised in new events.

Chapter 30. The State: Identification, Registration, Certification, Implementation, and Write-Back

I. The State Cannot Be Written as One Enormous Person

The state is often spoken of as a person: it sees, decides, punishes, and also protects. Convenient as this may be, it readily leads readers to imagine the state as an enormous subject standing outside society, as though it could see all people and facts at once and then issue commands through a single will. The actual handling of documents, school admission, labor, medical care, adjudication, and passage does not work this way. Applying for an identity card requires connections among a birth certificate, household registration, photographs, an address, family relations, the public security system, and the process of producing the document. In seeking school admission, a child encounters household registration, a residence permit, parents' social insurance, rental filing, application review, and the establishment of student registration. After an injury, a worker must submit materials concerning the employment relationship, medical records, a work-related injury appraisal, social insurance contributions, and an employer's certificate. An elder seeking medical care away from home must connect medical records, medical-insurance relations, filing for care away from home, referral formalities, and an itemized list of expenses to reimbursement nodes.

In these events, the state's role is jointly formed through concrete agencies, personnel, documents, registration systems, certification procedures, and implementing nodes. This does not redefine the state as a "network" conceived as the sole underlying reality, nor does it deny the reality of state organizations and their procedures. Precisely because service-counter personnel can accept or reject materials, and nodes of schools, hospitals, courts, public security, communities, borders, taxation, social insurance, and assistance can form, preserve, and retrieve records, relevant determinations can become eligibility, restrictions, protection, penalties, or consequences of implementation. The state is not an enormous personality, but the consequences formed through these organizations and procedures have real and often very high intensity.

In concrete events, personnel or the corresponding procedures may extract various differences anew. These include birthplace, household registration, nationality, age, sex, marriage, and ethnic registration, as well as educational qualifications, occupation, tax records, social insurance contributions, records of legal violations, medical records, and property. Eligibility for military service, facts of residence, migration routes, eligibility for assistance, educational eligibility, and judicial status may likewise be retrieved in such procedures. Analysis need not begin by debating whether the state is a subject. More important is to distinguish each action along the procedures: who identifies differences in life, who registers materials, who certifies their validity, how different nodes achieve mutual recognition, how determinations enter implementation, and who then preserves the results for renewed retrieval in future events.

II. The State Is Not the Source of Differences but a Mechanism for Formatting Them

Many differences already exist before state agencies intervene. Family, locality, nation, market, illness, migration, marriage, debt, labor, and conflict are not created out of nothing by registration or administrative procedures. Interactions with neighbors and landlords and in food markets can confirm that someone lives here. A child's birth, a father's unpaid wages, and an elder's illness are likewise, first of all, things that have already happened in life. When these matters enter the relevant service counters, personnel and procedures extract particular differences from them. The fact of residence may be entered into household registration, a residence permit, rental filing, address registration, or a community certificate; the fact of birth may be entered into a birth certificate, household registration, guardianship relations, vaccination records, and student-registration materials.

This recasting involves several actions that must not be conflated. Service-counter personnel, reviewers, or case handlers first extract from facts of life differences relevant to the current event: this is identification. Only when the content enters forms, certificates, files, or databases does it become registration. Authorized nodes judge, according to materials and procedures, whether identities, relations, or eligibility can be established: this is certification. Only when the corresponding personnel further put certification or adjudication into effect as school admission, reimbursement, assistance, penalties, permission to pass, or restrictions does it enter implementation. Registration is not a neutral transcription of life in its entirety. Facts that do not fit the fields may be downweighted, and materials may be cut off, misread, omitted from registration, or rejected. The distinctive role of state procedures is to turn some differences in life into formats that subsequent nodes can read and act on with consequences, not to create all differences.

The concentration of data at state nodes does not mean that information is complete. Databases can preserve only content accepted by the fields as designed, while personnel remain limited by access permissions, the timing of updates, and correction procedures. Centralized preservation can improve the capacity for connection across nodes, but it may also amplify erroneous records. Analysts must also trace whether synchronization and correction actually occur.

III. A Family of Workers from Elsewhere Enters State Nodes

The mother does casual work at a restaurant and hurries back to the rented home in the afternoon to pick up the child. Behind her is a family of workers from elsewhere facing pressure from multiple nodes at once: rent is due at the end of the month, and a loan from relatives remains unpaid; the father works at a construction site away from home, and his wages have been overdue for two months; the child has reached school age and, depending on local policy, may need some of the materials concerning residence, social insurance, renting, or existing student registration; the elder's medical records and medical-insurance relations remain at the hospital in the home county town. These are not abstract labels of poverty but pressures of materials, eligibility, nodes, and time that this family faces simultaneously along several procedural chains.

The mother occupies the position of an actor who prepares and submits materials, explains them, and supplements and corrects them. At the same time, she bears the consequences when the results of these procedures fall back on household cash flow and care arrangements. Her working hours, contract, and social-insurance records may affect her ability to prepare materials and care for family members. Specifically, whether she signs a contract, whether social-insurance records are formed, whether her working hours can be adjusted, and whether taking leave reduces her income change her ability to visit service counters, supply additional materials, and care for her family.

Labor or care that has already occurred in life does not automatically bring the corresponding consequences within state procedures. Care among family members, traces of responsibility, and past support, as well as local recognition formed through landlords, neighbors, the community, and people from the same place of origin, certainly play their roles before or outside connection to state procedures. State procedures cannot replace family responsibility or local recognition, but they can change the positions from which family members obtain eligibility, assistance, and consequences of implementation.

This mechanism, in which "the existence of a fact does not mean that its consequences are in place," also operates in a child's school-admission procedure. The child really lives here: that is a fact of life. Yet school reviewers and application systems may still not accept the corresponding materials. In this process, the fact of the child's residence must undergo review through admission-application and student-registration procedures. Rental materials provided by the landlord, certificates produced by the community, and residence and social-insurance records submitted by the parents may be extracted by application personnel and entered into the application. School reviewers then judge on the basis of the corresponding materials whether to accept the application for admission, and student-registration personnel establish the approved result as student registration. Once student registration has formed, the family may reconsider this record in later migration, changes of rental accommodation, and work arrangements. This chain is not a fixed checklist of rules. Whether particular materials are required and how they are combined remain matters of institutional setting that require verification before publication.

The father really did the work, but to turn the labor that occurred at the construction site into acceptable materials on the employment relationship and unpaid wages, that relationship must still be certified through inspection, arbitration, or adjudication nodes. In the concrete procedures, the father needs to submit a contract, wage records, and information about the employer to prove the actual labor. Testimony from coworkers or others with knowledge of the facts may also become material. Whether labor inspectors accept the materials, whether arbitrators or a court certify the employment relationship and reach an adjudication, and whether enforcement personnel initiate and complete enforcement are distinct links.

Employment relationships, wage payments, arbitration, litigation, and court enforcement belong to different procedures under the Labor Contract Law, the Labor Dispute Mediation and Arbitration Law, and the Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China. Whether witness materials can be admitted and enforcement completed still depends on the concrete case and statutory conditions.

Reimbursement of the elder's medical expenses likewise faces the problem of connecting concrete nodes. The elder really is ill, but medical records, medical-insurance relations, and materials for care away from home must be connected through hospital personnel and reimbursement nodes. Procedures for medical insurance away from home may also fail to complete reimbursement. Along this chain, hospital personnel produce medical records and itemized expense lists; family members prepare materials on medical insurance, filing for care away from home, or referrals; and reviewers at reimbursement nodes then decide whether the relevant expenses can enter reimbursement. These arrangements may affect who accompanies the elder to medical appointments, who advances payment, who takes leave, and who bears the pressure of care. They cannot, however, be written as fixed procedures followed in every area.

The several procedural chains confronting the family thus affect one another, but they cannot be compressed into one unified process automatically advanced by "the state." The key to recognition that can be put into effect lies not only in whether someone knows the facts, but also in whether materials can be accepted, eligibility can be certified, nodes can achieve mutual recognition, and someone initiates and completes implementation. If rent payments or the connection of materials are interrupted, residence registration,

applications for student registration, and eligibility for assistance may also affect one another within certain procedures.

IV. State Recognition Is Not Merely Seeing but Recognition That Can Be Put into Effect

Local recognition can make a person known among neighbors; family recognition can make a person subject to demands or afford them protection within kinship relations; recognition within a national community comes from the intergenerational write-back of long-term interaction, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, responsibility, and experiences of boundaries. State registration cannot create this kind of national community, nor can it make a registration field equivalent to a national entity. What distinguishes state procedures is that personnel can enter identified differences into records, certification nodes can judge whether materials are valid or eligibility is established, and implementing personnel may turn the results into school admission, reimbursement, assistance, penalties, permission to pass, or restrictions.

Recognition that can be put into effect therefore involves, at a minimum, connections among reception, certification, mutual recognition, and implementation. Application personnel seeing a child's residence materials does not mean that admission eligibility has been certified. Labor inspectors accepting materials on unpaid wages does not mean that an adjudication has been reached; nor does an adjudication mean that enforcement has been carried through. State recognition appears "harder" because certain determinations can connect to coercive force and chains of implementation, directly changing eligibility and action spaces, not because it has greater ontological reality than recognition within families, localities, or nations. Recognition at one node may still encounter a failure of mutual recognition at another.

V. Authority to Extract Differences, Certification Authority, and Authority to Initiate Implementation within the State

Differences do not turn into institutional consequences on their own. In the concrete operation of organizational power, nodes do not command the same actions and authority. Service-counter personnel can accept materials but do not necessarily have authority to make the final certification. Content uploaded to a database by personnel may not be recognized by another node. Even after arbitrators or a court have reached an adjudication, wages or compensation can reach those concerned only through enforcement personnel. Authority to extract differences, authority to register, certification authority, authority to supplement and correct, authority to upload, authority to refuse, and authority to initiate implementation must not be conflated. Writing all of this as "the state decides" conceals breaks in procedures and positions of responsibility.

These differences in power appear in specific divisions among legal sources. In the legal sources cited in this book concerning procedures for school admission, student registration, determination of work-related injury, labor arbitration, civil litigation, and administrative reconsideration, the relevant personnel accept, extract, preserve, or judge particular materials only within their respective matters and authority. The specific authority to extract differences at public-security, community, social-insurance, border-inspection, civil-affairs, taxation, and other service counters must still be established separately under their own legal sources; it cannot all be established by the sources just mentioned. Who can extract what is not an ordinary judgment of fact but power actually allocated within procedures. The procedural sources discussed in Chapter 17 are used here only within their expressly stated jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material scope.

As concrete procedures unfold, the difficulties confronting a family of workers from elsewhere often do not lie in a complete absence of facts. The child lives here, the father did the work, the elder has medical records, and the mother works at the restaurant every day. The problem is whether materials supplied by landlords, coworkers, family members, or workplace personnel can be accepted at a service counter, supplemented and corrected as required, certified by authorized personnel, and read by subsequent nodes. When facts of life cannot readily be turned into usable materials, a person may exist in reality yet lack a position from which to initiate consequences within a particular institutional procedure.

Whether materials can be extracted, recognized, and corrected further involves the actual allocation of resources and time. The capacity for centralization at state nodes includes arranging these conditions: budgets determine how many people can handle applications, how soon a review can take place, and where entry points for supplementation and correction are available, while appointments and supervision affect the positions at which discretion lies. These arrangements do indeed change whether materials can be extracted, recognized, and corrected. Yet the words "the state" cannot directly yield an account of all responsibility.

Understanding this actual allocation also requires examining whether ownership and control over use coincide. The nominal owner of equipment, data, or an account is not necessarily the person who decides who can use it, who can change it, and who can benefit from it. Actual control may be shared among managers, authorizers, technical personnel, or those allocating resources. Only by separating nominal title, control, use, benefit, and the capacity to correct can we avoid writing ownership as a subject that acts on its own.

The analysis of responsibility must therefore examine concrete control, knowledge, and capacities for correction. When institutional personnel maintain arrangements despite knowing their accumulated consequences, responsibility must be judged in relation to their actual capacities. People who can raise objections, stop passing materials on, initiate review, or adjust resources are in a different situation from those who merely receive results and have no corrective authority. Allocating responsibility requires preserving distinctions between levels of authority, rather than treating everyone alike because they share an organizational name.

VI. The Costs of State Recognition

Bringing facts of life into procedures of registration, certification, and implementation often requires time, travel, filling out forms, preserving proof, operating digital systems, and repeated supplementation and correction. Getting facts of life before those who certify them already entails real costs. A child's admission procedure involves not only eligibility and whether applicants can understand application requirements, but also whether parents can take leave to visit service counters and whether the landlord supplies filing materials. If the mother cannot take leave, she may miss the time for submitting materials; a landlord unwilling to supply them may make it difficult for the real fact of residence to enter the application.

This threshold, composed of procedural costs and concrete obstacles, also exists in applications concerning medical care and labor rights. Reimbursement for an elder involves not only illness and medical-insurance relations, but also whether family members can prepare referrals, filing for care away from home, and itemized expense lists. If the elder cannot operate digital systems, the procedure may require a family member to act on their behalf. Whether unpaid wages can enter a determination procedure depends on whether the father can establish information about the employer, obtain coworkers' testimony, and preserve wage records. If wage records have not been preserved, the person concerned may have to provide additional evidence repeatedly.

The costs of recognition therefore do not fall equally on everyone. These concrete difficulties do not prove that a class entity is acting behind the scenes. They show how real differentiating units, such as working hours, income, housing, digital skills, caregiving responsibilities, resources for providing proof, and available exits, change people's ability to enter procedures. The more elaborate the materials and procedures, the more likely it is that the costs of recognition become a new filtering mechanism.

An explanation of the state must further distinguish the existence of rules from the capacity to handle matters. A law or procedure providing an entry point for review does not mean that the person concerned is certain to obtain materials, time, and personnel support, nor that the responsible position has sufficient resources to complete a correction. The distance between a formal entry point and an actual one changes whether rights can enter real consequences.

VII. The State Is Not a Seamless System

Four levels must not be omitted in the progression from a record's initial formation to its being readable by other nodes, to mutual recognition, and finally to implementation. After hospital personnel confirm an illness and produce medical records, the corresponding reimbursement materials may still not be accepted by medical-insurance review nodes. A certificate issued by community personnel may not receive mutual recognition from school reviewers. A worker has done the work, yet the employment relationship still awaits certification through inspection, arbitration, or a court. Even after a court issues a judgment, enforcement personnel may not yet have found the conditions that permit enforcement, leaving the result unrealized. Wider consequences from a judgment within a limited scope depend on connections, passing-on, and mutual recognition between nodes. Material valid at one service counter may, after entering a database, prove unusable by another node because of problems with fields, authority, or connections. Nor does the existence of a record mean that subsequent personnel can read it in the current event or will assign it the same weight. State organizations have real capacities, but they must not be imagined as a unified brain that knows everything, synchronizes everything, and automatically accomplishes everything.

A family of workers from elsewhere often encounters difficulties at the seams between these links. Landlords, community personnel, and neighbors know that the family lives here, yet school review may still require another set of acceptable materials. The hospital back home preserves medical records, yet personnel at reimbursement nodes elsewhere may still require supplementation and correction. Coworkers and the labor contractor know that the father did the work, yet inspection, arbitration, or adjudication nodes must still certify the employment relationship on the basis of usable materials. These situations show that the existence of a record does not necessarily produce the expected consequences. When contrary materials, erroneous records, or failures of mutual recognition change the concrete result of handling, the explanation that "a record automatically produces consequences simply by existing" must be revised.

The possibility that the same centralized policy is implemented differently at different nodes also arises along similar paths of relaying. Requirements from above must pass through notices, database fields, assessments, and staff training before they can gradually reach the final positions. Along the way, intermediate positions can delay, interpret, resist, or selectively pass them on. Analysis therefore needs to compare how commands are relayed across nodes, identify positions with the capacity for review, revocation, or correction, and examine which consequences are rewritten in the course of being passed on.

Stable state capacity across regions and departments must be demonstrated through repeated acts of mutual recognition and implementation. A document's being recognized in one place does not establish that all nodes can read it. Nor does an order from above being carried out in several places erase resistance, delays, and

exceptions elsewhere. Judgments of capacity at the macro level should specify regions, institutions, periods, and visible counterexamples. Formal unity does not guarantee uniform implementation either. The same forms and rules may produce differences when they enter different regions, depending on staffing, budgets, training, local materials, and supervision from above. State capacity at the macro level requires support from these concrete configurations; a uniform format cannot be directly equated with uniform consequences.

VIII. Protection and Exclusion Come from the Same Set of Mechanisms

The state cannot be written as a machine of pure oppression. Administration of the minimum subsistence guarantee may enable eligible applicants to obtain support for living. Assistance review can admit those who meet the conditions, but it may also reject those unable to provide proof. Basic medical insurance, medical assistance, and the personnel administering them can handle illness and expenses under their respective rules. Medical-insurance review can allow expenses to enter reimbursement, but it may also refuse to accept them because materials fail to connect.

Schools connect educational eligibility through admission and student-registration rules. Courts handle debt or labor disputes through adjudication and enforcement procedures. They can enforce rights, but evidence, procedural costs, or enforcement conditions may also leave those concerned unable to obtain a result. These procedures belong to different systems. They do not constitute a set of rules through which a single agency uniformly connects education, employment, passage, and welfare. These forms of protection are not the automatic benevolence of an abstract institution; they are results achieved by concrete personnel working with materials, authority, and procedures. The sources concerning admission, remedies, and assistance discussed in Chapters 17 and 20 are used here only within their expressly stated jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material scope.

Border-inspection personnel may permit or restrict passage according to documents, existing records, and judgments of risk. Protection and exclusion through state power may come from the same set of capacities. Unified certification can allow rights to travel across regions, but it may also cause people who could not enter the format to be rejected in several places. Centralized implementation can deliver assistance, and it can also amplify erroneous determinations. Analysts must trace concrete uses and entry points for correction; they cannot infer a single character directly from the concentration of capacity.

Protection and exclusion are not two unrelated states, but different consequences produced for different materials and positions by the same chain of identification, certification, and implementation. Analysis cannot stop at blanket judgments such as "the state is good" or "the state is bad." What actually needs tracing is which staff member extracted which differences, which materials were accepted or rejected, at which node mutual recognition broke down, who gained entry to eligibility, and who was excluded from the chain of implementation. The reality of state consequences lies precisely in these locatable acts of admission, refusal, protection, restriction, and implementation, not in the benevolence or malice of some abstract personality.

IX. State Relational Chains: From Facts of Life to Implementation

In particular local systems, such as applications for first-year junior-secondary school places in Dapeng New District, Shenzhen, for the 2024–2025 school year, and points-based school admission in Baiyun District, Guangzhou, for children accompanying people who have moved to the city, applicants submit some of the materials concerning housing, residence, social insurance, or work according to their category. The relevant departments accept and review these under the procedures for that year. After approval, the establishment and preservation of student registration are handled separately under the current rules for its administration. The particular combinations of materials and review procedures belong to specific institutional settings. They must not be extended into a nationally uniform checklist, nor may concrete cases be expanded into universal rules. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

In an event involving unpaid wages, the father, coworkers, workplace personnel, and relevant records supply materials on labor and wages. Labor inspectors decide whether to accept them; arbitrators or a court judge the employment relationship and the claim for unpaid wages under the procedures; enforcement personnel then turn the adjudication into actual consequences. In an event involving illness, hospital personnel produce medical records and itemized expense lists, family members submit materials concerning medical insurance, referrals, or filing for care away from home, and reviewers at reimbursement nodes judge which expenses can enter subsequent processing. Each chain may branch, break off, or require supplementation and correction. They cannot be written as fixed, inevitable linear sequences.

Records formed through penalties, judgments, student registration, reimbursement, or border processing must be retrieved again by authorized personnel in subsequent relevant events before they can change credit, employment, passage, loans, administrative permits, or other judgments. A record does not cross all domains on its own, nor does the past automatically determine the present. Whether a record can lead to new consequences depends on whether it is still preserved, whether subsequent nodes have authority to read it, and whether personnel extract it in the current event. Contrary materials or supplementation and correction may also change its original weight.

When centralized arrangements produce long-term consequences, responsibility is still allocated along concrete paths. Participants who design rules, allocate resources, reject objections, maintain records, and initiate implementation may differ in capacity and in how much they know. Those carrying out implementation at the end of the chain, those authorizing it from above, and those with review authority cannot all be treated alike. Judgments of state incorporation of differences at the macro level must compare whether these positions recur across several events and retain materials concerning resistance, exceptions, and failures.

X. State Formatting Produces New Differentiating Units

Concrete procedures for registration, review, adjudication, and implementation not only preserve existing differences; they may also form new institutional records. In the legal sources cited in this book concerning procedures for school admission and student registration, labor, work-related injuries, administrative penalties, and civil litigation, household-registration or residence materials, student registration, employment relationships, determinations of work-related injury, and penalty and adjudication records can be formed under their respective rules and may be extracted in subsequent matters that have a legal basis for doing so. Later uses of medical-insurance, assistance, or passage records must still be checked separately against the specific systems concerned. This is the limited meaning of "state formatting produces new differentiating units." It does not mean that the state creates the whole of lived reality, or that all differentiating units originate in the state.

Understanding the long-term effects of arrangements for state incorporation of differences requires distinguishing three temporal levels: immediate consequences, the formation of write-back, and the content of write-back taking effect again. A concrete penalty or permission first changes the person's position in the present. Yet an immediate consequence does not mean that write-back has already formed. When personnel or procedures preserve a handling result as a difference that can be extracted again in the future (for example, by entering it in a file or database), write-back has already been established. Nor does preservation that forms write-back mean that its content has already taken effect again in a subsequent situation.

The subsequent consequences of content preserved through write-back are conditional. Records established by student-registration personnel may be retrieved anew in family migration or later educational events. Arbitration or adjudication records may be extracted in related enforcement or risk judgments. Handling results formed by reimbursement personnel may change the family's later arrangements for care and advancing payment. Records formed by border-inspection personnel may also be consulted anew by subsequent personnel acting within their authority in future events of passage. These are conditional consequences, not inevitable effects across domains as soon as a record forms. While not being retrieved, a record can ordinarily remain silent.

Only when subsequent events such as school admission, migration, work, assistance, medical insurance, loans, leaving the country, litigation, or administrative approval prompt relevant personnel to retrieve it anew do past handling results gain weight in the present. A historical index is not an automatic continuation of the past; it is the re-entry of preserved differences into the present through concrete materials, personnel, and procedures. How the record is interpreted, whether contrary materials are accepted, whether erroneous registration can be supplemented and corrected, and whether different nodes achieve mutual recognition may all change its weight.

Once concrete personnel or the corresponding procedures preserve the results of present supplementation and correction, refusal, or new determinations as differences available for renewed extraction in the future, new write-back has already formed. Neither existing preserved records nor newly added write-back takes effect automatically merely because it is preserved. Only when personnel or procedures retrieve, interpret, or assign weight to it anew in subsequent events does its content take effect again. The three temporal levels of immediate consequences, write-back formation, and the content of write-back taking effect again must be separated so that we can accurately identify when different positions hold corrective capacity, and so that concrete responsibility can be borne at the corresponding links.

XI. How the State Is Compressed into Fixed Images

The state is often compressed into several fixed images. The image of a single personality may highlight centralized commands or coercive consequences, at the cost of hiding different agencies, personnel, powers, procedures, and breaks in mutual recognition behind one will. Interpreters who adopt the image of a machine of pure oppression can extract coercion, exclusion, and punishment, yet may have no room for assistance, protection, adjudication, public services, and the enforcement of rights. The image of all-powerful order treats registration as accurate knowledge and adjudication as completed enforcement, thus overlooking misregistration, omissions from registration, incorrect registration, costs associated with materials, and enforcement failures. As for the image of a single neutral institution, interpreters who adopt it may see only the uniform forms of procedures, while the ways personnel extract differences, disparities in authority, and institutional biases recede beyond the frame.

Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract real differentiating units such as labor, wages, income, housing, property, debt, resources, risk, available exits, relations of domination, and certain institutional biases. The partial explanatory power formed through this process of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression does not prove that class entities exist within any limited scope. Class entities do not exist, and class theory is not an ordinary limited Model A or Model B; it belongs to the direction of Model C: total-image subsumption. It elevates a set of differences subjected to low-dimensional compression, projection, and naming into society itself, thereby subsuming other valid explanations. The state is not an instrument of implementation for a class entity. Class theory and interpreters who adopt it cannot demote the concrete chains of identification, registration, certification, mutual recognition, implementation, and write-back to subordinate materials.

State registration likewise cannot create or replace national communities. The reality of a national community comes from long-term interaction, multiple layers of relaying, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. Registration agencies can create ethnic-category fields and change members' institutional positions, but fields alone cannot manufacture these interactions, memories, and responsibilities. Nor can family, locality, nation, market, or society be subsumed by state procedures. Social Differentiation Network Theory is used to trace how concrete differences enter consequences; it cannot, in turn, be elevated into another single underlying reality or total image of the state.

XII. Preventing Complexity-Based Conflation and Calibrating Explanations of the State

Understanding the state does not consist in choosing an essence for it from among a subject, a machine, an institution, or a class instrument. It consists in returning to the examination of concrete events such as school admission, assistance, medical insurance, unpaid wages, litigation, border passage, household-registration transfers, document applications, and the enforcement of penalties. Each of these events involves different materials and procedures; the word "state" cannot say everything about them. The real consequences produced by state organizations and procedures must always be explained in terms of personnel, materials, eligibility, restrictions, and implementation.

Which staff member identifies and extracts the differentiating units, and into what materials or records are they registered? Which node holds certification authority, and are the materials recognized or rejected at authorized nodes? Where do nodes achieve mutual recognition or encounter breaks? Who initiates implementation, and who bears its consequences? How are handling results then preserved to form write-back? Throughout this process, preservation that forms write-back must not be conflated with records

taking effect when retrieved again later. If old records reappear, the specific position and authority of the person retrieving them must be made clear.

These mechanisms do not follow one fixed path. Different events involve different differentiating units and relational chains entering consequences, and no node can be presumed always to matter most. In school-admission events, for example, one can compare which residence, application, and student-registration materials are extracted. In unpaid-wage events, one needs to trace employment relationships, wage records, inspection, adjudication, and enforcement. In medical-insurance events, one can examine medical records, medical-insurance relations, expense materials, and reimbursement processing. In border events, one must locate documents, the purpose of passage, existing records, and personnel's judgments. Acknowledging these differences among agencies, procedures, materials, and implementation shows that the state is indeed complex, but it by no means amounts to canceling judgment.

In concrete handling, supplementing and correcting materials, presenting contrary materials, or failures of mutual recognition between nodes may force an existing explanation to be revised, thereby grounding abstract concepts in traceable relational chains. Acknowledging complexity, limits, omissions, and counterexamples does not make the state impossible to judge. On the contrary, counterexamples retain an ongoing entry point for revising explanations.

Only when complexity is used to cancel valid comparison, placing valid explanations, limited explanations, erroneous explanations, and junk explanations on the same level, does one enter Model C's direction of erasing distinctions between explanations. The other direction elevates images of personality, oppression, order, or class into the state and even society itself, subsuming other chains under a total image. These two directions are opposite, yet both destroy comparison, revision, and calibration. By contrast, a healthy path of understanding remains outside Model C precisely because, while acknowledging complexity, limits, omissions, and counterexamples, it preserves comparison between different explanations, provisional judgment, and revision.

An interpreter's extracting some phenomena through a fixed image does not prove that the explanation is thereby valid, still less entitle it to subsume other chains. An image that personifies the state may highlight centralized commands or coercive consequences, yet occlude concrete nodes, the operation of procedures, and breaks in mutual recognition. Interpreters who adopt the image of a machine of oppression can extract coercion, exclusion, and punishment, but cannot swallow assistance, protection, adjudication, public services, or the enforcement of rights. Interpreters who adopt an image of institutional neutrality may see uniform procedural forms, yet occlude misregistration, omissions from registration, costs associated with materials, differences in implementation, and biases of power. Interpreters who adopt class theory can extract only some resources, labor, power, and institutional biases; they can neither swallow the state's concrete differentiation chains nor thereby prove the existence of class entities.

Analysis of state mechanisms must therefore continually preserve the conditionality of institutional settings. As concrete relational chains unfold through materials, eligibility, and procedures, the boundaries of family, locality, nation, market, and society itself must not be subsumed under state categories. Counterexamples always retain an entry point for revising explanations.

Chapter 31. The Market: Differentiation Networks in Prices, Debt, Credit, and Risk

I. The Market Cannot Be Written as an All-Purpose Explanation

The market is easily written as a total image. Once the market is mentioned, some people immediately think of prices, competition, exchange, wages, rent, and profit, as though these could explain every circumstance of human life. Another way of speaking reverses the direction and writes the market entirely as a false appearance, treating prices, credit, debt, and contracts as nothing more than a shell concealing real relations of domination. Both ways of writing move too quickly.

Prices, wages, rent, debt, credit, risk, the capacity to wait, the width of available exits, information gaps, contract terms, payment deadlines, costs of default, and consumption capacity enter real consequences through the personnel, organizations, rules, and procedures that process these materials, and they change a person's real position. But the market cannot explain all social reality. Family care, local recognition, state registration, national communities, school eligibility, historical memory, kinship support, and identity certification cannot all be reduced to market consequences. Nor is the market a false appearance. The real effects of prices, wages, rent, debt, credit, and risk cannot be denied merely because the market cannot explain everything.

The market includes transactions, pricing, credit extension, evaluation, and performance of contracts; it is not merely a space of exchange. Prices do not automatically regulate everything. The people, organizations, rules, and procedures involved in these processes turn differences in life into prices, deadlines, debt, credit, risk, and contract terms. These are only common entry points in a market differentiation network, not an exhaustive list. This chapter asks how concrete transactions and processes compress differences in people's lives into prices, wages, rent, debt, credit, and risk; which deadlines, liquidity, capacity to wait, and width of available exits change people's choices; and which differences that cannot enter prices smoothly are omitted, obscured, or shifted onto others.

II. Prices Are Not Pure Numbers

Prices are often treated as the clearest facts of the market: the amounts of rent, wages, and a deposit; what the loan interest rate is; when a debt must be repaid; and how much a contract's penalty for breach is. These numbers appear very definite. Yet a price is not a pure number. It is the market expression of multiple sets of differentiating units compressed together. Rent reflects location, school district, transport, the landlord's attitude, the deposit, the possibility of filing the lease, neighborhood safety, commuting time, and the stability of the tenancy. Wages condense work intensity, the regularity of payment, social insurance, the risk of workplace injury, overtime, skill certification, fluctuations in the industry, and opportunities for substitute work. Debt maturities and loan interest rates contain credit records, guarantee relations, repayment capacity, future income, the risk of delinquency, and family fallback support.

At the same time that market pricing turns some differences into tradable forms, it downweights, obscures, or excludes others. A price can compress differences, but it cannot translate reality in full. Care time is difficult to express fully through wages; bodily wear is often underestimated; anxiety, waiting, and the loss of dignity do not enter contracts in full; family fallback support is treated by the market as an individual's capacity to

bear burdens; and once risk is passed to workers, the price may not compensate for it. Physical wear, care pressure, the anxiety of waiting, loss of dignity, and shifted risks may in fact be left outside the numbers.

Prices within market relations are not isolated consequences. Wages, rent, deposits, interest, credit, and insurance terms enter arrangements concerning families, localities, schools, and medical care along paths of waiting, guarantees, liquidity, and substitute opportunities. Analysts must explain which market materials are put forward by whom, who can change the terms, and who bears the consequences of delinquency and the risks, instead of writing the market as a subject that allocates things by itself.

The same price can produce different results in different families. Income buffers, care responsibilities, local support, housing materials, and existing credit alter the capacity to wait. Market materials therefore have to be compared together with non-market relations. Acknowledging that market differences are real does not mean accepting a total image of the market; criticizing market consequences does not mean denying the actual effects of transactions, prices, debt, and risk.

III. A Family of Workers from Elsewhere Enters Market Nodes

We can continue with that family of workers from elsewhere. The father works at a construction site, and his wages have been overdue for two months. The mother does casual work at a restaurant, is paid by the day, and has no stable social insurance. Rent is due at the end of the month, and the deposit is held by the landlord; the child needs a stable address for school admission, but renewing the lease will require a higher rent. The elder has fallen ill, and the family must choose among medical expenses, rent, debt, and the child's expenses, while relatives are also pressing them to repay money previously lent. The family's problem cannot be described simply as low income. Low income is certainly important, but the market chapter must look more closely: when wages arrive, when rent is due, when debt must be repaid, whether the deposit can be returned, whether the landlord is willing to renew the lease, whether the mother can refuse bad work, whether the father can wait for labor arbitration, and whether moving is an available exit for the family before the child enters school.

Key differences in the market are often not simply how much money there is, but when money arrives, when debt comes due, whether a tenancy can continue, whether risk can be borne, and whether a choice can be postponed. The father's unpaid wages do not merely mean that two months of wages are missing. Those two months fall exactly between rent coming due, the child's school-admission materials, the elder's medical care, and relatives' demands for repayment. Unpaid wages thus become more than a labor problem: consequences pass along rent, debt, student registration, medical insurance, and family relations.

The mother's daily wage appears to give her cash more quickly than the father receives his, but daily payment also means no stable protection, no paid rest, and no continuity of social insurance. She can obtain a little money immediately, yet it is difficult for her to build long-term credit and institutional materials. Concrete events of transaction, payment, renting, and debt do not look only at the family's income over a year. Whether there is cash today, whether rent can be paid at month's end, whether the deposit will be returned, whether debt can be delayed, how much credit remains, and whether the family can wait for the next job will all gradually gain weight.

IV. Market Time and Liquidity

The market does not merely measure how much money there is. It also turns time in life into payment dates, due dates, repayment periods, lease terms, waiting periods, and periods of default. Wages arriving, debts falling due, rent being paid, and deposits being returned each have their own deadlines. Here, time is not background; it is a market differentiating unit. The end of a lease, repayment of a loan, the time required for arbitration and enforcement, and the ability to wait for the next job likewise change a person's circumstances. Pressure in the market is often produced by the superposition of prices, deadlines, and the capacity to wait, and does not arise from price alone.

The same ten thousand yuan produces entirely different consequences when one person must repay it today and another can repay it in six months. The same three-thousand-yuan wage places people in entirely different market positions when it is paid on time or left unpaid for two months. The same rent leads a family to entirely different choices when it falls due in a month or tomorrow. This is exactly the situation facing the family of workers from elsewhere. The father's unpaid wages may perhaps be recovered later, but rent will not wait, the school-application window will not wait, the elder's medical care will not wait, and relatives demanding repayment will not wait. When the deadlines associated with the landlord, creditors, relatives, medical expenses, and the application window approach at the same time, the family is pushed toward a particular node and choices that previously appeared to exist may narrow.

The key differences in the market lie not only in how many resources a person possesses but also in whether those resources can promptly become usable money, credit, housing, and exits. An unpaid wage claim cannot be treated as cash at hand and cannot be used to pay rent. A deposit theoretically belongs to the family, yet cannot be used before the tenancy ends. If it cannot be returned for the time being, the family may possess the resource and still lack the conditions to move; if the landlord withholds it, a new dispute also forms.

If a contract cannot be put into effect in time, a right on paper has not yet become protection available now. If a credit limit cannot be turned into a cash loan, it can hardly buffer risk. If no relative is willing to provide short-term funds, kinship cannot provide the fallback currently needed. Even if relatives were willing to lend in the past, showing that the family once had a relational channel, that channel may turn into pressure when repayment is demanded.

Insufficient liquidity presses a person into a position of few choices even when, on the surface, the person has income, a contract, and assets, so long as those resources cannot promptly become cash. Rent, debt, medical expenses, and living expenses still bear down on the person. Market circumstances depend not only on the total amount of resources but also on whether resources can move in time. Many families are not without resources; wages, deposits, contracts, kinship relations, and future income cannot, for the time being, be turned into exits usable now. Many market collapses begin with a break in cash flow, not with insufficient total income.

The role of debt and credit especially requires attention to temporal sequence. When a loan is formed, the contract and repayment deadline first constitute conditions for the future. After delinquency, collection, evaluation, guarantees, and responsibilities borne by the family may make them heavier. Once a record is preserved by personnel or procedures as a difference that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has formed. Only later, when it is retrieved and assigned weight in credit extension, renting, or job seeking, does the content of write-back take effect again. Data that has not yet been retrieved may truly exist, but it must not be written as already restricting opportunities at every moment.

V. Authority to Extract Differences and Evaluation Authority in the Market

Differences in the market do not automatically become prices, credit, wages, leases, orders, and contract terms. Certain nodes must first extract, evaluate, price, and rank them. An employer evaluates what wage a worker is worth; a landlord evaluates whether a tenant is reliable; a bank evaluates a borrower's credit; a platform evaluates whether a worker deserves recommendation; and a customer evaluates whether a service is worth continuing to buy. Whether a worker enters a position is handled by recruiters; whether an account receives recommendations is handled by the platform; who bears contract risk is handled by those processing the contract. None of this is governed by one abstract subject. The amount of a deposit, the length of the pay cycle, and the level of a penalty for breach are likewise set by their respective nodes.

These are not ordinary opinions but evaluation authority within the market network. In addition to the nodes above, labor contractors, intermediaries, insurers, customer-rating systems, people making introductions through personal networks, guarantors, and credit systems may possess this evaluation authority. Power in the market is expressed not only in who has money but also in who can set prices, extend credit, set contract terms, delay payment, demand deposits, evaluate reliability, and pass risk to others. Whoever can extract certain differences and turn them into prices, credit, contracts, and risk judgments can influence a person's position in the market.

In concrete market events, ownership, control, and benefit may come apart. The nominal owner may not be responsible for daily arrangements; a manager may control use rights and data permissions; platform or intermediary personnel may set prices, rankings, and entry points for appeals; and benefits may flow to different positions. Responsibility should therefore be judged through concrete control, knowledge, capacity for correction, and causal linkage. It cannot be settled once and for all by a name for ownership.

Yet this market evaluation that affects another person's position is not a complete judgment of that person. It is a transactional judgment formed by a market node under particular conditions. A person's market price cannot be equated with the person's real ability, real contribution, or real value. Low wages do not mean low ability; poor credit does not necessarily mean poor morals; failure to rent a home does not necessarily mean unreliability; and taking low-paid work is not necessarily voluntary. It may result from an approaching debt deadline, insufficient family fallback support, and a capacity to wait that is too weak.

The mother's casual work at a restaurant does not show that she can do only low-value work. She may need to pick up the child in the afternoon and therefore be unable to accept a long shift. She may also lack social-insurance records and introductions through local acquaintances, or the family's cash flow may be so tight that she cannot wait for a more stable job that pays more slowly. The father's continuing to take low-paid work does not necessarily show that he regards the price as acceptable. Approaching debt, rent coming due, the child's school application, and the elder's medical care all reduce his capacity to wait. Market evaluation affects people's opportunities, but cannot replace a complete understanding of them.

VI. Contract Nodes and Platform Nodes

Beyond prices, wages, rent, and debt, contracts and platform rules fix, rank, implement, and write back market differentiating units. They are themselves important market nodes. Once a contract fixes and states the payment deadline, penalty for breach and compensation for delay, the deposit and its return, the allocation of responsibility, the bearing of risk and who bears unexpected risks, and the conditions for exit or termination, market consequences have already been allocated in advance.

In a platform market, whether a person obtains opportunities depends on more than labor capacity. A platform allocates opportunities through ratings, response speed, historical completion rates, complaint records, the risk of account suspension, ranking, and account weight. When an account receives a bad review or complaint, has its account weight reduced, or is suspended, market opportunities are reordered. For the family of workers from elsewhere, whether the father signed a contract and whether the contract states a payment cycle, whether the mother receives orders through a platform, and how the account is rated will all affect whether they can obtain stable income and future opportunities.

Coordination in the market can also cross multiple nodes. Payment, logistics, credit extension, insurance, evaluation, and appeals are processed by different personnel and procedures; a correction in one place may not synchronize with other positions. Understanding market order requires tracing how data is passed on, who has authority to revoke or change it, and whether old content is still adopted in subsequent transactions.

VII. Risk Shifting

Risk is also transferred in transactions; it is not distributed evenly. Many transactions appear to be agreed to by both sides but in practice transfer uncertainty to people with a weaker capacity to wait, narrower exits, and thinner credit. A labor contractor who leaves wages unpaid transfers cash-flow risk to workers; a landlord who raises the deposit transfers rental risk to the tenant; a platform that uses ratings and account suspension transfers the risk of fluctuating orders to workers; a bad contract presses the risk of breach onto the weaker party; and work without social insurance transfers the risks of illness, workplace injury, and unemployment to the family.

Risk shifting is an important mechanism in the market differentiation network. It allows certain nodes to retain choices while pushing uncertain consequences toward people who find it harder to exit. Risk shifting is often hidden in contracts, deposits, pay cycles, platform rules, probationary periods, the absence of insurance, and clauses concerning breach.

The construction site or labor contractor leaves the father’s wages unpaid, and he and his family bear the pressure on cash flow. He cannot easily send that pressure back along the original direction; he can only continue to bear or shift it among rent, debts to relatives, the mother’s working hours, and household expenses. A landlord demanding a higher deposit pushes rental risk onto the tenant. For someone with savings, a deposit is only temporarily tied up; for a family with tight cash flow, it may directly determine whether the family can move. A transaction may have the form of a contract, but one must still determine who bears the risk, who can exit, and who can only remain.

Benefits and causation in the market must also be separated. If a platform, landlord, lender, or enterprise benefits over the long term, that may prompt an inquiry into whether it controls rules, sets deadlines, or refuses correction. Benefit itself cannot prove motive, authority, or the whole causal chain. Responsibility must be located in the concrete positions that formulate contracts, set prices, evaluate data, collect debts, process appeals, and make corrections.

VIII. Capacity to Wait and Width of Available Exits

The capacity to wait is not a psychological quality. It is a market position jointly generated by cash flow, debt deadlines, family fallback support, bodily capacity to endure, and institutional channels, and it forms an important differentiating unit in the market. People who can wait for wages to arrive and people who cannot are in different market positions. People who can wait for a better job and people who must take work today have different bargaining power. When wages are unpaid, people who can wait for a court to enforce a judgment and people who must pay rent at the end of the month face different choices.

The width of available exits changes bargaining power and also changes whether a person can refuse bad terms. Being able to stay temporarily with relatives, having another job to choose, having savings to rely on, having a place of origin to return to, and having credit that enables borrowing are resources that alter the width of available exits. Market relations also include conditions of exit. Being able to terminate a transaction under a contract does not mean that the person actually has the ability to withdraw. Substitute work, moving costs, debt deadlines, care responsibilities, and local support alter whether exit is feasible in practice.

Take the father's accepting construction work as an example. Whether he accepts low-paid work cannot be judged only by the wage. The time required to recover unpaid wages, whether other construction sites are accessible, current rent, and expenses for the child's school admission and the elder's medical care jointly limit the space in which he can refuse low-paid work. Market choice is not an isolated act; it is the result of several nodes approaching at once. The narrower the exits, the more the market resembles coercion; the wider the exits, the closer the transaction comes to a choice.

Many market transactions look voluntary, but we must ask whether there is a capacity to wait and a channel of exit. Without the capacity to wait or a channel of exit, market consent is squeezed very thin. When there is no capacity to wait, no exit, no cash, no housing, and no credit, consent is squeezed just as thin. Treating formal choice directly as free exchange obscures the width of available exits; treating every transaction as coercion also overlooks negotiation, alternatives, and what is actually taken up and carried forward.

A lack of resources changes bargaining, but it cannot establish that one side has no capacity to act at all. A person may obtain support through family, local, legal, or organizational relations, and those relations may also add new responsibilities. Market analysis must explain how exits are formed and limited, rather than fixing people in a passive position.

IX. Market Relational Chains

A market problem is not a set of prices simply placed side by side. Prices do not remain inside themselves. The characteristic of a market relational chain is that, through deadlines, debt, credit, and risk, it transmits consequences outward along family, local, school, state, and labor nodes. When unpaid wages enter the rental process, the father's wages failing to arrive affect rent; rent pressure affects renewal; unstable renewal in turn affects a residence permit, community registration, and the child's school-admission materials. As the child's school admission is affected, the mother's work arrangements and the family's choices about moving also change.

Rent can also enter the educational chain. A rise in rent may force a family to leave its former home, interrupt local familiarity, community registration, rental filing, and school-application materials, and thereby change the child's educational path. Debt enters the labor chain as well. When a creditor, a repayment deadline, and the family's cash flow approach together, the father may be unable to wait for labor arbitration and be left

with no choice but to continue taking low-paid work. The mother may likewise be unable to quit the restaurant and be left with no choice but to accept longer shifts with less protection.

If a delinquency is extracted from records by relevant personnel or procedures in a later lending event, these market consequences may extend through the record into later conditions of life. It may affect a loan, and restrictions on the loan may in turn affect renting, medical care, short-term funding needs, and a small business. When relevant personnel or procedures retrieve a credit record, a past market event may enter future opportunities.

X. How Non-Market Nodes Enter the Market

The market is not a closed system. Families, localities, the state, schools, the body, and relations among acquaintances all enter the market in particular events. Family fallback support changes the capacity to wait; local recognition changes the costs of renting and finding work; state documents change eligibility for employment, loans, renting, and passage; educational qualifications and certificates change entry to positions; bodily condition changes the capacity to bear risk; and introductions by people from the same place or by acquaintances change work opportunities.

The entry points for many transaction conditions lie outside the market. Family fallback support, local recognition, state eligibility, bodily capacity to endure, and channels through acquaintances are extracted by the personnel, organizations, and procedures that process transactions and turned into market differences. This does not mean that family, locality, state, school, body, or relations among acquaintances are created by the market or swallowed by it.

Whether the father can enter a particular construction site may depend on an introduction by someone from his place of origin. Whether the mother can find a more stable restaurant job may depend on the times for dropping off and picking up the child, bodily fatigue, and local acquaintances. Whether the family can rent a somewhat cheaper home may depend on whether the landlord trusts it, whether the community knows it, and whether its documents are complete. The nodes processing these materials extract differences from outside the market and rewrite them as wages, rent, credit, deposits, contracts, and risk judgments.

XI. Market Historical Indices and Write-Back

The market also has historical indices. Wage records, bank transaction records, credit records, loan records, lease records, disputes over deposits, platform ratings, breaches of contract, insurance records, consumption records, and transaction evaluations may settle into a market past that can be extracted later. These records can remain silent in daily life until a later event occurs—renting, borrowing, seeking work, buying insurance, opening a shop, taking orders, applying for a platform account, or seeking a guarantee—and relevant personnel or procedures may then extract them anew from documents, accounts, contracts, or records.

Current transactions, evaluations, contract performance, and record processing do not produce only immediate consequences; they also leave market materials that can be retrieved again later. Once a current evaluation, contract performance, breach, complaint, or payment result is preserved, its retrieval by later participants or procedures in a new event may change how the person is priced, granted credit, rented to, employed, insured, recommended, or guaranteed in the future. The effect of this write-back is not confined to the individual; it also extends to the family, locality, state, and school. One instance of unpaid wages changes a family’s cash flow; one broken lease changes a child’s school path; one credit delinquency changes future

borrowing capacity; one poor platform rating changes order opportunities; and one risk of workplace injury changes a family's care arrangements.

Credit is both a compression of past handling and an entry point through which later personnel extract differences. A credit record may preserve part of a person's payments, contract performance, or evaluations, yet may not show illness, unemployment, care, or the course of a dispute. If a later credit provider relies only on this compressed result, the relevant facts of life are lowered in weight. The existence of contrary materials and correction procedures is therefore a necessary condition for credit write-back to remain calibratable.

XII. How the Market Is Compressed into Fixed Images

It is particularly easy to compress the market into several fixed images. Interpreters of an all-purpose market image believe that prices can explain everything, as though looking at market outcomes revealed real ability, real needs, and real value, thereby obscuring family fallback support, state eligibility, local recognition, debt deadlines, the capacity to bear risk, and the capacity to wait. People using this image can extract some real consequences from concrete materials such as prices, wages, rent, debt, and credit. But once these people elevate the materials into a total image of all social reality, they swallow family, locality, the state, nation, school, and history. Market analysis cannot treat price as a substitute for every form of value. Care, community responsibility, dignity, and legal rights may intersect with price relations, but they are not automatically generated or canceled by price. Analysts must trace how prices change action options while preserving real relations that cannot be absorbed by a total image of transactions.

Interpreters of an anti-market image believe that the market is only a false appearance or a shell of exploitation, and thus overlook the real effects of prices, wages, rent, debt, credit, and risk on practical choices. An anti-market explanation can indeed identify domination, risk shifting, and unequal contracts, but it cannot deny the concrete force of these market differences merely because it takes a critical position.

A moral-evaluation image writes market consequences as personal diligence, laziness, frugality, extravagance, or good and bad credit, obscuring cash flow, contract terms, information gaps, risk shifting, and the width of available exits. Moral evaluation can identify concrete conduct and responsibility for performing contracts, but it cannot reduce market consequences directly to personal virtue.

Interpreters who adopt class theory subsume the market under a total class image. They can extract some high-weight differentiating units from differences in resources and labor circumstances, but the partial explanatory power formed by this extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression neither means that class entities exist within any scope nor changes the judgment that class theory belongs to Model C: total-image subsumption. This explanation cannot show why people with the same low income occupy entirely different market positions because their wage-payment dates, debt deadlines, rent due dates, deposits, credit records, family fallback support, capacities to wait, and widths of available exits differ. The market cannot be subsumed under a total class image; still less can interpreters who adopt class theory swallow the market's own mechanisms of prices, pricing, debt, credit extension, deadlines, cash flow, credit, risk, risk shifting, capacity to wait, and write-back.

XIII. Calibrating Explanations of the Market

The market is indeed complex, but its complexity does not mean that all explanations are more or less the same. Nor can we say that the market has wages, rent, debt, credit, and risk all at once and therefore cannot be judged; that would cancel analysis. The key to calibrating the market is not to decide whether it is ultimately free exchange, an exploitative structure, moral reward and punishment, or a class tool. Understanding the market cannot stop at one price. Whether the current event concerns unpaid wages, renting, borrowing, job seeking, consumption, insurance, taking platform orders, breach of contract, or credit evaluation, analysis must return to the concrete event and ask which differentiating units it extracts, who extracts them, which nodes are pricing, extending credit, guaranteeing, collecting, or evaluating, and how the market relational chain transmits consequences.

In concrete events, different factors do not carry equal weight. In an unpaid-wage event, the time at which wages arrive, the employment relationship, debt deadlines, rent pressure, and the capacity to wait may carry more weight. In a rental event, rent, the deposit, filing, the landlord's attitude, transportation costs, school-admission materials, and moving costs may carry more weight.

In a borrowing event, credit records, guarantee relations, repayment deadlines, interest, consequences of delinquency, and family fallback support may carry more weight. In a job-seeking event, wages, social insurance, the risk of workplace injury, the regularity of payment, substitute positions, and bodily capacity to endure may carry more weight. Calibration of an explanation further compares which explanations extract key market differences, which obscure non-market nodes, which compress the market into a single image, and which refuse to acknowledge counterexamples.

Further calibration requires concrete analysis: which differences in life are currently being priced, which nodes are making evaluations; which deadlines are approaching, which cash flows have broken, which debts have compressed choices; and which risks are being shifted onto others, and which capacities to wait and widths of available exits are changing bargaining.

Calibration must examine how the results of handling prices, debt, credit, transactions, or evaluations are preserved by concrete personnel, institutions, or procedures as differences that can be extracted again in the future—preservation forms write-back—and how records already preserved are later retrieved, interpreted, or assigned weight in subsequent events of credit extension, transactions, renting, employment, or evaluation, thereby taking effect again and influencing future opportunities.

The conditions under which a limited market analysis fails can be stated. If the materials do not support a connection between price or debt and the consequences, or if counterexamples show that another node changes the result more directly, the analysis should reduce its operative weight, rewrite its path, or narrow its scope, and revise the original explanation on the basis of the counterexamples. Re-translating all consequences concerning family, nation, the state, or education into market outcomes is total-image subsumption. The presence of real market materials cannot give that move legitimacy.

Prices, credit, contract formats, ownership arrangements, and debt responsibilities can be repeatedly taken up and carried forward across regions, institutions, and even generations, thereby forming long-term and real market consequences. Such stability requires no class entity and cannot establish that the market is the underlying reality of all social relations. Relations of nation, family, institutions, and community may still limit transactions, provide protection, or change the bearing of risk, and they must be explained through their own real paths. Only by acknowledging both these long-term effects and independent relations can market explanation avoid expanding from a limited analysis into a subsuming total image of the market.

In the chain of long-term relations, calibrating market relations also requires preserving a record of failed corrections. An appeal channel may exist with no one processing it; a record may have been corrected without synchronization; and a contract may have been terminated while an old evaluation is still retrieved. These breaks separate formal change from actual consequences. Faced with such a disconnection, analysts should trace the authority to correct, the path of synchronization, and subsequent adopters separately.

Chapter 32. Schools and Education: Differentiation Networks of Student Registration, Evaluation, Qualifications, and Future Opportunities

I. Schools Cannot Be Written as Mere Channels of Upward Mobility

Schools are easily written as two kinds of image. One treats them as channels of upward mobility, as though children could change their fate simply by studying hard. The other treats them as ideological machines, claiming that they do nothing but train students in obedience, produce selection, and reproduce the existing order. Each account grasps part of what is real. Procedures for admission, examinations, places, student registration, evaluation, and qualifications in schools can indeed open new channels of opportunity, yet they do also produce consequences of selection, exclusion, compression, and stratification. The problem is that both judge too soon, compressing these intersecting processes into a single image.

Admission, examinations, certificates, teachers' recommendations, and a school's reputation can indeed open new opportunities for children. At the same time, student registration, household registration, places, scores, rankings, evaluations, language habits, family fallback support, and school resources do also send different children down different paths. These consequences do not come from an abstract entity with a unified will. They are jointly carried by teachers, homeroom teachers, admissions or review personnel, school administrators, and concrete examination, student-registration, archive, and qualification procedures. Understanding how they operate requires that these diverse ways of handling matters not be reduced to direct expressions of a single overarching will.

This chapter offers no general account of education. It traces how differentiating units are extracted, assigned weight, connected, transmitted, and written back in concrete school events. Student-registration systems, application materials, and classroom order are common entry points. Teachers' evaluations, peer relations, examinations, disciplinary records, recommendation opportunities, school places, internship opportunities, and graduation qualifications also figure among them, as do school space and school time. These entry points intersect to form relational chains, but they do not constitute an exhaustive list, nor can differentiation networks within schools be elevated into the underlying reality of education or an all-purpose explanation. Even when "the school" is used as organizational shorthand, the actual actors must still be identified. We must distinguish which personnel accept applications, who interprets materials, who forms classroom observations, through what processes of question setting and scoring results are produced, and at precisely which steps particular qualifications are confirmed or interrupted. Writing every action as "the school decides" merges different authorities, materials, and responsibilities, and readily mistakes a particular instance of handling for the unified will of education as a whole.

Within a single school, opening opportunities and forming constraints can occur at the same time. A teacher's supplementary explanation may give a student a new entry point for understanding, while student registration and certificates may preserve the learning the student has completed. By contrast, another material requirement, a missed deadline, or an evaluation that has hardened into a fixed form may narrow later choices. Analysts need not decide in advance whether schools bring upward mobility or suppression. They need to identify which differences are amplified and which concealed in different events, and who still has opportunities at concrete steps to present new materials and change judgments.

II. School Admission for the Child of a Worker's Family from Elsewhere

Consider again the worker's family from elsewhere in the preceding chapter. The father works on a construction site, and his wages are in arrears; the mother does casual work in a restaurant and is paid by the day. Rent is due at the end of the month, and the landlord may raise it or be unwilling to help produce certain rental materials. Meanwhile, medical treatment for an elder has taken up the family's cash flow, and relatives are still pressing for repayment of loans. When the child reaches school-entry age, depending on local policies and the admission category, some materials concerning residence, renting, the parents' social insurance or work, applications, and student registration may enter review, while school places are handled separately under specific arrangements. Formal admissions materials belong to a different level from family cash flow and the landlord's cooperation, yet they meet within the same event in life.

Preparing materials itself takes time and coordination among those involved. Parents must know what is required, where to obtain it, who issues it, and when to submit it. Whether landlords, community personnel, employers, or other bearers of materials are willing to cooperate may also affect whether the information can be produced in time. A family does not enter the school only on application day. Events involving renting, work, and communication before application already determine which differences can be turned into documents. If analysis begins only with the stack of materials received by review personnel, obstacles preceding their production disappear.

Once the various differences of life enter the admission event, they continue to be transmitted through such nodes as housing, the community, receipt of materials, admissions review, student registration, and class placement. Within school procedures, steps such as receiving materials, reviewing admissions, managing student registration, and teachers' evaluation recast differences from life outside into materials that can be registered, reviewed, and processed: whether the address is stable, application materials are complete, student registration has been established, entry into class is timely, results are stable, what teachers' evaluations are, whether family communication runs smoothly, and whether examination eligibility is continuous. This recasting has a real organizational role, but it does not mean that the relevant personnel and procedures have seen the child's entire life. A child's school admission is therefore no simple matter of education, but the result of differences in the family, locality, state, market, and school connecting with one another in a concrete eligibility event.

After admission, differences formed early on may continue to be transmitted further. Whether the child has a stable address, can submit materials on time, has those materials accepted and reviewed, can establish student registration, and can enter class on time connects in turn to explanations of transfers and missed classes, adaptation to classroom language, homework support, and future examination eligibility. Gaps in coursework caused by late entry into class may appear in the first assignments and tests. Teachers' preliminary judgments based on performance at that time may affect seating, opportunities for classroom questioning, supplementary guidance, or communication with parents. Upon receiving evaluations, parents in turn rearrange their time and expectations accordingly. This chain does not inevitably deteriorate: new teaching interventions, help from peers, and subsequent performance can all change its direction. The point of analysis is to explain how the first eligibility event connects to later classroom events, rather than treating "successful admission" as the end of every problem.

III. Preservation of Eligibility through Student Registration and Breaks in Materials

A child’s physical presence in class does not mean that student registration is already secure, or that all subsequent eligibility follows automatically. The child may already be attending teachers’ lessons, getting to know classmates, and submitting homework. Yet if student registration cannot be smoothly established because of rental materials, proof of residence, parents’ work records, community registration, school places, application timing, or transfer materials, breaks may still occur in later examinations, transfers, and progression to further schooling. Student registration affects current eligibility only when personnel or procedures authorized to handle it extract it anew in a concrete event.

The Ministry of Education's Measures for the Administration of Student Registration in Primary and Secondary Schools specify student-registration information, the management system, and the establishment and updating of student registration.

Student registration is a mechanism for preserving eligibility within school relational chains. After parents or other guardians submit the general materials listed in the aforementioned measures on student registration, personnel responsible for receiving materials, admissions, or review process them, and student-registration personnel or the corresponding systems preserve the registration that has been established. When subsequent events of examinations, transfer, or progression to further schooling arise, the relevant personnel and procedures retrieve student registration again, making it one item of material for confirming eligibility. Student registration is neither a simple name nor an ordinary form; nor is it the student’s complete identity. Its continuity cannot be judged merely in terms of “having it” or “not having it.” The time of establishment, transfers in and out, continuity between grades, course records, and whether names or information match may all become different problems in later events. A registration’s having once been established does not mean it will necessarily be understood in the same way at a new school, examination, or eligibility review. What the relevant personnel need to check is the materials required by the current event and whether the old record can establish this particular form of eligibility.

Teachers, review personnel, and administrators in schools often have to handle student affairs through student registration, materials, results, written evaluations, attendance, and archives. They confront not the whole of children’s lives but some differences preserved and formatted through these forms. Misalignment may therefore arise between a child’s real circumstances and the child in school records. At the stages of eligibility review and entry, actually living nearby does not mean that application materials are valid; a family’s real poverty does not mean its financial-aid materials will necessarily pass review. If moving house causes the family to miss the application window, this may appear in the review procedure as “incomplete materials.”

Such misalignment can also occur in everyday teaching, continuity of coursework, and understanding behavior. When facts of life cannot enter the corresponding forms, they are easily omitted, compressed, or misread. A child’s having actually studied does not mean continuity of student registration can be smoothly maintained; an actual transfer does not mean that coursework can be picked up where it left off; real difficulties do not mean teachers can correctly understand them from existing records. Discontinuity in coursework after a transfer may appear in classroom and results records as “weak foundations.” Having no quiet space at home may be understood by teachers from homework results as “poor study habits.” Parents’ irregular working hours and slower replies in the parent chat group may also be understood as “low family cooperation.” These misalignments need not be attributed to someone deliberately ignoring the child. School organizations rely on materials, results, attendance, written evaluations, and archives to handle large numbers of affairs. The focus of analysis is not an abstract accusation against schools, but identifying through what materials facts of life pass, who receives and interprets them, and at which step a break occurs.

Materials may also conflict with one another. Attendance records show missed classes, while medical or transport materials kept by parents may explain why. Results suddenly decline, while transfer records, differences in coursework, and teachers' observations may reveal another line of explanation. Slower replies in the parent chat group do not necessarily mean a family is unconcerned; they may also be connected to working hours and the use of devices. If personnel handling the matter use only the records that are easiest to quantify or that appeared first, other facts of life struggle to enter judgment.

Supplementary materials do not guarantee that the original judgment will be overturned, but they should be able to form an objection open to examination. The relevant personnel need to explain whether new materials bear on the current event, which record they can correct, and which parts still cannot be confirmed. This neither treats every family account directly as sufficient proof nor grants existing archives an unquestionable status merely because they were preserved first. Repairing breaks in materials depends on concrete receipt, checking, and response, not abstract goodwill. Omissions, errors, or outdated content in student-registration records further involve explicit entry points for correction: can parents and students learn where the problem lies, can they submit supplementary proof, which staff member has authority to amend the record, and will amendments be synchronized with the records used later? All these affect whether eligibility can be restored. Calling student registration an automatically operating system conceals how materials are accepted, refused, and corrected, and makes procedural responsibility untraceable.

IV. Examination Scores, Everyday Evaluation, and Students' Responses

An examination is not ability itself. Procedures for setting questions, answering them, scoring, and using results compress part of a child's abilities, training, language habits, family support, time arrangements, physical condition, and answering techniques into scores, rankings, and qualifications. Scores have real effects: they may influence class placement, progression to further schooling, recommendations, scholarships, and school choice. But they cannot fully represent a child's understanding, capacity to bear strain, curiosity, expressive ability, care pressures, family burdens, and future possibilities.

Scores take shape through several steps. Question setters choose what to measure; teachers decide the focus of routine training and review; students answer within a limited time and in a particular physical condition; scoring personnel or procedures then turn answers into results according to rules. No step has to be described as arbitrary, but each establishes which abilities are more readily seen. If only the final score is retained, the scope of the questions, conditions of answering, and method of scoring drop out of the explanation. Low results may be connected to speed of understanding, but may also involve difficulty adapting to the language, insufficient training resources, continuity of coursework after a transfer, a sick person in the household, insufficient sleep, or physical condition on the examination day. The examination compresses these differences into a score, which teachers, class-placement personnel, and admissions or qualification-review personnel may retrieve in later events. Understanding examinations requires both acknowledging that scores enter real consequences and preserving the possibility that new materials, subsequent performance, and counterexamples may change existing judgments. A single result cannot be treated as the whole child.

Scores from different examinations cannot be directly compared apart from their uses. A classroom test can help a teacher identify current gaps in understanding, whereas an examination for further schooling or qualifications may directly allocate limited opportunities. The same score has different consequences in different classes, at different times, and for different purposes. Analysts need to distinguish scores as learning materials from scores as qualification materials, avoiding writing every test as the same kind of selection, without denying an examination's comparative role within a particular scope merely because it is limited.

Examinations are a starting point; evaluation in schools has no single source. Teachers' evaluations, homeroom teachers' evaluations, examination results, and discipline and reward-and-punishment records may form formal or semiformal materials under school rules. Experience as a student class officer, peer reputation, family evaluations, parent communication, and recommendations may operate through different interpersonal and organizational relations. They differ in origin, mode of preservation, and consequences, and cannot be merged into an undifferentiated "school evaluation," still less become a judgment on the child's entire worth.

Low results do not mean low ability, just as silence does not mean having no thoughts, and inconsistent homework likewise does not necessarily stem from a lack of effort. Evaluation often forms through everyday accumulation. Speaking up once may be understood as engagement, or seen in another interaction as an interruption. Silence may stem from thought, unfamiliarity, anxiety, language difficulties, or a judgment of the present atmosphere. Teachers must handle class affairs within limited time. Preliminary evaluations have a working role, yet may take insufficient sleep for laziness and anxiety for inattention. Adjustment after a transfer, upheaval in the family, and difficulty adapting to the language may also be read, respectively, as weak foundations, regression in learning, or poor expressive ability. Physical weakness may even be moralized as a lack of effort in physical-education evaluation. Teachers' judgments may help a child be seen, but may also misread family, bodily, emotional, or language problems as problems of attitude and character.

Once teachers or homeroom teachers turn classroom behavior, homework, results, and parent communication into written evaluations, rewards and punishments, recommendations, or other records, these materials may affect class positions, family judgments, and subsequent opportunities. Peer evaluations operate through everyday interactions and reputation, while family evaluations affect resource investment, expectations, and arrangements of responsibility. Different evaluations may support or conflict with one another. When temporary observations enter formal written evaluations, recommendations, or disciplinary records, their scope of effect changes. Yet none automatically amounts to the student's essence, and preliminary evaluations must still be distinguished from subsequent materials.

Students also respond to evaluations. Some participate more after receiving recognition; some speak less after being repeatedly misread; others seek another teacher, peer, or family member to explain their circumstances. These responses may change the materials teachers see next time, forming a new cycle. Analysts cannot write evaluation directly as the cause of character, nor ignore that evaluation has already changed opportunities for participation. They need to trace how evaluation, response, and subsequent records connect with one another.

V. Authority to Extract Differences, Evaluation Authority, and Recording Authority in Schools

Differences within schools do not automatically become educational consequences. Application or admissions personnel receive materials, review personnel judge whether they are valid, and student-registration personnel preserve registration. Teachers and homeroom teachers evaluate classroom, homework, and everyday performance; examination and scoring procedures produce results; school administrators handle rewards, punishments, and records. The power held at each node is different: authority to extract differences, evaluation authority, recording authority, and authority to process qualifications, each within a different scope.

Specific personnel must judge from existing materials and procedures whether an instance of lateness is an isolated event or an attitude problem, whether silence stems from not yet having adapted or from a lack of ability, and whether missing materials can be supplemented and corrected or will interrupt eligibility. Education-department personnel, admissions or review personnel, homeroom teachers, subject teachers, and

relevant people in parent committees and training organizations may extract differences from different positions. Student-registration and examination systems preserve or process records, community attestations carry materials that can be submitted, and peer relations operate through interaction and reputation. The authority, materials, and consequences at different nodes must not be written as though they were the same.

Authority to extract differences also includes choosing the scale of observation. Teachers can focus on a single assignment or compare changes over a period. Review personnel can look only at whether materials meet current requirements, or, within the permitted scope, inform people of entry points for supplementation and correction. In handling a conflict, administrators can retrieve one side's records or check materials preserved by different participants. A difference in scale does not make every conclusion valid. Such differences in scale remind interpreters to explain the span of time, number of events, and sources on which their judgment rests.

Personnel or procedures able to turn a difference into results, written evaluations, disciplinary action, places, recommendations, or qualifications may thereby change a child's position in school relational chains. A child's circumstances must pass through review of materials, confirmation of student registration, classroom judgments, examination rankings, parent-communication records, and peer responses before different educational consequences form. Organizations and procedures do have effects; no single node can possess or explain a child in full. At the same time, different authorities may constrain one another. A subject teacher can describe classroom performance but may not have authority to amend student registration. Student-registration personnel can handle registration but may not understand the child's everyday learning. Peers can describe their experience of interaction but cannot directly determine formal qualifications. Bringing each limited judgment into its appropriate scope can supplement materials. Elevating one node's evaluation into a global conclusion turns limited authority into an overall naming of the student.

VI. How Family Fallback Support Enters Schools

Family fallback support is not a background outside school. Who can be present to support a child's studies, drop the child off and pick the child up, help with homework, and purchase materials; who can afford extracurricular training and transfer costs; who can provide time, emotional support, and material support when results decline—all these differences enter school through homework, lateness, communication, results, and teachers' evaluations. A father returning late, a mother working nights, the lack of a desk in a quiet place at home, a phone needed by parents to handle work messages, and an elder's medical treatment disrupting daily routines may all leave traces in the child's school performance.

With fuller family support, an instance of lateness, a missed homework submission, or fluctuating results may be more easily remedied. With insufficient family support, the same event is more readily preserved as a fixed evaluation. This difference has real weight, yet family fallback support cannot be written as the sole source of educational outcomes. How teachers interpret, whether materials can be supplemented and corrected, how peer relations develop, whether school resources are available, and how the child subsequently responds may all change the original outcome.

Family fallback support also takes different forms. Money can buy materials and transport time; care can sustain daily routines; family members familiar with procedures can help organize materials; a stable residence makes continuity in student registration and peer relations easier. These forms of support do not necessarily coexist and cannot all be converted into income. Families with similar incomes may develop different capacities to remedy problems because of differences in working hours, available caregivers, residential stability, and familiarity with school procedures.

Family investment likewise cannot be directly equated with how much a family cares. Parents may be unable to come to school because of work, transport, care, or physical constraints; slower replies to messages may also result from shared devices or working hours. If teachers can obtain supplementary explanations, original judgments may be adjusted. If families do not know what evaluations are forming at school, they also struggle to provide relevant materials. The role of family-school communication therefore depends on who sends messages, whether they arrive, when both sides respond, and whether responses actually enter subsequent handling.

VII. School Space and School Time

School space is no mere background to education: space changes who is easily seen. Seating changes how teachers observe, with positions near the teacher increasing everyday observation. Drop-off and pickup at the school gate may make family fallback support visible; these and various parent activities make some families more likely to enter teachers' view. Responses in parent chat groups may also affect teachers' judgments of family communication. Students who frequently come and go from offices may likewise leave more formal or informal impressions. Increased visibility may bring help but may also increase the density of evaluation. Being less easily seen may avoid certain kinds of attention while losing entry points for explaining difficulties and obtaining support. These consequences arise from concrete interactions and cannot be attributed to space acting on its own.

Different aspects of the same student may be seen at different spatial nodes in a school. The classroom foregrounds answering questions and discipline; the playground presents the body, cooperation, and peer positions; the dormitory exposes daily routines and interactions; and office conversations often organize scattered events into explanations that can be recorded and may become formal evaluations. The teacher's dais, playground, cafeteria, dormitory, tutoring class, bulletin board, and results board may likewise become nodes where differences are seen, compared, preserved, and interpreted. Cafeteria spending, dormitory interaction, tutoring-class lists, and results boards may also bring resources, peer evaluations, and examination results into visible positions.

Materials formed in different spaces may supplement or contradict one another. Someone's silence in class does not mean a lack of ability in collaboration with peers. A dormitory conflict cannot directly be elevated into a fixed character trait across all learning activities. Space itself makes no judgments; consequences arise from how teachers, students, parents, and administrators observe, compare, record, and respond within it. In this context, the parent chat group is treated in this chapter only as a limited node of school communication. This chapter does not extend it into a general theory of platform ranking, recommendation, or visibility.

Besides differences arising from spatial distribution, educational consequences may also change with how time nodes are demarcated. Application windows, material deadlines, and school-entry age form one set of conditions. Transfers, examinations, supplemental admission, terms, and progression to further schooling each have their time points, as do the preservation of disciplinary records and graduation. These temporal conditions must not be expanded into a uniform policy or fixed deadlines. Concrete school procedures turn growth, migration, illness, family upheaval, and delays in materials into temporal differences within qualification events.

Materials becoming complete a day earlier or later, a transfer occurring at the beginning of a term or before graduation, and fluctuating results appearing in an ordinary examination or at a point of progression to further schooling may receive different evaluations. Behind a worker's family from elsewhere missing the application period may lie a landlord's failure to file a record, parents' inability to obtain leave, insufficient

time to supplement materials, or a delayed move caused by wage arrears. Once they enter application and review procedures, these differences of life are handled as missed timing, late materials, or unstable eligibility. Time produces the corresponding consequences only when it is received, reviewed, and assigned weight in concrete procedures.

School time is also cumulative. Short absences can be made up for; if they fall precisely at the start of new coursework, before class placement, or before eligibility is confirmed, the later cost of catching up may increase. A late submission could have been supplemented and corrected; if several procedures close one after another, the family faces a new transfer or a wait. Consequences come not only from "how late" but also from which node was missed and whether later arrangements still leave entry points for repair.

The time of a child's growth may also be misaligned with organizational time. Students need a longer period of adaptation, but term schedules and evaluation arrangements do not necessarily wait. A family has just finished moving, while applications, coursework, and examinations may already have occurred in succession. This misalignment does not directly prove that the procedures are wrong, nor can it be attributed to insufficient ability in the child. Analysts must separate individual change, family events, and school schedules before judging which temporal difference actually entered qualification or evaluation consequences.

VIII. School Relational Chains

In some regions and particular admission years, changes in housing may affect a family's obtaining or submitting formal materials on residence, renting, social insurance, or work. Admissions personnel process only those items required under local rules. The effects of parents' working hours, family routines, and study space on homework, results, and teachers' evaluations belong to the composite scenario in this book, not to admissions-policy requirements. These contents serve only to explain how external differences enter schools; this chapter does not rewrite the general mechanisms of the market, state, family, or locality. Through receipt of materials, registration, examinations, and evaluation, school relational chains both recast external differences into student registration, results, written evaluations, places, and qualifications, and bring current judgments by teachers, homeroom teachers, or administrators into records, thereby forming write-back. Only when specific personnel or procedures retrieve these records anew in subsequent handling may they again affect family resource arrangements and future opportunities. The policy examples here are used only within the jurisdictions, periods, procedures, and material requirements specified by the admission policies discussed in Chapter 20.

Materials formed at the preceding node have not reached their endpoint. Teachers' evaluations may enter recommendations, class positions, reward-and-punishment records, and opportunities for further schooling. Examination results may enter rankings, class placement, scholarships, certificates, and school choice. Consequences continue to be transmitted only after specific personnel or procedures at the next node retrieve and interpret the materials anew and assign them weight. As it unfolds, the chain may branch, weaken, or break. Actual residence does not necessarily become valid materials, and family hardship is not necessarily understood by teachers as a child's lack of effort. These breaks belong to the analysis and cannot be erased by a single image.

Relational chains may extend in several directions at once. A decline in results can enter teachers' written evaluations, parents' expectations, peer positions, and the student's own subsequent participation. Correction in one chain does not necessarily change other records at the same time. A teacher has updated their view, but the family may still allocate resources according to old results. A student's subsequent performance improves,

but old recommendation materials may not yet have been updated. Analysts need to trace each chain separately, rather than sum up the whole situation through a single improvement or failure.

There are also repair nodes in the chains. Supplementation and correction of materials, retesting, teachers' supplementary explanations, new information from parents, students' subsequent performance, and peer testimony may all reopen existing judgments. Their effectiveness depends on whether the relevant personnel actually receive them, which record they can amend, and whether they enter later qualification events. Identifying entry points for repair does not guarantee that all consequences can be reversed. It avoids writing a single break as a fate that must continue.

IX. School Historical Indices and Write-Back

Student-registration records, transfer records, transcripts, rankings, written evaluations, rewards and punishments, disciplinary actions, attendance, competition records, teachers' recommendations, graduation certificates, examination eligibility, and archives are preserved by the corresponding teachers, homeroom teachers, student-registration or archive personnel, and school procedures. They constitute an educational past that may be located and extracted anew in the future. When current judgments are preserved as differences that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. But preservation itself does not mean that these records automatically take effect or automatically govern the future.

Results, written evaluations, recommendations, and rewards and punishments first produce changes in present evaluations and opportunities, and can be preserved in archives or through teachers' communication. Only when events such as progression to further schooling, transfer, selection for honors, scholarship applications, job seeking, internships, or qualification review occur may admissions, review, recommendation, hiring, or other authorized personnel and procedures retrieve some of these records and give them different weights according to current purposes. An absence, transfer, disciplinary action, examination setback, or teacher's recommendation affects new evaluations, admission, class placement, financial aid, trust, or qualifications only through this extraction in the present. Likewise, only when the content of write-back is identified anew, extracted, interpreted, or assigned weight in subsequent handling does it re-enter family judgments, changing parents' expectations, resource investment, and arrangements of responsibility.

After receiving teachers' evaluations, peer reactions, and changes in opportunities, students form new modes of participation and expectations of themselves through their own understanding, responses, and subsequent actions. These responses unfold from the present situation and need not wait for future retrieval to occur. Teachers' evaluations cannot bypass these intervening steps and directly determine how students see themselves. Old records cannot cancel new materials, subsequent performance, and counterexamples. A transfer may explain fluctuating results; sustained improvement may change the weight of a low score; and new teacher judgments may correct old written evaluations. A single disciplinary action cannot automatically determine character and the future. Historical indices allow the past to enter the present while requiring current judgments to explain who extracts it, why it is assigned weight, and which materials will compel revision of the original evaluation.

Records may differ in version. An original written evaluation has not yet been amended, while new teacher observations have already formed. A paper archive preserves one instance of handling, while materials held by the family and student reveal another course of events. The bases for coursework and results may also differ before and after a transfer. Current users unaware of when records were formed and for what purpose easily mistake outdated materials for the latest state. Calibrating historical indices requires explaining together who formed the records, when they were formed, and in what events they are extracted anew.

Write-back also involves scope. A classroom evaluation can be used to adjust present teaching; it should not automatically expand into a judgment on graduation qualifications or character. A disciplinary record can establish that a particular instance of handling occurred; it cannot replace observation of subsequent actions. The more readily records pass across events, the more their users need to explain their relevance to the current problem. Only by preserving conditions of scope, time, and counterexamples can the educational past become revisable material rather than permanent labels.

X. How Schools Are Compressed into Fixed Images

Schools are easily compressed into several fixed images. An explanation of schools as channels of upward mobility can grasp the real opening of educational opportunities, but it cannot swallow student registration, family fallback support, local eligibility, school resources, and market pressures. An image of schools as channels of upward mobility, by contrast, holds that schools will naturally open the future as long as one studies hard, thereby concealing these five conditions, along with household registration, physical condition, and breaks in materials.

The ideological-machine image writes schools entirely as indoctrination and discipline, concealing student registration, certificates, teachers' evaluations, peer relations, examination eligibility, and real opportunities. An ideological-machine explanation can grasp some discipline and selection, but it cannot swallow these six carrying mechanisms and actual opportunities.

An ability-ranking explanation can grasp some of the role of examinations and comparison, but it cannot swallow language habits, training resources, family support, physical condition, and care burdens. An ability-ranking image, by contrast, treats scores and rankings as the complete expression of ability, thereby downweighting these five conditions as well as psychological pressure.

Interpreters using class theory can extract some real differentiating units from differences in family resources, school resources, and opportunities. This partial explanatory power comes from these differentiating units and the processes of extracting, assigning weight to, connecting, and compressing them. But this power does not prove that class entities exist either as a whole or in part, nor does it make class theory a normal Model A or Model B. The basic structure of class theory still belongs to the total-image-subsumption direction of Model C. Interpreters using class theory and its total image cannot subsume schools under a class image. Student registration, continuity of student registration, examinations, evaluation, teachers' evaluations, places, qualifications, transfer nodes, application timing, language adaptation, school space, physical condition, historical indices, write-back, breaks in materials, and future opportunities each have their own bearers and relational chains. If interpreters using class theory and its total image downgrade all these mechanisms to subsidiary materials of the class image, this is precisely the manifestation of total-image subsumption in explanations of schools.

Schools may also be compressed into an "educational investment" image, as though investing money, time, and training would yield proportional returns in results, qualifications, and future income. Investment can indeed change some conditions, but does not automatically turn into outcomes. Entry points for materials, physical condition, language habits, teachers' judgments, peer relations, continuity of student registration, and qualification time points may all change how investment enters consequences. When education is written entirely as investment, those who fail to obtain expected outcomes are once again said to have invested too little or chosen wrongly.

Another compression treats every outcome in school as a natural display of individual ability. This image neglects question setting, materials, time, and evaluation nodes, and fails to see that students' abilities may

appear in different ways in different environments. Conversely, pointing out these conditions does not cancel differences in ability. Calibration requires explaining through what materials an ability appears, within what scope it can be compared, and which new performances will correct the original judgment.

XI. Preventing Complexity-Based Conflation and Calibrating Explanations of Schools

Schools are indeed complex, yet comparisons can still be made by event. Admission requires examining how student registration, application timing, residence materials, household registration, school places, rental stability, and parents' work records operate. Examinations involve training resources, language habits, family routines, physical condition, examination rules, and psychological pressure. In a transfer, continuity of student registration, receipt of materials, grade timing, teachers' evaluations, peer relations, and family migration form another combination. In teachers' evaluations, classroom performance, family communication, language habits, attendance, conditions for homework, and physical condition are extracted in turn. Complexity does not mean that all explanations are equivalent, still less that judgment is impossible.

Calibrating explanations of schools requires comparing which explanations extract key differences, which conceal important nodes, and which compress schools into a single image. In comparing explanations, one can examine whether each identifies real actors, explains how materials are formed and used, traces qualification, evaluation, and time nodes, and leaves entry points for revision through new materials. Merely saying "schools provide opportunities" cannot explain who obtains which opportunities. Merely saying "schools select" likewise cannot explain which material excludes whom in which procedure. Explanations that can make relational chains clear usually have greater comparative power than simply attaching an overall label to schools.

Acknowledging that explanations are limited and keeping omissions, boundaries, and counterexamples in view is not itself Model C. Only when complexity is used to cancel valid comparison, revision, and calibration, placing valid, limited, erroneous, and invalid explanations on the same level, does explanation enter Model C's direction of erasure of distinctions between explanations. Limited models can differ in the differences they extract: one model is suited to analyzing how examinations form comparisons; another may better explain how family fallback support or local eligibility enters student-registration events. They need not merge into a sole image, nor can they be judged to have failed equally because each has omissions. Only by comparing their explanatory power, boundaries, differentiation bias, and capacity for revision in concrete relational fields can complexity be prevented from becoming a reason to cancel judgment.

Understanding schools first requires identifying the current event: admission, transfer, examination, class placement, teachers' evaluation, disciplinary action, rewards and punishments, progression to further schooling, graduation, internship, or qualification review. Once the event is identified, we then ascertain the differentiating units extracted, identify personnel and procedures that receive materials, certify, evaluate, rank, record, or recommend, and trace consequences along relational chains. In concrete events, how differences of life are extracted by teachers, homeroom teachers, admissions or review personnel, school administrators, and student-registration, examination, archive, and qualification procedures, and how they form student registration, evaluations, qualifications, and opportunities, must each be explained clearly. It is not enough to decide which fixed image schools belong to.

These analytical dimensions have no fixed order. An admission event may begin with residence materials and application timing; a classroom event may first present teachers' observations and students' responses; an examination event may begin with question setting, answering, and the use of results. Analysts should follow the materials that first change qualifications or opportunities, then adjust relational-field boundaries in light of

newly appearing nodes. Arranging this into steps that are always the same would turn explanations of schools into procedural checklists, losing sensitivity to concrete events.

Calibration must also preserve positions from which students and families can give explanations. Teachers, administrators, parents, students, and peers may hold different materials, and their accounts may conflict. Interpreters cannot automatically treat formal records as the complete facts, nor abandon judgment because objections exist. They need to compare when materials were formed, the procedures actors control, and the relevance of accounts to the current event, then specify which conclusions can stand and which parts still await revision through later materials.

Explaining school events requires showing which records from the past are retrieved anew in the present and how current judgments are written back as future materials. None of the following can be omitted: how family fallback support, local eligibility, state materials, and market pressures enter schools within limited scopes; how specific personnel or procedures preserve current judgments as differences that can be extracted again in the future, thereby forming write-back; and how the relevant records are retrieved anew in subsequent handling and affect later actions and future opportunities of families and students. Identifying which new materials and counterexamples will compel revision of the original explanation is likewise part of analytical calibration.

The judgment retained at the end of this chapter on schools is that student registration, examinations, evaluations, qualifications, and records can indeed change students' positions and future opportunities, but operate only through specific personnel, materials, organizations, and procedures. Materials and relations of the family, locality, state, market, body, and community enter school events within limited scopes. Write-back forms when specific personnel, materials, organizations, or procedures preserve the results of school handling as differences that can be extracted again in the future. Only when specific personnel or procedures subsequently retrieve, interpret, or assign weight anew to the relevant records may they take effect again in relations of the family, locality, state, market, body, or community. Such tracing neither calls schools natural channels of upward mobility nor confines them to the role of ideological machines. Still less can it subsume educational differences back into class entities and class theory's total image.

Chapter 33. Platform Society: Differentiation Networks of Accounts, Records, Ranking, and Visibility

I. Platforms Cannot Be Written as Mere Tools

A platform is easily written as a tool, as though people used it to find work, buy things, chat, rent housing, book medical appointments, submit homework, or publish content, and could leave once they were done. Another account treats it as a virtual space, as though a screen separated what happens there from real life. The distinction between online and offline cannot adequately explain platform society. Both understandings omit platforms' positions within social relations. Personnel responsible for rulemaking, operations, review, customer service, and technical maintenance within companies use accounts, record systems, ranking rules, and review procedures to preserve materials, arrange opportunities, distribute visibility, and form evaluations. Labor relations, trust, and pathways of punishment also change as a result.

A platform node, as used here, refers to the relational positions of company personnel, rules, procedures, accounts, records, and users within an event. A platform has no unified personality and is neither an autonomous underlying reality nor the social totality. It can produce real consequences, but it does not think and act on its own. As people use platforms, account and record systems maintained by the relevant personnel also preserve behavior. Ranking rules, review procedures, and evaluators in the current event form account evaluations, arrange opportunities, limit visibility, and carry records into the future.

In concrete events, accounts, real-name information, records, scores, labels, ranking, recommendations, visibility, bans, complaints, orders, traffic, rules, permissions, social relations, transaction evaluations, and penalty pathways connect with one another to form differentiation networks. These items are only common entry points, not a complete list. Differentiating units within platforms remain potentially infinite.

People using the same platform service do not thereby enter identical relations. Workers are concerned with whether they can obtain orders and income; merchants, with whether their goods can be seen; parents, with whether notices and materials have arrived; and content publishers, with review and circulation. A user may simultaneously be a buyer, an evaluator, someone being evaluated, and an appellant. The materials encountered, permissions held, and consequences borne differ at each position. The term 'platform user' cannot flatten these differences.

Different positions also exist within platform companies. Those who make rules do not necessarily handle individual appeals. Customer-service personnel can receive explanations but may lack authority to amend records. Review personnel can make a determination about a piece of content or a transaction, while technical-maintenance personnel are responsible for whether the system operates according to established arrangements. An analysis of a concrete event must identify which personnel or procedures actually extract materials, form judgments, and put consequences into effect. It cannot assign every action to an abstract 'platform.'

II. The Family of Workers from Elsewhere Enters Platform Society

Let us continue with that family of workers from elsewhere. The family always lives within real relations. Platforms enter their lives through events involving job seeking, renting, education, medical care, kin, and debt; they do not create another world isolated from reality. The father works at construction sites and may find work through chat groups of people from the same place of origin, recruitment platforms, recruitment information in short videos, or construction-site groups. Information posted by recruiters is presented after ranking, affecting which site he goes to and whose claims he believes; the related chats also remain in accounts and record systems. The mother does casual work at a restaurant and may also take orders through delivery, domestic-service, or hourly-work platforms. When she takes orders, ratings, response speed, and completion records change her next opportunity. What actually needs tracing is how company personnel use accounts, records, ranking, and evaluation procedures to preserve real differences anew and then bring the processing results back into life.

Housing and education events likewise pass through different entry points. Landlords post rental listings through rental platforms and consult tenants' credit, chat records, payment methods, and past evaluations. A child's schooling involves home–school chat groups, application systems, homework platforms, notification software, and online materials. Whether parents can see group messages in time and successfully upload materials may enter teachers' judgments of the family's cooperation.

In medical care and debts to relatives, the elder's treatment involves appointment platforms, medical-insurance settlement, medical-record uploads, and online-consultation records, and is affected by appointment timing, real-name information, medical-record uploads, and payment records. When relatives press for repayment, chat software, transfer records, and family chat groups also enter the event. The transfer records, chat content, and silence in the group that remain may later be extracted anew by family members.

The same family may also move materials among entry points on several platforms. Phone numbers, real-name information, payment methods, and addresses are used to establish different accounts, while work messages, school notices, appointment results, and transfer receipts are scattered across different procedures. When one entry point fails, the effect may not stop at a single service. Restricted payment may obstruct order-taking; a changed phone number may interrupt notifications; and a shared device may mix together records of different family members. These connections must be traced one by one, rather than attributed directly to the family's 'not knowing how to use platforms.'

Family members differ in their command of platforms. Parents may be familiar with taking orders or chatting but unfamiliar with submitting school materials. A child who can operate a device may not have authority to handle real-name, payment, or medical information. An elder relies on family help to book an appointment, yet the account's operation record may show only one success or failure. Operating ability should not be treated as a fixed individual attribute. How care, devices, time, and permissions jointly change results must also enter the analysis.

III. Entry through Accounts and the Storage and Retrieval of Records

An account is a basic entry point into platform society, with a role far beyond that of an ordinary name. It carries history, permissions, credit, relations, transactions, evaluations, labels, and penalty records. Taking orders, speaking, buying, selling, livestreaming, commenting, appealing, entering groups, or obtaining recommendations often depends on account status. The relevant personnel and procedures also identify users primarily through accounts. Real people are thus represented as real-name information, phone numbers, payment methods, past records, scores, devices, locations, group relations, and violation records. These data can present only part of a person's circumstances.

Many platform difficulties arise at the point of translation: a person's real circumstances cannot readily be turned into an account image that company personnel and established procedures can process. Within this process, accounts, records, ranking, and visibility each perform a distinct role. Accounts carry entry eligibility and permissions; records preserve materials; ranking arranges the order of presentation within an event; and visibility indicates whether users can actually see or be seen. The four are related, but their distinctions should still be maintained.

The formation of an account image also involves selection. Which behaviors are recorded, which differences are placed under the same label, when activity is treated as continuous, and what anomalies require review all depend on classifications and processing arrangements established and maintained by company personnel. Facts of life that the system has not preserved may be difficult to bring into an appeal. Preserved fragments, meanwhile, may be detached from their circumstances at the time and reinterpreted in another event.

The relevant procedures encounter precisely these account statuses, records, scores, and labels, not a person's whole life. This way of processing readily produces misalignment. A person reliable in real life may fail to gain the trust of trading partners or review procedures because the account is too new and has too few ratings and records. Someone has in fact encountered difficulties, yet the record retains only lateness, slow responses, or canceled orders. After processing, a malicious complaint may leave only the label 'complaint upheld.' A change of device, phone number, or city may also be marked as anomalous by established identification rules, and risk procedures may even judge normal behavior suspicious. All these examples show a distance between the real person and the account image.

The formation of records may itself be disputed. Behind cases in which the record 'retains only lateness, slow responses, or canceled orders,' an order may have been canceled voluntarily by the worker or in connection with the other party changing requirements, a device failure, or an emergency in real life. An unread message may not have been opened, or its alert may not have arrived; the account may have been switched, or the device shared by family members. If the final record retains only 'canceled' and 'unread,' the reasons for their formation are compressed. Later users retrieving the record must explain what it can prove and what it cannot.

One person may also occupy several account positions at once. Work accounts, shared family accounts, purchase accounts, and accounts for public speech carry different relations, while the same phone or payment method may connect them. Whether accounts are identified as belonging to the same person, whether their histories can be transferred, and whether restrictions are shared all change permissions and risks. Analysis must still distinguish the real person, identity materials that can be submitted, and the account image established by procedures. Identity information cannot replace the person.

Account and record systems preserve large amounts of past behavior in ways set by company personnel. A purchase, a poor review, a complaint, an instance of lateness, a statement, a violation, a ban, or a failed appeal may all be extracted anew in the future.

Such records can appear repeatedly across times, settings, and relational chains. Past behavior continues to participate in later events in forms such as labels, scores, recommendations, and restrictions. Chat records left by the father in a recruitment group may become evidence in a claim for unpaid wages, or be forwarded by others and become evaluation materials. A poor review received by the mother on an order-taking platform may affect the following week's orders. A parent's slower reply in a group may leave an impression on a teacher. A failed appointment booking for the elder may force the family to rearrange care and time.

Records become candidate materials for future judgments and therefore cannot be treated merely as neutral storage space. Historical indices do not produce power on their own. Only when operations, review, customer-service, or technical-maintenance personnel, or users, retrieve records in a current event, interpret them for concrete purposes, and assign them weight does the past enter the present.

Different records may also conflict. Transaction-completion records, chat content, proof of payment, location data, and the two parties' evaluations may present different courses of events. Supplementary explanations from customer service and original labels may not be updated in step. Judgment cannot rely only on the most easily retrieved material. Current personnel should compare when records were formed, their sources, applicable scopes, and amendment statuses, while keeping entry points open for contrary materials to enter processing.

IV. Ranking, Visibility, and Evaluation Authority on Platforms

When one order-taking worker's account ranks ahead of another's, the workers face different opportunities. When one appeal for help is widely reposted and another is barely seen, the two can hardly produce the same consequences. Record systems preserve materials, while ranking rules arrange opportunities within the current event. Who is recommended, who can be found in searches, whose goods appear first, which accounts are easily seen, which content is hidden, and which evaluations appear earlier all produce different distributions of opportunity. Visibility actually affects income, reputation, relations, trust, and action space. It is no empty name.

Invisible content still exists; it simply has difficulty entering chains of opportunity. Content has been posted, yet no one sees it; an account still exists, yet cannot be found in a search; goods have been listed, but rank far down; workers stay online, yet still receive no orders; parents' silence in a group may be understood as unwillingness to cooperate; and appeals for help pushed into positions where response is difficult likewise struggle to produce consequences. As visibility distributes opportunities, it leaves large numbers of accounts, pieces of content, goods, forms of labor, and appeals for help at the margins. These situations do not necessarily all arise from penalties. But power does often operate through ranking, downweighting, traffic restrictions, hiding, bans, and rejection of appeals, and it need not be accompanied by public commands. Once an account is downweighted, opportunities have already diminished even if no one expressly states a prohibition. When content is hidden, that alone is enough to impede its effects even without public rebuttal. When an appeal is rejected, the reasons may remain unclear, yet the penalty has already been written into the record.

The effects of a ranking position must also be considered within the concrete event. Ranking higher does not necessarily bring the same kind of benefit: goods being seen may increase transactions; an appeal for help being seen may bring support; and personal content being widely seen may also increase misreading, attacks,

or reports. Being farther down usually reduces opportunities for contact, yet not every consequence can be inferred from position alone. The weight of visibility depends on who can see, when they see, what action they can take afterward, and whether subsequent evaluations are in turn preserved.

Actions among users also enter ranking chains. Clicks, time spent viewing, evaluations, reposts, blocking, and reports can become candidate materials, from which ranking arrangements set by company personnel then extract some differences. These behaviors provide only limited signals and cannot fully determine the value of content; nor do ranking rules discover what is true on their own. The formation of signals always involves concrete users, record systems, and rule arrangements.

Differences in accounts and records do not turn into consequences on their own. Personnel or procedures must extract, evaluate, rank, or restrict them. Personnel and procedures that can extract differences and turn them into scores, labels, recommendations, restrictions, or penalties can also affect users' positions within platform relations. Who determines whether an account is reliable? Each of the following has actual handlers: whether a delivery rider or domestic worker can be recommended, where a merchant ranks, whether content is visible, whether a complaint is upheld, whether an appeal succeeds, and whether past records affect the next opportunity. These processes involve evaluation authority and ranking authority within platform networks, far beyond ordinary views.

Rulemakers, customer-service staff, and review personnel within platform companies, together with merchants, evaluators, group administrators, and complainants, may all hold differing degrees of authority to extract differences and evaluation authority. Recommendation, payment, and credit procedures also carry established processing authority. Platform power appears not only in account ownership, but also in record preservation, rule setting, ranking for visibility, credit evaluation, hiding content, banning accounts, and handling appeals.

Different evaluators have different materials available. Trading partners may see only a page, price, and past ratings. Customer-service personnel can see appeal materials and processing records. Review personnel judge content or behavior under current rules, while group administrators may impose restrictions based on interactions within the group. If a judgment formed at one position is extended directly to other positions, limited materials may be expanded into an overall evaluation of the entire account.

Authority to extract differences also determines which materials remain outside judgment. When procedures accept only established formats, circumstances that cannot be turned into images, text, timestamps, or specified options may fail to enter processing. If personnel examine only recent records, long-term reliable conduct is also easily overlooked. Analysis need not add all materials of life without limit, but it should explain how the current window was formed and examine whether excluded materials could change the conclusion.

V. Platform Rules Are Not a Stable Background

Platform rules change weights and cannot be treated as a stable background. Recommendation methods, review standards, appeal entry points, the scale of penalties, and merchant rules may all be adjusted, changing accounts' weights within the relevant events. After a rule update, previously normal speech, order-taking, transactions, and interactions may face new ranking, evaluation, or restrictions. Previously effective practices may cease to work, and long-silent records may receive new interpretations. A once-unimportant label may even begin to affect recommendations, searches, and order-taking. The same account, the same set of records, and the same behavior may thus produce consequences different from those in the past.

For those who rely on platforms for orders, a rule update directly affects income; it is no distant technical adjustment. Families relying on home–school platforms for notices are also affected by changes in entry points, alerts, and submission methods. After rulemaking and operations personnel complete an update, review procedures and ranking rules may give old records weight anew or interrupt actions that could otherwise have continued.

Rule changes also produce gaps in understanding. Company personnel may already have changed entry points, standards, or classifications while users still act on past experience. Customer-service explanations, page prompts, and actual processing may also fall out of step. Records of mistaken selections or delays left in this way cannot immediately be understood as users' refusal to comply. Analysis must trace when rules changed, how notices were delivered, who had time to adjust, and whether penalties permit supplementation and correction.

Rules also have scopes of application. A restriction may concern only a certain kind of transaction, content, or account status and should not automatically be extended into a judgment on all actions. An update may change recommendations without necessarily changing payment or appeals. Treating platform rules as a single whole obscures differences among departments, personnel, and procedures, and makes responsibility difficult to locate.

VI. How Real Differences Enter Platform Ranking

Platforms are not closed online systems. The key to platform society lies in how real differences gain new representations through accounts, records, and ranking procedures maintained by company personnel, and are then preserved, ranked, and written back. Online life has not replaced offline life; the two have long been connected through concrete events.

In everyday life, care responsibilities compress time online, while physical condition may appear in completion rates, lateness rates, and complaint risks. When real care responsibilities enter a platform, they may leave only a duration offline; bodily fatigue may leave only a completion speed. The mother cannot stay online for long because she must pick up her child; the record system may retain only slow responses, few orders accepted, and low activity.

Spatial and material conditions are likewise recast. Geographical location may turn into delivery distance, nearby recommendations, and local ranking; device condition affects response speed and content quality; and network stability leaves traces in online status. Movement between places may leave only changes of location once it enters a platform. After the father changes cities to find work, his location, device, and account behavior all change, and the relevant rules may generate marks on that basis.

Mandarin, dialects, and forms of expression may enter customer-service evaluations, livestream viewing, and content circulation. Once language differences enter a platform, they may leave only the form of a reply. In another situation, a parent working nights misses messages in a home–school group, while a teacher or school reviewer may see only an untimely response. Circumstances of life are compressed through accounts, records, and ranking rules into differences that procedures can process. Personnel and procedures in the current event then bring the results back into reality.

Real-name information involves account certification and payment permissions; market credit concerns trading eligibility; and local acquaintance groups carry work and rental information and reputations within the group. Such recasting is not one-way copying. There are fewer differences that procedures can process, and these are easier to compare, but compressed marks cannot replace the full circumstances that formed them.

Real differences may also be recombined on platforms. Location, device, payment method, and the time of an operation are all ordinary when considered separately, yet may form a risk marker when extracted together under the same rule. When ratings, completion rates, and response speed jointly enter ranking, they may also change one's position in order-taking. This combination does not create a person's essence. It indicates only that procedures set by company personnel represent and assign weight to differences in a certain way within a particular event.

VII. Platform Time and the Costs of Complaints, Penalties, and Appeals

Different platforms turn different business processes into calculable time. Under the specific business activity and published rules, the times involved may include some of those for registration, response, fulfillment, refunds, appeals, handling, or record retention. Recommendation cycles, popularity windows, read-status timestamps, transfer times, and deletion times do not necessarily all coexist on the same platform. Time in life does not enter systems automatically. Only after rulemaking and operations personnel set time limits is time in the corresponding activity turned into response periods, completion periods, popularity periods, appeal periods, penalty periods, or recording periods. Once established, these times are easily recorded and compared precisely, and may even become grounds for penalties. For example, lateness on an ordinary order and on a peak-period order may have different consequences; whether a message is answered immediately or only several hours later may also change trust; and once a complaint has passed the appeal deadline, the relevant positions may be temporarily fixed by procedural handling.

Record systems and ranking rules turn people's busyness, fatigue, care responsibilities, network delays, and real difficulties into processable markers such as slow response, poor completion, missed deadlines, or untrustworthiness. A late reply, a missed appeal period, or lateness at a peak time may all be transformed within the current event into differences in credit, scores, recommendations, and penalties.

Platform time also distributes waiting unevenly. Some people can wait for a review, refund, or appeal; others depend on that day's income, and every day of account restrictions adds another layer of pressure on their lives. Some can submit supplementary materials repeatedly, while others can deal with the matter only once in a break from work. The same processing time need not produce the same weight. Judging this difference also requires returning income, care, device use, and eligibility deadlines together to the current relational field.

Under rules that some platforms have made public and that apply to the corresponding business activities, actions on accounts may include some of the following: reduced visibility, limits on certain functions, suspension of service, or termination of eligibility. Specific measures, targets, periods, and appeal methods vary by platform, activity, and rule version. Downweighting, traffic restrictions, points deductions, hiding, and restrictions on withdrawals, order-taking, speech, and groups cannot be written as a unified list present on all platforms at once. Complaints may trigger points deductions, traffic restrictions, account bans, refunds, compensation, or disqualification. When review and operations personnel impose penalties through procedures and then write the results into records, this constitutes a form of write-back. Penalty records are extracted anew in later applications, appeals, recommendations, and transactions. A successful appeal can restore some opportunities; failure may leave penalties in the record.

Complaint materials and appeal materials often occupy different positions. Complainants can submit screenshots, evaluations, or accounts of events, while those complained about need to know why they are restricted, which materials can answer the complaint, and who will review them anew. If a penalty occurs

before its reasons are delivered, appellants must also prepare materials after opportunities have already diminished. Procedural sequence thus becomes part of real consequences.

Appeals both serve to correct errors and incur costs. Whether people can find an entry point, understand the rules, possess evidence, and wait for a reply all change the actual weight of a penalty. If customer service offers only fixed replies, appellants must spend more time finding effective explanations. When an account is banned, people who depend on that day's income find it especially hard to wait. After a failed appeal, the penalty may remain fixed in the record.

For a casual worker such as the mother, every stretch of appeal time after an account restriction may also be a stretch without income. If the father is removed from a recruitment group, the work information he can access diminishes. If parents fail to submit materials and cannot find an appeal entry point, a child's school-admission procedure may also be delayed. An appeal requires an entry point, time, evidence, and the ability to understand rules; those concerned must also be able to afford to wait for the result. In life, it has never been merely an abstract right.

After an appeal succeeds, relational chains may not all recover at once. A penalty can be revoked, yet previous visibility, trust in transactions, group position, or family arrangements do not immediately return to their former state. If others have already retrieved the records, the associated evaluations may persist. Examining appeals therefore cannot stop at the result field. Which permissions have been restored, which records corrected, which consequences have already spread, and whether supplementation and revision can continue must each be checked.

Time records themselves may also require calibration. System time can prove when an operation was preserved, but may not fully explain when a user saw a notice, when the user began dealing with it, or why the process was interrupted. Read status, online status, and response duration are all limited materials and cannot automatically prove a person's attitude. If new materials can explain a delayed notice, device failure, or real event, the weight of the original time marker may need adjustment.

VIII. Platform Relational Chains

The consequences of platform events do not stop inside platforms. Accounts, records, scores, ranking, visibility, and penalties are transmitted through nodes such as labor, family, locality, state, market, and school, connecting events of labor, education, medical care, kinship, and markets. For example, when the father finds work through a recruitment platform or coworkers' group, whether information is true, coworkers' evaluations are reliable, and past chat records have been retained all affect which job he enters. Scores also enter income chains: when the mother takes hourly work or casual food-service work through a platform, scores affect her next opportunity; a poor review may lower her recommendation position, and lateness may also affect her eligibility to take orders.

Home–school platforms enter education chains. A child's homework, notices, applications, and material uploads may all have to be completed through platforms. Whether parents can see messages in time, successfully upload materials, and reply on time also enters teachers' evaluations and school procedures. Appointment platforms enter medical chains. The elder's treatment involves appointments, medical records, medical insurance, and online materials. Unfamiliarity with operations, missed appointment slots, or failed medical-record uploads all change access to medical care. Chat records enter kinship chains: relatives' demands for repayment, family disputes, transfer records, voice messages, and group silence may all be preserved, making the past within kinship relations easier to extract anew.

The same platform record may also enter several relational chains. An account restriction can first change income from orders and then lead the family to rearrange spending and care. An argument in a group chat can affect local reputation and then be carried into renting, job seeking, or kinship relations. When consequences reach the next node, someone must actually see, adopt, or forward the relevant materials. Transmission cannot be written as records spreading on their own. At the same time, relational chains also branch, break, and weaken. A poor review may affect one ranking without necessarily entering long-term penalties. Chat records can serve as materials for claiming unpaid wages, yet may fail to change the processing result without other proof. A failed submission of a home–school notice may also be repaired through a teacher's supplementary confirmation. Analysts must see both continuity and breaks. A platform's leaving traces cannot be equated with consequences necessarily remaining forever.

IX. Platform Historical Indices and Write-Back

If specific platform rules and lawful data-processing arrangements preserve records of transactions, chats, scores, complaints, appeals, or payments, some of their content may be extracted anew in subsequent matters. Whether traces of likes, reposts, browsing, follows, blocking, group chats, location, and deletion are preserved, for how long, and by whom they can be retrieved must still be judged separately by platform, business activity, authority, and version. Account and record systems do not thereby become subjects acting on their own apart from personnel and rules. Records silent in ordinary times may gain weight anew when people take orders, seek jobs, rent housing, apply for services, join groups, or handle disputes.

The relevant personnel retrieve, evaluate, and adopt records in the current event, and new judgments are then written back into the system. Such write-back changes how others later recommend, trust, hire, rent to, pay attention to, help, or exclude a person. Its effects may also return to the family, locality, school, market, medical care, and kinship relations, confronting people offline once again with evaluations left by platforms. Specifically, a poor review may reduce order opportunities; a complaint changes account status; and a ban may even cut off income. A group-chat dispute may enter local relations, and transfer records may be used by relatives in debt disputes. A parent's absence from a home–school platform may also lead teachers to judge the family's cooperation on that basis. A failed appointment booking forces the family to adjust care, while rental chat records may affect a landlord's choice. As company personnel and users deal with events at hand, they also leave materials that may be extracted later. Write-back is not the final word. New materials, contrary records, counterexamples raised in appeals, and subsequent events may all prompt the relevant personnel to adjust weights, revoke judgments, or revise the original image.

Historical indices also require distinctions among versions. An original evaluation, a customer-service supplement, an appeal result, and later handling may appear in succession. Users who see only the earliest label may overlook corrections already made; retaining only the final result, meanwhile, may conceal losses previously caused by a penalty. Only by explaining when a record was formed, who amended it, why it was amended, and the event to which it applies can different versions be kept from being pieced together into a seamless history. Moreover, a record's deletion or temporary silence still does not warrant a direct judgment that the relevant history has disappeared. A user's inability to see a record does not establish whether other authorized personnel or procedures can retrieve it. Nor does a trace remaining in a system mean that it necessarily acquires high weight in the next event. Whether history can enter the present depends on who retrieves it and why, how it is interpreted, and whether contrary materials can enter judgment at the same time.

X. How Platforms Are Compressed into Fixed Images

Platforms are often compressed into several fixed images. The tool image sees only life becoming more convenient and thus overlooks record preservation, opportunity ranking, identity evaluation, visibility distribution, and penalties. Although the corresponding tool explanation can account for the convenience platforms bring, records, ranking, visibility, evaluation, and penalties remain outside its field of vision. Moving from tool to space, the virtual-space image places platforms outside reality and fails to see that they have long entered nodes of labor, family, locality, school, medical care, market, and state. The virtual-space explanation grasps the distinctive forms of online interaction, yet easily overlooks platforms' long-standing entry into these nodes.

The purely technological image assigns the entire problem to systems, rules, recommendations, and review, concealing the social differences, evaluation authority, appeal costs, and real consequences behind them. The purely technological explanation helps analyze systems, recommendations, and review, but social differences, evaluation authority, appeal costs, and real consequences cannot disappear on that account. Another account depicts technology as an all-powerful subject, as though a single algorithm directly determined every consequence. Actual events often involve rulemaking, receipt of data, user actions, human review, customer-service handling, merchant choices, and external qualification procedures simultaneously. Technical procedures certainly matter, but not every decision necessarily comes from the same mechanism, and there is no invisible unified will. The responsibilities concrete personnel should bear must be made clear, while the continuing effects of ranking and record procedures on visibility and opportunities must also be retained.

The public-opinion image focuses on voices, quarrels, and expression, pushing accounts, records, ranking, order-taking, payment, penalties, and transaction opportunities out of view. The corresponding public-opinion explanation sees expression and circulation but may not see order-taking, payment, transactions, and penalties. Writing all users as passive recipients likewise produces misjudgment. Users are subject to ranking, penalties, and entry restrictions, but they also preserve materials, lodge appeals, adjust actions, establish groups, evaluate one another, or move relations elsewhere. These responses may not be effective, and must certainly not be romanticized. They nonetheless form new records and nodes, thereby changing subsequent judgments. Only by retaining actors' positions can platform relations be kept from becoming a closed machine.

Interpreters who adopt class theory may also subsume platforms under a total class image. Within a limited scope, they can extract income differences and relations of control in platform labor, yet cannot explain another set of questions. People whose incomes are similarly low still experience entirely different consequences because of differences in account status, scores, complaint records, response speed, ranking position, group relations, appeal outcomes, device condition, rule updates, and the risk of bans. Although interpreters using class theory can extract some income differences and relations of control, they still cannot encompass mechanisms of accounts, scores, ranking, visibility, appeals, and write-back.

This capacity for distinction extraction within a limited scope cannot prove the existence of 'class entities.' Class entities do not exist. What actually exist in concrete events are differences that have been extracted and given weight, together with class images built on those differences. Class theory belongs neither to Model A nor to Model B. From the outset it belongs to Model C's direction of total-image subsumption, reducing accounts, records, scores, ranking, visibility, complaints, appeals, bans, group relations, and write-back to subsidiary materials. Model C also has a direction of erasure of distinctions between explanations, which uses the multiplicity of differences to cancel judgments of weight. The subsumption direction merges differences

excessively, while the direction of erasure of distinctions between explanations cancels judgment. Both cross the boundary of healthy complexity.

XI. Comparison amid Complexity and Calibration of Platform Explanations

Platform society is indeed complex. If we therefore declare all explanations much the same, or mix labor, consumption, social interaction, public opinion, and rules together, analysis cannot continue. Concrete events offer clearer entry points. Disputes over taking orders require examining account status, scores, response time, ranking, historical completion rates, complaint records, and penalties. Home–school communication requires checking whether messages can be seen, when parents reply, whether materials upload successfully, how teachers record matters, and whether the system provides confirmation. Rental events involve property listings, chat records, credit, payment methods, evaluations, and identity certification. Medical appointment booking concerns real names, available slots, time windows, medical-record uploads, and payment. In content-circulation events, visibility, reposting relations, group position, reports, traffic restrictions, and account history in turn acquire greater weight.

Acknowledging complexity in a healthy way means narrowing the current window and making an explanation's limits explicit. In handling a dispute over taking orders, we can first compare order requirements, completion records, both parties' materials, evaluations, and appeal handling without having to explain the whole of platform society at once. If we later find account history, care responsibilities, or rule changes altering the result, we can expand the window. Limited distinction extraction is always constrained by events and materials. It cannot arbitrarily select differences favorable to an existing position.

Although platforms are complex, judgments remain possible, as do comparisons among models. Calibration of explanations must compare which key differences various models actually extract and which nodes of family, locality, state, market, and school they obscure. Any explanation that compresses platforms into a single image or refuses to acknowledge counterexamples should narrow its scope of application. An explanation that identifies concrete personnel, procedures, materials, and chains of consequences, and explains how counterexamples compel revision of judgments, has greater explanatory power than one that sums up everything as 'technical control' or 'market domination.' If another explanation extracts more crucial differences in a different event, the original model should narrow its scope of application. Acknowledging such comparison and revision is precisely the condition for avoiding the direction of erasure of distinctions between explanations.

Understanding platform society is best begun with an event in progress. Taking orders, scoring, account bans, complaints, renting, appointment booking, home–school communication, group-chat disputes, payment disputes, content circulation, account appeals, and information searches each offer a different entry point. Analysis must explain who extracts differentiating units, which personnel or procedures are preserving, ranking, evaluating, restricting, recommending, or penalizing, and how consequences travel along relational chains. When old records regain weight, when current judgments are preserved as differences that can be extracted again later, and who retrieves, interprets, or assigns weight to them in subsequent handling must all be brought back to materials. When counterexamples appear, the original explanation should also keep an entry point open for revision.

Analysis has no fixed starting point. An account-ban event can be investigated from the grounds for the penalty and the appeal entry point. An order-taking event often first reveals ranking and scores. Home–school communication may first encounter problems of whether notices, accounts, and materials can reach their destinations. Analysts should trace the differences that first change eligibility, income, trust, or visibility and

adjust the relational-field window in light of new materials. Steps that are always the same merely turn platform explanation into a procedural checklist. What must actually be seen clearly is how differences in life are preserved, how account images obscure whole persons, who evaluates and ranks, and which weights rule updates change. We must also trace how visibility distributes opportunities, how penalties and appeal costs change paths of action, and how records return to relations of family, labor, school, medical care, and kinship. Any explanation that compresses these relations into a single image must undergo calibration by counterexamples.

Calibration must also retain positions from which those concerned can give their accounts. Company personnel, workers, merchants, consumers, parents, teachers, and group members may hold different records, and their accounts may conflict. Formal records present only some facts; the existence of disagreement does not mean all accounts are equally valid. Interpreters must compare the sources and times of formation of materials, the authority held by actors, and their connection to the current event, then mark which conclusions can stand and which parts still require revision.

Accounts, records, ranking, visibility, and penalties do indeed change people’s positions and opportunities. Their effects must pass through concrete personnel, rules, materials, and procedures and cannot be attributed to an abstract platform. Differences in labor, family, locality, state, market, school, medical care, and community enter platforms within limited scopes, and processing results return to these relations. Tracing this path prevents platforms from being elevated to the status of what society fundamentally is and complexity from becoming an excuse to abandon comparison. The total image of class theory likewise cannot subsume real and diverse platform mechanisms.

Chapter 34. Revolutions and Movements: Differences Gaining Weight Together, Rapid Connections between Nodes, and Action Write-Back

I. Distinguishing Revolutions from Movements and Tracing Paths of Explanation

Revolutions and movements are easily compressed into a single image. An eruption following the accumulation of class contradictions is one common explanation; mass anger, youthful impulsiveness, state oppression, or harms suffered by a nation are also frequently invoked as causes. These accounts may extract part of the truth, but they cannot alone warrant inferring the emergence of revolutions and movements, still less reduce the actions of different participants to a shared impulse of a crowd suddenly losing its reason. Dispersed differences of various kinds do not converge on their own. People occupying different positions must bring them into concrete events.

Within a particular relational field, differentiating units such as labor circumstances, debt, rent, local relations, national memory, young people's circumstances, educational opportunities, platform circulation, family pressures, public space, and punishment records may be brought into the current event simultaneously by people in different positions. Participants put forward their experiences and demands; organizers establish contacts; communicators and recorders preserve materials; and the relevant institutional personnel and procedures process the matter. The event brings previously dispersed differences together; slogans and friend–enemy divisions compress them; participants bear costs in different positions; and records of action and subsequent handling then enter judgments within families, localities, the state, schools, markets, platforms, and communities. These relations are not the result of the social differentiation network reorganizing itself. They are consequences jointly produced by concrete personnel, organizations, materials, rules, and procedures.

In defining concrete actions, movement and revolution must not be conflated into one term. Movements may form around limited demands, public protests, strikes, student action, local resistance, platform mobilization, or community action, varying in duration and scope of influence. Revolutions have greater intensity and scope: beyond demanding wage compensation, policy changes, the revocation of penalties, or local recognition, the participants concerned also seek to change the state, institutions, nodes of power, narratives of legitimacy, and the future order. Understanding revolution within a continuum of movements does not diminish its intensity. It rejects an account of revolution as a historical rupture that suddenly arrives detached from existing relations.

Revolution is not an inevitable stage reached when a movement naturally escalates; most movements do not become revolutions. Only when the demands put forward by certain participants and their organizations reach into institutional structures and structures of legitimacy, and persistently change people's judgments about the state, the sources of power, community boundaries, and the future order, may action reach greater intensity. Revolutions and movements therefore cannot be named solely according to an event's intensity. A limited protest may gradually connect with institutions, the state, and historical memory, or it may end after compensation, division, or withdrawal; a major conflict, meanwhile, may fail to form a stable chain of responsibility across nodes. Judging the relation between the two requires comparing duration, the transmission of materials, what organizations take up and sustain, shared consequences, and the links at

which earlier judgments lack support from materials. The scale of an event cannot directly yield a macro-level conclusion about revolution.

On this basis, this chapter does not begin by asking which total image revolutions and movements belong to. It examines which differences gain weight within the same event, who connects them, who proposes, accepts, or rejects a shared expression, and how action leaves records that can be extracted anew later. This chapter concerns how such processes are explained; it does not teach people how to launch a movement.

II. The Accumulation of Differences and Conditions for Action within a Situation

Consider a conceptual composite situation: an industrial city. It once had stable factories, connected to surrounding workers' communities, technical schools, markets, local acquaintance relations, and public squares. The factories provided work and also affected family incomes, local identities, prospects for young people, master–apprentice relations, evaluations concerning marriage, and community memory. Later came factory restructuring, unstable youth employment, increasing outsourced labor, and rising pressures of rent and debt. Taking orders on platforms became a fallback for many. Graduation certificates no longer guaranteed jobs, and old relations in local communities weakened. Unpaid wages, demolition and relocation, penalties, and the state personnel, materials, and procedures implementing “stability maintenance” also became visible. This situation does not correspond to a particular real city or a single historical event and must not be treated as verified historical fact. It merely brings several differentiation relations together within one analytical setting.

In this setting, a young worker is injured while seeking payment of wages owed. At first, the people concerned can treat this as a labor dispute. Then coworkers repost photographs of the scene in groups, students begin discussing how he too attended technical school, and parents talk about their own children possibly facing similar circumstances. Residents of the old factory district bring up housing allocations, layoffs, relocation, and compensation disputes again. Short-video account holders edit clips, a small local newspaper offers an interpretation, and family members also speak out. Personnel and procedures within the relevant state institutions begin to handle the event. After platform-company personnel or review procedures intervene, traffic restrictions, deletions, reposts, screenshots, and arguments appear at the same time.

Unpaid wages remain an important entry point into the event, but are not the only difference extracted. Coworkers, students, parents, residents, family members, account holders, and the personnel handling the matter bring debt, housing rental, prospects for young people, school qualifications, local memory, state implementation, platform bans, family pressures, and differences left over from history into current explanations from their respective positions. The fact that multiple materials gain weight within the same event does not justify inferring that they arise from the automatic eruption of a single cause. Unstable labor, debt, young people's uncertainty about their future, family pressures, local memory, and state implementation can coexist without necessarily forming a movement. Differences gaining weight are only one condition.

The event needs people to explain and communicate it; information needs people to preserve and confirm it; dispersed people need to connect with one another through organizations, relations, and public space. Participants must also judge whether they can bear the risks and whether action might change the future. In the industrial-city situation, the young worker's injury can become an event node. If no one preserves materials, brings forward the experience, or connects it with other circumstances, the event may remain at the individual level. Even if information about it circulates, attention will still dissipate if no one verifies the information, allocates work, or establishes trusted relations. At the same time, pressures involving debt, rent,

student registration, care, and work raise participation costs, leading some people to remain silent, withdraw, or move into logistical support.

Only when connected through concrete bearers can slogans, organizations, circulation, sacrifice narratives, imaginings of the future, and institutional handling turn dispersed discontent into collective action. The so-called critical state is not a natural law. It is the provisional result formed when these conditions are weighted in relation to one another in concrete action. Even under similar conditions, different people may still judge differently according to the credibility of materials, participation costs, and consequences they can expect. Analysis cannot work backward from a list of conditions to infer an inevitable critical point.

III. Organizational Nodes and Positions of Participation

In the industrial city, coworkers verify who was at the scene; students bring the event into school; family members provide personal experiences; residents of the old factory district connect local memory; and account holders expand visibility, while possibly also causing misreadings through editing and retelling. These concrete tasks are distributed across different positions. That does not mean there is a center issuing orders to everyone. Dispersed differences do not become a movement on their own.

Trade unions, student organizations, local communities, religious organizations, national communities, platform groups, kinship networks, and occupational associations constitute one set of possible organizational nodes. Underground publications, public space, commemorative activities, strike committees, and mutual-aid networks may also take on the same functions in particular events. None is a subject that acts automatically. Within and between these various nodes, organizers coordinate direction, information keepers preserve materials, verifiers confirm information, task allocators arrange work, communicators expand visibility, and logistical supporters sustain care and supplies; the relevant rules and procedures delimit the actions available. Only if concrete personnel continue to preserve, confirm, and transmit materials and allocate work can differences move from grievances, rumors, and posts into shared action.

The existence of nodes does not guarantee successful connection. Information may be questioned, assigned tasks may go unclaimed, and different organizations may compete for interpretive authority.

The people within a movement are not homogeneous, nor are participants' positions fixed identities. Those owed wages, family members, students, residents, coworkers, recorders, and bystanders may enter the same event through different materials. Some bear risks of unemployment and debt, some take responsibility for transmitting records, and some provide support only for limited periods. Writing all these people as one “movement subject” obscures differences in positions of participation and capacities to bear responsibility. The same person's position may also change during the process: at different times, someone may move from waiting and watching to participation, while someone else may withdraw as costs rise. One person may also occupy several positions at once—as a worker, family member, local resident, or account holder—bearing different consequences within different relations.

Belonging to the same category does not mean bearing the same costs. A movement may contain many kinds of positions. Alongside those drawn into it, logistical supporters, opponents, those remaining silent, those withdrawing, and those misidentified, core organizers bear risks of coordination and interpretation, ordinary participants face risks at the scene, sympathizers bear risks of expression, and those waiting to see may come under suspicion from different sides. In concrete circumstances, students may face risks involving student registration, disciplinary action, and future qualifications; workers' risks concern unemployment, unpaid wages, and punishment; account holders must consider bans and records; local residents may be caught

between public expression and relations with acquaintances; and family members must also bear care responsibilities and subsequent consequences.

Participation therefore cannot be measured solely by the size of a crowd or its apparent stance. The same slogan may connect to different hopes and bring different risks for workers owed wages, students, an injured person's family, communicators, and local residents. Analysts must identify who puts forward demands, who communicates and records, who implements or opposes, and who remains silent. They must also trace how family, labor, school, state records, platform accounts, local relations, and bodily risks concretely constrain each person's choices.

Resource allocation within a movement affects who can continue to participate. Concentrated action requires concrete organizers, relations of authorization, and communication nodes. Who puts forward demands, decides slogans, arranges resources, reviews lists, preserves records of harm, and negotiates with outside institutions may all affect the path of action. An organization's name can summarize these relations, but cannot replace tracing the actual bearers, rules, and procedures. If transport, time, medical care, legal assistance, information channels, and family support are concentrated in only a few positions, other participants may bear higher exit costs even if they support the same demand. Analysts should trace who arranges resources, whether the reasons for their allocation are public, and how differences in resources change who has a say and the risks involved.

Centralized decision-making within a movement may also coexist with dispersed action. Core organizers set demands and directions for resources, while local participants may still handle matters differently according to their own risks, community relations, and materials. Analysts can neither attribute every consequence to a single center nor deny the effects of authorization from above and resource allocation merely because participation is dispersed. Representation within a movement must also be substantiated through relations of authorization. The ability to speak, negotiate, or preserve records does not make someone a representative of all participants. The formation, scope, and withdrawal of authorization, and objections to it, must all be located in concrete relations. This requirement preserves the reality of collective action while preventing an organization's name from acquiring a unified personality.

IV. Slogan Compression and Friend–Enemy Divisions

Slogans can compress complex differences into forms that are easy to circulate, remember, and express together. Organizers propose slogans, some people take responsibility for circulating them, and participants decide whether to accept them. Different parties may not give the same words the same meaning. Some workers may see wages and labor protections in a slogan demanding payment of wages owed; some students may connect it to future opportunities; local residents may think of the dignity of the old factory district; and family members may care more about risks. Platform workers may focus on the stability of their accounts and income, while some members of national communities may demand recognition of shared memory.

The same slogan can temporarily establish a direction for action, but cannot prove that all participants have the same motive or expect the same result. Faced with a proposed slogan, some repeat it, some accept it, and others reject or reinterpret it. If a slogan is too weak, dispersed differences struggle to enter shared expression; if compression is too strong, it may obscure conflicts among wages, the future, local recognition, family protection, and sustained action. Subsequent calibration must ask which differences the slogan has upweighted, which it has downweighted, and how downweighted demands reappear within the action.

In delineating a direction for action, organizers and participants may use friend–enemy divisions to concentrate action. They ask: Who prevents wages from being paid, conceals the injured person's condition,

deletes information, or protects those responsible? Who is willing to support a particular demand publicly? Such compression can clarify direction and has real mobilizing force. Yet those making the classifications may also extend misidentification, assigning the hesitant, bystanders, those pursuing different strategies, internal critics, or those forced into silence to hostile positions.

Friend–enemy divisions may quickly gain weight in a crisis. But silence does not equal opposition, withdrawal does not necessarily negate the original demands, and silence, hesitation, withdrawal, and internal criticism do not automatically amount to betrayal. Some worry about unemployment, student registration, care, and debt deadlines; some have restricted accounts; others cannot participate publicly because of student registration, care, housing, accounts, or debt. Still others disagree with a particular strategy while continuing to recognize limited demands.

The stronger friend–enemy divisions become, the more necessary it is to leave room for questions, additions, internal criticism, and the correction of classifications. If counterexamples and materials concerning withdrawal show that the image of action has downweighted differences in positions of participation, the explanation must be narrowed or rewritten. Dissent must not be reabsorbed as evidence of hostility. Otherwise, compression originally intended to concentrate action will turn differences in positions of participation into new harms.

When movements connect with national communities, local society, or family relations, these relations may take up and sustain them, but conflicts may also arise. Community members need not adopt the same strategy because they share a name, and family support may come with its own conditions concerning care and risk. Interpreters must preserve the independent standing of these relations and cannot require them to serve merely as resources for mobilization within a movement image. External pressure also changes weights within a movement. Penalties, bans, violence, entry points for negotiation, and public support may rapidly give certain strategies greater weight, or may split existing alliances. These changes must be explained through actual events, records, and processes of taking up and sustaining action. “Historical inevitability” cannot replace participants' choices and costs.

V. Sacrifice Narratives, Shared Memory, and Imaginings of the Future

Death, injury, arrest, or disappearance, as well as humiliation, punishment, dismissal, and expulsion, may all be brought into sacrifice narratives by family members, coworkers, students, recorders, communicators, and organizers of commemorative activities. Neither the event itself nor the movement's name automatically forms shared memory. Only when people preserve, circulate, and reinterpret photographs, testimony, posts, songs, slogans, commemorative activities, and subsequent handling can individual experiences enter a community's memory. Which harms, victories, failures, and dissent recorders choose to preserve, how families and localities retell them, and whether school, platform, or institutional personnel allow the relevant materials to be extracted all affect how later people understand the event. If a single commemorative narrative swallows internal differences, it too compresses complex action into a total image.

After the young worker is injured, bearers in different positions bring different understandings: some coworkers may see their own labor circumstances in it; some students connect it to future risks; family members are concerned about consequences for the family; residents of the old factory district recall local decline; and platform workers may notice instability in accounts, income, and responsibilities. These interpretations can generate pressure to protect, commemorate, and continue action, but do not naturally combine into a single narrative. If recorders and organizers demand that everyone commemorate in the same

way, questions, additions, and new materials may be excluded. Shared memory thus both connects and needs to remain subject to subsequent calibration.

In confronting their present experiences, participants may oppose unpaid wages, penalties, a particular act of state implementation, or local exclusion, and may also propose different arrangements for the future. Some demand stable work; some young people hope that educational qualifications can connect to real opportunities; local residents may hope the old factory district leaves more than memories of decline; others hope that personnel and procedures responsible for implementation can protect workers as well as impose penalties. These aims may be compatible or may conflict. They cannot be summed up in the phrase “people's shared imaginings.”

Imaginings of the future must enter action through slogans, organizational discussions, documents, images, and communication nodes. They are not a will generated by the movement itself. Those proposing a plan, those accepting it, and those bearing its consequences may be different people. Articulations of the future are also constrained by existing records, available resources, and positions of participation. Their effects cannot be judged merely by the grandeur of a slogan. When an articulation of the future leads participants to believe that action is not in vain, it can prolong action; when different aims can no longer coexist, it may also bring about division, negotiation, or withdrawal.

VI. Relational Chains of Movements

Unpaid wages can enter chains of debt. Wages failing to arrive affect rent, borrowing, family care, tuition fees, and future choices. When several workers face similar deadlines, organizers may interpret their individual experiences as shared circumstances. Similar deadlines provide visible materials for comparing their situations, but do not mean that different individuals will automatically make the same choices of action as a result.

Injury, in turn, can enter chains of memory. The bare fact that an injury has occurred is not enough to explain how a group will later understand and characterize it. Whether family members, coworkers, recorders, and communicators preserve materials, and how they tell the story, change whether an individual's experience can enter subsequent public judgments. The concrete ways of preserving materials and the process of telling the story both require substantive verification.

Students' reposts, discussions, and assemblies may bring the event into schools and public space, while the relevant school personnel, records, and disciplinary procedures in turn change participation costs. Platform account holders can circulate and preserve materials. Traffic restrictions, bans, and deletions imposed by platform-company personnel or review procedures block visibility; some participants may also interpret them as concealment and repression.

Permission, prohibition, arrests, negotiation, investigation, and compensation are implemented through personnel, materials, and procedures within the relevant state institutions. They change risks but do not constitute a will possessed by “the state” on its own. Different procedures may also yield inconsistent results. How participants understand them still depends on the materials and relations visible at the time.

Family members' care, attempts at dissuasion, support, and resource arrangements also lead some participants to change positions. As the pressures of rent, debt, student registration, work, and the body regain weight, some may fall silent, withdraw, move into logistical support, or change their mode of action. A movement's relational chain is therefore not a line that extends automatically. It consists of multiple sets of bearers, records, and procedures transmitting consequences across one another within a short period.

VII. Attenuation, Division, and Failure

Movements do not only spread; they also undergo attenuation, division, and failure. People who initially accepted the same slogan may later diverge over wages, negotiation, safety, state records, school disciplinary actions, and sustained action. Some wish to continue; some advocate negotiation; some prioritize safeguarding the injured person's family; and others withdraw because of rent and debt. Pressures involving family, debt, student registration, and work lead people back to their existing responsibilities. Division does not prove that the original differences did not exist, nor does failure erase the records and consequences already formed.

Slogans may no longer accommodate internal differences, coordinators may be unable to sustain trust, and participation risks may exceed what some people can bear. At the same time, platform bans cut off some circulation, and different participants may contest arrangements for the future and sacrifice narratives. These mechanisms can operate simultaneously; failure cannot be summed up in a single cause. Explaining a movement requires both explaining its emergence and tracing how trust wears away, how bridging nodes break down, and why people in different positions disperse.

An explanation of a movement must also preserve its internal contradictions. Resource allocators, propagandists, implementers, and ordinary participants may hold different judgments about aims, costs, and withdrawal. Appointments, reviews, and the allocation of responsibility within an organization may likewise produce new exclusions. These internal relations are not noise outside the movement. They are conditions of how action is sustained, redirected, or dissolved.

When new materials show that the movement image previously drawn covers only some participants, or that an assumed chain of mobilization never actually formed, the original judgments and their grounds should still be retained to explain why the conclusion needs to be narrowed, reorganized, or withdrawn. Such revision must not conceal the failure of earlier judgments by rewriting them after the fact. Nor does it require reducing the movement to total categories such as class, state, nation, or market. Explanatory images of various kinds can hold only on the basis of their own materials and within their own scope; a partial image must not be passed off as a self-sufficient entity.

The results of a revolution or movement have different levels and cannot be summed up under a single label of victory or defeat. In concrete situations, even when a policy has been corrected, harm to families and local rifts may persist; even when organizational relations disintegrate, shared memory and mutual-aid networks may remain. Demands not being accepted, members withdrawing, records becoming distorted, and subsequent write-back being revoked each belong to different levels. Only by distinguishing immediate changes, the persistence of relations, the formation of write-back, and its later renewed effects can we accurately determine which explanation needs to be narrowed, which relations still exist, and which new materials are sufficient to rebuild judgments about the event.

VIII. Historical Indices and Write-Back of Movements

Past strikes, memories of old factories, local resistance, harms suffered by a nation, and student movements may all be preserved as a movement past available for later extraction. So may state punishments, commemorations of martyrs, experiences of failure, and arrest records. Family stories, local legends, anniversaries, songs, photographs, slogans, and documents preserve other entry points. A new event does not automatically make these materials gain weight. Family members, participants, organizers, recorders, communicators, commemorative activities, and the relevant institutional procedures need to extract the materials anew within the current event. The materials' weight depends on their connection to current experiences, their verifiability, the position of those presenting them, support or refutation from other materials, and how they enter slogans, identity judgments, commemoration, punishment, or choices of action.

Extraction is not a once-and-for-all confirmation. New photographs, contrary testimony, supplementary records, and subsequent events may all require people to revise old judgments. Previously silent materials may also acquire new meanings through current rules and positions of participation.

Injury, bans, compensation, negotiation, or failure first produce present effects. When families, organizations, platforms, schools, or state procedures preserve the relevant content as differences that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. After action ends, injury, strikes, student assemblies, platform bans, compensation, and failure may in turn be preserved by families, factory managers, school personnel, platform-company personnel, the relevant personnel within state institutions, and community organizations, entering subsequent fears, experience, commemoration, and institutional handling. How the content is used in the future still depends on the bearers, relations, and procedures at that time. Only when concrete people later retrieve, interpret, or assign weight to it anew does the preserved content take effect again in a new event. The original harm does not necessarily disappear as a result, nor does subsequent action necessarily develop along the same path.

A movement can bring immediate institutional change without necessarily forming a lasting community. Equally, it may fail to change policy immediately yet establish enduring mutual aid, memory, and responsibility. Evaluating a movement's historical standing requires separately tracing institutional consequences, organizational continuity, members' relations, and the content of write-back. A sweeping conclusion of success or failure must not flatten the differences between these levels.

IX. How Movements Are Compressed into Fixed Images

Revolutions and movements are often compressed into fixed images. The class-eruption image writes action as the automatic eruption of class contradictions; the mass-emotion image writes participants as angry, blindly conformist, or out of control. The heroic image attributes consequences to the courage of a few, while the conspiracy image reduces local differences and participants' interpretive capacities to external manipulation. Interpreters adopting a state-oppression image can extract concrete materials concerning implementation and control, yet may still obscure differences within action, organizational strategies, community responsibilities, and imaginings of the future.

Class entities do not exist. Differentiating units such as labor, wages, resources, domination, debt, and risk have real consequences, and class theory and the interpreters adopting it can also extract these differences. The partial explanatory power formed through this process of extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression cannot prove that a class entity exists either as a whole or in part. Even in similar labor predicaments, people may follow different paths because of local relations, national memory, prospects for

young people, organizational nodes, and platform circulation. Differences in family pressures, sacrifice narratives, state implementation, and imaginings of the future also form different positions of participation and paths of action.

Interpreters adopting class theory and its total image cannot subsume locality, nation, youth, organization, platform, family, sacrifice, state implementation, and imaginings of the future. Class theory is neither Model A nor Model B. Its basic structure belongs to Model C's direction of total-image subsumption; it does not become Model C only upon "overuse." Acknowledging that class theory can extract certain high-weight differences does not permit interpreters adopting it to reduce event nodes, organizational nodes, slogan compression, friend–enemy divisions, participation costs, historical indices, and action write-back to subsidiary materials. Communism subsumes revolutions and movements under class entities and a total class image, continuing the same structure of subsumption. Pointing this out does not deny the real consequences of labor, debt, and domination.

X. Comparison amid Complexity and the Calibration of Movement Explanations

Although revolutions and movements are complex, different explanations remain comparable. Complexity cannot justify declaring all explanations much the same or beyond judgment. In events involving unpaid wages, wage deadlines, debt, relations among coworkers, organizational nodes, state implementation, and platform circulation may have greater weight. In student action, school evaluations, prospects for young people, public space, imaginings of the future, and risks of disciplinary action may weigh more. In action by national communities and in local resistance, participants extract different memories, boundaries, recognition, family futures, and institutional materials. The weights of the various differentiating units must be compared within concrete events; they cannot be ranked in advance by a fixed list.

Limited explanations can acknowledge omissions, counterexamples, and boundaries of application, and can be revised when new materials appear. This healthy complexity does not belong to Model C. A total class image subsuming other explanations is Model C's direction of total-image subsumption; canceling valid comparison through complexity is its direction of erasure of distinctions between explanations. Complexity enters the latter direction only when used to refuse comparison, counterexamples, revision, and provisional judgment. Calibration does not seek a total image that is always correct. It compares which explanations have extracted key differences, which have obscured nodes, and which refuse to change after counterexamples appear.

Calibration requires identifying which differentiating units the current event has extracted. Unpaid wages, strikes, student assemblies, local resistance, action by national communities, platform mobilization, commemorative activities, public conflict, or events of state implementation bring different materials into current relations. Analysts cannot characterize an event in advance through images of class eruption, mass emotion, heroism, conspiracy, or state oppression. They must examine concrete materials and their weights.

Examining the concrete links within an event requires identifying who extracts, assigns weight, connects, and communicates through which nodes. Organizers, ordinary participants, family members, and communicators each use different materials and bear different costs; recorders, reviewers, implementers, and opponents occupy other positions. Slogans, organizational classifications, and friend–enemy divisions compress differences, while photographs, testimony, posts, documents, and institutional records preserve certain explanations. Abstract terms such as "movement," "state," "platform," or "history" can serve as shorthand for relations only when their bearers are already clear. They cannot replace actual actors and procedures.

Whether positions of participation, counterexamples, and withdrawal change the original judgment must also be examined. Different demands under the same slogan, the actual constraints on those remaining silent, materials from those misidentified, failure and division, along with new records and contrary testimony, may all force the original explanation to narrow its scope or reduce its intensity. A judgment may provisionally hold, but it must retain the conditions for revision by subsequent materials. Injury, penalties, bans, compensation, negotiation, withdrawal, and failure are preserved by concrete personnel, organizations, and procedures, and thereby change subsequent judgments within families, localities, schools, factories, platforms, and state institutions. The calibration described above serves only to compare the explanations of revolutions and movements in this chapter. It provides no operating procedure for entering a relational field or performing distinction extraction. Within the relations among events, nodes, positions of participation, records, and write-back, analysts must identify which accounts can still distinguish mechanisms and which have already compressed the movement into a single image.

The overall force of a movement explanation depends on its ability to preserve both shared demands and differences in positions of participation. Materials and relations across events can support broader judgments about action, while withdrawal, division, and failure delimit their scope. The two do not cancel each other. Gathering all differences into a unified subject obscures responsibility; breaking every shared relation down into individual choices denies the real processes through which organization and action are taken up and sustained. Calibration takes place precisely between these two errors.

Whether an explanation of a movement slides toward a total image depends on whether concrete demands, positions of participation, and contrary materials can actually change its conclusions. Community action can really exist, and mistaken classifications can be revoked. Supporting a demand does not amount to authorizing an organization to speak for all members. When withdrawal, internal dissent, or interrupted relations appear, analysis must adjust the scope of representation and its causal judgments, rather than reinterpret them as proof of a unified will. Participants can form shared demands, share risks, preserve memories, and establish enduring relations; contrary materials, withdrawal, and internal dissent still retain the capacity to limit judgments. Preserving differences and counterexamples does not break collective relations apart into mutually isolated individual choices, and acknowledging action formed together does not require writing the movement as a unified personality.

Chapter 35. Limited Distinction Extraction and Entry into Concrete Relational Fields

I. Explanation Cannot Begin with an Ultimate Answer

Faced with a concrete event, explanation must first answer how to begin. Adding another domain at this point does not answer that question. After an event occurs, people often ask: ultimately, is it class, the state, the market, the nation, the family, or the platform? These images are not meaningless. Those using them can extract real differences such as labor, certification, prices, shared memory, care responsibilities, or account records, forming judgments with partial explanatory power.

Distinction extraction within a limited scope does not mean that an overall explanation is correct, still less prove that the entities named by an image exist. Analysts can extract real differentiating units such as labor, wages, property, housing, debt, risk, domination, and available exits, but cannot infer class entities from these materials. This chapter's use of limited distinction extraction does not alter the established judgment that class theory belongs to Model C from the outset. This chapter's task is simply to establish how concrete events enter analysis; it does not repeat the full argument concerning Model C here.

If interpreters settle on an ultimate answer before encountering an event, subsequent materials will serve only to fill in the predetermined image; differences, nodes, and consequences not accommodated by the image in advance may remain outside their view. An ultimate answer often offers a convenience: it quickly tells people what to look for, yet also readily leaves no place for unexpected differences. Beginning with the event may be slower, but every judgment can return to concrete materials and processes of handling. Analysts can still use images of the state, market, or family, or other images, provided they disclose their scope of validity and do not let the images answer for the event in advance.

A concrete event is not a casually chosen example. It must contain identifiable actions, people handling matters, and consequences: someone makes a demand, someone accepts or rejects materials, a particular form of eligibility is being established or interrupted, and a relationship may change as a result. Social Differentiation Network Theory begins here precisely because preliminary judgments must establish who is handling matters, how materials are required, which relations have been implicated, what differences are extracted or occluded, and which consequences have already occurred. If an event is reduced to grand terms such as “inequality,” “marketization,” or “family problems,” analysts still do not know which differences have actually entered into consequences. Across different events, moreover, the order, kinds, and intensity of the relevant dimensions vary; they are not fixed steps completed in sequence every time.

At the beginning of explanation, the accounts of those concerned, documentary records, procedural requirements, and observers' descriptions may differ. Analysts need not immediately select one piece of material as the ultimate answer, nor can they abandon judgment because materials conflict. A more reliable approach is first to distinguish who produced each piece of material, which event it concerns, what it can establish, and which parts it does not cover.

The starting point of an event may also be disputed. A child's school admission can begin when the family prepares materials or when the school refuses to accept them; an unpaid-wages event can begin when wages fall due or be traced further back to contracting arrangements and the formation of work records. Which starting point to choose depends on the question the analyst is answering. The starting point is only the entry into the current window; it cannot be presented as the sole true beginning of the whole matter.

Interpreters must also retain their own position in the account. Which materials they see, which records they cannot access, and which stretch of events they use to delimit the event all affect preliminary judgments. Acknowledging these limits does not weaken analysis. On the contrary, it allows those who come later to check the grounds for a judgment and identify where revision should begin when new materials appear.

II. The Relational-Field Window and the Unfolding of a School-Admission Event

A child in the family of a worker from elsewhere really does live in the city. Every day he leaves the residential compound where his family rents a home; his parents work nearby, and neighbors have seen him. These facts of life do exist, but school personnel cannot complete an eligibility review solely on the grounds that “everyone knows he lives here.” They require proof of residence, a rental contract, the landlord's filing, community registration, proof of the parents' employment, and continuity of social insurance, and require the family to submit the materials within the prescribed time.

Poverty and household registration may both matter, but explanation cannot stop at these two names. If the actual obstacles at present are the landlord's failure to file, the end of the application period, and the student-registration procedure not accepting materials, analysts must trace how these differences acquire weight. The fact of the child's residence has not disappeared; it has simply not been successfully extracted through materials and procedures. Entering the relational field therefore also involves identifying which differences are occluded.

This shows that the relational field is the state of relations in which a concrete event is already situated, not a frame manufactured by the interpreter. A child's school admission already implicates family cash flow, the fact of residence, the landlord's filing, community registration, continuity of social insurance, school places, application deadlines, and student-registration materials. A worker's unpaid wages already implicate contracting relations, wage records, coworkers' testimony, rent, arbitration, and family expenses. A mother taking platform orders already implicates account scores, response times, care responsibilities, bodily condition, customer evaluations, and payment records.

The relational field precedes the window because relations in an event do not wait to be named by an analyst before they occur. There are already specific actors and consequences involved in whether the landlord files, whether the school accepts materials, and whether coworkers are willing to testify. Analysts may see some of these relations and temporarily miss others. Their omissions limit the explanation but do not make those relations cease to exist.

The relational field must not be written as an entity driving the event from behind the scenes; it describes only the actual state of these relations within the event. Omitting their bearers makes it easy to misrepresent a state of relations as an actor with a will. Relations themselves do not extract or determine differences on their own. Concrete personnel, organizations, and procedures actually make demands, preserve documents, refuse to provide proof, or change eligibility: school personnel review admission eligibility on the basis of materials and link admission to student registration; landlords decide whether to cooperate with filing; community personnel register or issue proof under procedures; workplaces and coworkers provide or refuse to provide proof; and platform account records and allocation procedures change opportunities to take orders. Concrete personnel, organizations, materials, rules, and procedures jointly carry the handling and consequences within the event.

In the school-admission event, the application deadline is only a procedural condition limiting the conversion of materials; it cannot handle the event on its own. Family cash flow is a real difference affecting whether parents can take leave, make the rounds to obtain materials, and maintain housing; it likewise has no capacity

for autonomous action. Listing the school, landlord, community, deadline, and cash flow serves only to check who is handling matters, on what materials, which conditions constrain that handling, and how consequences form. It does not claim that the list exhausts every relation. The kinds of nodes, their sequence, and their weights can differ across events; these distinctions cannot be copied into a fixed procedure for every event.

A relational-field window is an analytical boundary that interpreters establish from clues in an event. It cannot be drawn arbitrarily, nor is it a container that never changes once established. Too small a window misses nodes that have already changed consequences; too large a window brings every possible background into the core analysis. Interpreters need to adjust the window in light of new materials, nodes' responses, relational changes, and consequences, allowing it both to expand and to narrow. The window carries an explicit analytical responsibility: including the landlord in the school-admission event requires explaining how filing affects residence materials; including the parents' working hours also requires showing why taking leave, submitting materials, or replying is affected. If there is no traceable connection between a background condition and current eligibility, risk, evaluation, or responsibility, it can temporarily remain outside the window.

Several overlapping windows may form around the same event. Parents care about whether the child can enter school on time; school personnel care about whether materials can enter the student-registration procedure; the landlord cares about the responsibilities that filing brings; and the analyst tries to see how these positions connect. Different windows do not mean that everyone speaks past everyone else. The materials they provide can be compared and may reveal differences invisible from a particular position of handling.

Materials have their own times of formation. A rental contract may have been signed long ago, while filing must wait for the landlord's cooperation; proof of the parents' employment comes from their workplaces, while community registration requires another set of information. If the family learns which document is missing only as the deadline approaches, the problem is not merely “incomplete materials.” It also concerns when the notice arrived, who can supplement and correct the materials, and which procedure remains willing to accept them.

Different materials may also contradict one another. The address on the contract may not match the actual residence, community registration may differ from the landlord's account, and the parents' employment records may be interrupted by job changes. School personnel must handle these differences within a limited time. Analysts cannot treat the final “approved” or “not approved” as the complete course of events; they must preserve how materials were compared, interpreted, and selected or set aside.

The family is not restricted to waiting passively. Parents may seek out the landlord to sign additional documents, ask their workplaces for supplementary proof, explain their living arrangements to community personnel, or ask the school what avenues for supplementation and correction remain. Whether these actions take effect depends on whether the relevant personnel accept the materials and whether the procedure still allows revisions. Retaining the positions from which those concerned act can prevent the family's predicament from being written as a natural outcome.

Reasons for adjusting the window should be recorded. New testimony brings contracting relations into an analysis of a workplace injury, and the window expands accordingly; materials already explain a deposit dispute, while the distant real-estate cycle has not yet changed its current handling, so the window can narrow. Such adjustment does not aim to finish everything at once. It keeps the scope of analysis close to the consequences taking shape. Materials sometimes point to different event boundaries. The school's time of receiving materials, the time parents began preparing documents, and the time the landlord refused to cooperate may each form a different starting point. Analysts must choose an entry point according to the

question asked and retain the other timelines. This both clarifies the current problem and avoids using a single starting point to occlude antecedents and subsequent developments that already exist.

The space outside the window is not blank. Background conditions temporarily excluded may still really exist; there are simply no materials currently showing that they have entered into handling. If analysts write “not included” as “nonexistent,” they mistake an analytical boundary for a boundary of reality. Conversely, if every real background condition is placed at the core, the window loses its capacity to identify present consequences. Nor must the window include the family's entire life at its core. Parents' educational expectations, the child's classroom performance, and peer relations may become important after admission. If the present dispute concerns only whether materials can enter the student-registration procedure, they can temporarily remain in the background. When the event shifts from eligibility review to classroom life and evaluation, the analytical window can adjust accordingly.

III. Limited Distinction Extraction and Verification of Candidate Differentiating Units

A differentiating unit is a unit of difference in the world that can be distinguished, represented, assigned weight, and brought into comparison, and that may be extracted, connected, transmitted, and written back within a concrete relational field, thereby changing an object's position, eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, action, or consequences. It is not a fixed factor, a variable, a smallest social atom, or a purely conceptual label, nor does it produce consequences on its own apart from real bearers. The differences in the world that can enter social events are inexhaustible. Income, household registration, age, language, educational qualifications, bodily condition, family position, familiarity with a locality, account records, debt deadlines, medical records, student registration, coworker relations, neighborhood reputation, shared memory, and silent records may all acquire relatively high weight in particular events. Potential infinity does not mean that every difference is already taking effect in reality, nor that all are equally important.

Limited distinction extraction is precisely the interpreter's extraction, from inexhaustible latent differentiation space, of the differences that currently need to be traced, on the basis of materials, people handling matters, relational chains, and consequences already implicated in the event. It is not arbitrary selection, nor does it mean that only a finite number of differences exist in reality. Inexhaustibility does not cancel comparison and judgment. Judgments can hold provisionally while remaining open to revision through counterexamples and subsequent materials.

Potential infinity means that analysts cannot list every potentially relevant difference in advance. Language, bodies, time, equipment, memory, and local relations can all be subdivided further, and the same difference can connect to new nodes. This does not require interpreters to include infinite contents at once; it reminds them not to mistake the current list for the final structure of the world. Any concrete event extracts only some of these differences. For example, school personnel require proof of residence, the landlord refuses to file, the application deadline approaches, and the student-registration procedure cannot accept the materials. These are the differences that connect in the current school-admission event and change its consequences; others can temporarily remain in the background. If subsequent materials show that certain personnel or procedures have retrieved those other differences, analysts can still revise the original window.

Whether a difference can enter analysis depends on whether clues already connect it to the event. Clues can come from requirements for materials, actions by those concerned, procedural responses, changes in eligibility, or the transmission of consequences. They can also appear in the explanations of those concerned, differences in documents, requirements raised by procedures, or sudden changes in consequences. When materials are rejected, the reasons for rejection provide new candidates; after a successful appeal, new

materials that led to the changed judgment also deserve to be traced. For example, if parents' working hours have already affected taking leave and submitting materials, they enter the school-admission event. If no relevant materials are currently available, analysts can first record them as awaiting verification rather than immediately assign them high weight. The sources of candidates should be recorded so that analysts do not write their own suppositions as known facts of the event.

Interpreters can propose candidate differentiating units on the basis of requirements for materials, nodes' responses, relational changes, the transmission of consequences, and the retrieval of records. Proof of residence, the landlord's filing, community registration, and student-registration status in a school-admission event; proof of an employment relationship, medical records, and testimony in a workplace-injury event; and contracts, transfers, photographs, and chat records in a deposit event are all merely analytical entry points awaiting verification.

The representation of a differentiating unit may also change with the materials. “Unstable residence” can serve as a summary in a preliminary account and may later be divided into lease duration, number of moves, the landlord's filing, and commuting distance. Conversely, several scattered records may be combined into a single eligibility judgment in the current procedure. Subdivision, combination, and renewed representation must all be constrained by the concrete event; there is no eternally fixed smallest unit. Candidates may therefore contain or overlap one another. “Residence materials” can include a contract, filing, and community proof; “time pressure” may take the concrete forms of an application deadline, the cost of taking leave, and the time materials arrive. Analysts can adjust the level of representation to the event's needs, but cannot treat a higher-level summary and one of its component details as two independent causes within the same comparison, creating a false impression of quantity.

Candidates are not already confirmed causes. Interpreters must still examine whether concrete personnel, organizations, or procedures have extracted a candidate, whether it has acquired enough weight to enter comparison, and whether it has traveled along relational chains and changed eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, or opportunity. A difference with only general relevance that has not yet entered present consequences can temporarily remain in the background; subsequent materials may also bring it back into the core analysis. Nor can the same difference be detached from relations and treated as a fixed factor. Household registration may enter directly into eligibility in one school-admission review but provide only background in another event. Care responsibilities may change the timing of material submission or cease to be an obstacle because someone shares them. The fact that a difference bears the same name does not mean it occupies the same position in every relational field. Analysts must trace the personnel, materials, and procedures that carry it.

Limited distinction extraction permits temporary omissions but requires that they be corrigible. If a preliminary window excludes a language difference and later communication records show that it is affecting the understanding of materials, analysts should add it. If verification shows that a candidate difference has entered neither handling nor consequences, it can also leave the core. For example, the landlord was initially thought to have refused filing, but later materials show that filing was completed and the actual problem lies in continuity of student registration; a negative review seemed to affect order opportunities, but subsequent records show that the account restriction came from another action in handling the matter. Removing a candidate that does not hold is part of revising the analysis, not proof that raising the earlier question was itself worthless. Both inclusion and removal require reasons grounded in materials. A candidate list cannot establish its completeness through length. Listing dozens of identities, resources, and backgrounds without explaining who extracts them in the current event still fails to enter the relational field. A shorter candidate set

can be more useful than a vast inventory if it corresponds to materials, nodes, and consequences. Its value depends on verifiability, not the number of entries.

Conclusions reached through limited distinction extraction can have different strengths. When materials show only that a difference may be relevant, the conclusion should remain provisional. A judgment can be strengthened only when multiple independent materials point to the same handling node and counterexamples still cannot overturn the connection. Making the strength or weakness of evidence explicit does more to keep explanations revisable than hiding what is unknown behind an assertive tone. Such limitation does not turn judgment into subjective preference.

When several analysts propose different candidates, they can return to the same body of event materials for comparison. An analysis has better-supported preliminary judgments if it identifies people handling matters, materials, nodes, and consequences more accurately; explains why materials were accepted or rejected and where relational chains broke; accommodates contrary evidence; and is willing to narrow or revise its conclusions when new materials appear. Comparison does not require every disagreement to disappear immediately, but should locate disagreements where they can be examined. A limited model that can be traced and accepts calibration can still have greater explanatory power than a closed total image or arbitrary speculation.

IV. How Causality Comes Down to Relational Connections

The impulse to seek a root cause easily compresses a complex event into a total image declared in advance. Social events still have causes, and causal analysis remains valid. Opposing a root cause declared in advance does not deny causality; it requires causal judgments to rest on verifiable connections. Interpreters need to distinguish which differences materials and procedures have already extracted, which mechanisms temporarily have relatively high weight, which relational chains can be verified, and which answers were simply declared the sole root cause before analysis began. Materials failing to arrive may interrupt an eligibility review; missing wage records may make responsibility difficult to establish; account restrictions may directly reduce opportunities to take orders. New materials can support, limit, or overturn all these judgments.

Causal judgment cannot stop at naming concepts. A child's school admission is not automatically caused by the word “poverty.” Poverty must enter consequences through rent, the cost of taking leave, the preparation of materials, continuity of social insurance, residential stability, school places, and application deadlines. Nor are a worker's unpaid wages automatically caused by the words “labor situation.” The facts of labor must pass through contracting relations, wage records, coworkers' testimony, arbitration materials, and enforcement procedures before becoming responsibilities and consequences that can be handled. Likewise, low income does not determine a mother's order opportunities on its own. Those implementing platform rules allocate opportunities to take orders according to scores, negative-review records, time online, and customer evaluations preserved in the account; care arrangements and bodily fatigue also limit when the mother can respond to orders. Only by explaining who extracts differences, through what materials they acquire weight, and how they are transmitted and change consequences does causal judgment become concrete.

An event often contains several levels of causes. The landlord's refusal to file is the immediate condition behind the current break in the flow of materials, while rental relations and local registration arrangements provide more distant conditions. Family cash flow affects whether parents can move or take leave and may in turn change the responses available to them. Compressing causes at different distances into a single level makes it harder to explain which difference acquires weight where. Causal chains may also break. Even with

a lower family income, a child may still enter school without difficulty if the landlord is willing to file, materials are supplemented and corrected, and school personnel can receive them in time. Conversely, a family whose income is not low may still be blocked by incorrect materials, a missed deadline, or problems with continuity of student registration. Counterexamples do not cancel the importance of income differences; they only limit overstrong conclusions such as “income necessarily determines the outcome.”

Talk of root causes also readily occludes positions of responsibility. If unpaid wages are attributed entirely to a distant structure, who keeps shift schedules, who confirms wages, who refuses to provide materials, and who is responsible for processing claims may disappear within the total image. Tracing concrete nodes can retain the more distant background while keeping current responsibilities and entry points for correction visible. Analysts may offer deeper explanations, but must show how they enter the current event. If the regional economy changes employment arrangements, connections through contracting arrangements, wage records, or job stability must be found; if educational resources affect places, it must be explained how those places translate into review outcomes. Without these intermediary links, macro-level concepts can serve only as provisional background.

Causes are not confined to actions that produce adverse outcomes. Someone submitting supplementary materials, being willing to testify, extending the time for accepting materials, or correcting old records may interrupt an existing relational chain and redirect consequences. If analysis looks only for sources of pressure without recording how corrections occur, it will write the event as advancing in one direction and miss the actual positions at which those concerned and the personnel handling it change the outcome.

Explanation must also distinguish actors' intentions from the consequences of their actions. A landlord's failure to cooperate with filing may arise from concerns, negligence, or refusal to bear responsibility. For the school-admission event, analysts must first establish how this action blocks materials. Intentions can enter analysis when materials support them; gaps cannot be filled with conjecture. Verifiable consequences do not mean that analysts have already grasped all of the other person's motives.

V. How Questions Change the Point of Entry: Workplace Injuries and Deposits

A worker strains his lower back while carrying goods on a night shift. A coworker saw him stop and brace himself against a wall; he visited a small clinic and may also have had imaging done. The injury really occurred, but that does not mean responsibility has been formally recognized. Personnel determining whether an injury is work-related need proof of the employment relationship, shift records, witnesses at the scene, medical records, the time of the accident, the workplace's stance, training records, and claim materials to connect the fact of injury to a determination of responsibility.

The workplace-injury entry point shows that bodily facts and institutional recognition must not be conflated. The workplace's denial of an employment relationship, medical records that do not clearly state where the injury occurred, coworkers' unwillingness to testify, or claim materials that fail to arrive may all keep the fact of injury from reaching a determination of responsibility. Lack of formal recognition does not make pain disappear, nor can the reality of pain directly replace materials required by procedures. How strongly these differences bear on subsequent eligibility, responsibility, and consequences for life will be traced fully through a labor dispute in the next chapter.

A tenant from elsewhere cannot recover the deposit when ending a tenancy. Rent, the deposit, and the landlord's bargaining power may carry relatively high weight, but those handling the dispute do not consider only the everyday fact that the tenant “lived here.” They examine contract terms, transfer records,

photographs of wear and damage to the property, repair responsibilities, the timing of the tenancy's end, the handover of keys, property-management fee arrears, and chat records.

The tenant may have moved out on time, cleaned the rooms, and returned the keys. If the contract did not specify standards for wear and damage, the deposit was paid in cash, there were no photographs at handover, and the landlord describes old wear and damage as new, actual residence and maintenance become difficult to turn into materials that mediation, complaint-handling, or litigation personnel can confirm. The facts have not disappeared; they have simply not acquired enough weight in the current procedure to change the judgment. “Wear and damage” in a deposit dispute also requires concrete representation: marks on walls, equipment malfunctions, the state of cleanliness, and missing items may be carried by photographs, handover inventories, repair records, or the two parties' accounts. When landlord and tenant interpret the same mark differently, the personnel handling the matter must check when it formed, how responsibility was agreed, and how strong a conclusion the available materials can support.

Cash payments and transfers leave different materials. A transfer can establish that a sum moved, but its purpose must still be judged alongside annotations, the contract, and chat contents. If there is no receipt for cash, later exchanges between the parties or other witnesses may also supply supporting material. The form of materials changes the difficulty of proof, but cannot be taken directly as the truth of the event.

Both parties may provide new materials. The tenant can add move-out photographs and handover messages, while the landlord can present repair documentation or contract terms. Analysts should not fix either side in advance as the only credible party. Who produced the materials, how they relate to the dispute, and whether they can be tested against counterexamples provide the basis for current judgment.

Failure to recover the deposit first constrains cash flow for the next rental, then narrows the time available to move, affecting commuting, dropping off and picking up children, job stability, and familiarity with a locality. These are immediate consequences; they do not mean write-back has already formed. If those concerned or relevant institutions preserve the outcome of the deposit's handling and the contracts, transfers, photographs, and chat records as differences that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has formed. Preservation itself does not mean these contents will necessarily govern subsequent judgments. Only when concrete personnel identify, extract, interpret, or assign weight to them anew through mediation, complaint-handling, or litigation procedures in later disputes does the content of write-back take effect again; it can then support, refute, or revise earlier judgments in light of new materials.

When the deposit event ends also depends on the analytical question. If the only question is whether the deposit can be returned, the window can close once a handling outcome has formed. If the question is how that outcome affects the next rental, cash flow, moving deadlines, and commuting arrangements enter a new relational chain. The earlier window provides materials and the later window takes up the write-back; the two need not be conflated into one infinite event.

VI. Adjusting Windows and Passing from One to the Next

When expanding the relational-field window, analysts cannot push all distant background conditions into the core analysis. A child's school-admission event can be traced back to urban policy, the regional economy, historical migration, education finance, the real-estate market, population administration, and still more distant social changes. If these backgrounds have not yet changed admission eligibility, application deadlines, school places, proof of residence, and the handling of student registration through current personnel, materials, or procedures, they need not be forced into the core.

Analysts should place at the window's core nodes and differences that have already entered actual handling through concrete personnel, materials, or procedures and changed the event's consequences. Nodes and differences that materials indicate are about to change eligibility, risk, evaluation, relations, or write-back, but that have not yet entered actual handling, should be listed as candidates awaiting verification, not brought directly into the window's core. Ordinary background should not be brought directly into the core either. If new materials confirm that candidates awaiting verification have entered handling, both the window and preliminary judgments need corresponding adjustment.

Without narrowing, analysis spreads without limit; without expansion, it misses crucial nodes. Technical tools cannot automatically supply an appropriate boundary. Interpreters must choose provisionally within concrete events on the basis of materials, counterexamples, and consequences. They must be able to explain the grounds for these choices and allow subsequent revision. Three kinds of change indicate when a window needs expansion: new materials point to another person handling matters; a new node begins to change eligibility or responsibility; or the original explanation cannot accommodate counterexamples that have occurred. If any one of these changes appears, analysts should examine whether the original boundary is too narrow. Reasons for expansion come from the event, not the pursuit of theoretical all-inclusiveness.

Narrowing also has grounds in materials. A background condition is important but has not entered current handling; a relational chain has broken and no longer transmits consequences; or a dispute, once checked against new materials, no longer makes a difference to the current conclusion. Such situations allow analysts to move the relevant contents back into the background and concentrate on nodes still operating. Different questions produce different stopping points: a study of whether a child can enter school can end its window at eligibility and student-registration handling; a study of how the admission outcome affects family life must continue to trace commuting, working hours, and cash flow. Provided the questions and boundaries are stated, the same event can admit several limited analyses without their competing for a single complete window.

The window should also distinguish the unknown from the irrelevant. When materials are lacking, analysts can say only that a difference has not yet been verified; they cannot directly declare it irrelevant. Only after verification establishes that it has not entered current handling is there reason to place it in the background. This distinction prevents insufficient materials from being written as nonexistence and keeps everything unknown from permanently occupying the core. When narrowing, it is best also to record reasons for exclusion: one background condition has no supporting materials yet; one node has been checked but has not changed consequences; one distant relation currently lacks traceable intermediaries. All three can remain outside the window, but for different reasons. When new materials later appear, analysts can identify where to re-examine without unfolding the entire event from the beginning.

Stopping expansion does not declare explanation finished. Once the current window can explain who handles materials, how differences enter consequences, and where the main counterexamples lie, while identifying what remains unverified, analysis has grounds for provisional closure. This stopping point serves the current question; it neither closes off the event nor prevents other questions from forming new windows.

After provisional closure, analysis can still reopen. New testimony, corrected records, subsequent handling, or unexpected consequences may make an old window inadequate. Reopening does not mean the earlier analysis failed in its entirety. Provided the original judgment explicitly stated the scope of its materials, it can be retained within its original range of validity, while the newly added parts undergo calibration.

Entering the relational field establishes a starting point for tracing, not a conclusion about weights. Analysts should be able to state which question about the event they are answering, which materials and people handling matters lie at the window's core, which candidates await verification, which differences temporarily

remain in the background, and which nodes and relational paths are currently identifiable. These contents have no fixed order and do not constitute an operational checklist completed once and for all.

The fact that materials have been presented establishes only that they have entered the view of those handling the matter. Extraction does not mean acquiring high weight, and a difference not being extracted does not mean it does not exist. Further comparison of how a difference changes eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, and consequences for action also requires tracing how nodes handle materials, how consequences are transmitted, how records are preserved, and whether counterexamples can change preliminary judgments. Chapter 09 has established the basic account of weight; Chapter 36 will take up comparison, recording, and calibration in actual events from this starting point. The responsibility this chapter leaves is to make the scope of limited distinction extraction and the remaining differences explicit, so that subsequent judgments of weight have materials to return to and nodes to examine, and the window can reopen when new relations or counterexamples appear.

Chapter 36. Applied Analysis of Weight: Nodes, Transmission, Records, and Write-Back

I. How Differences Gain Weight through Handling

When an event first arises, analysts may be able to establish only that several differences have entered handling, without yet knowing which carries the most weight. This provisional position does not evade judgment. Chapter 09 has already explained that weight is not a ranking of people, is not a fixed attribute that differences carry by nature, and cannot be judged apart from concrete relational fields and real consequences. This chapter retains that account. Its focus is no longer to redefine weight, but to explain how analysts can trace, compare, and calibrate the strength of differences' effects in actual events. Judging weight does not require a complete ordering at the outset. Only by clearly separating known materials, unknown aspects, and the strength of a judgment can later adjustments be made in light of counterexamples, without having to defend the first impression.

Conspicuousness does not mean weight. A difference may recur throughout an account yet change no eligibility or opportunity; another appears only once in the materials yet turns the entire handling in a different direction. Analysts cannot substitute frequency of appearance, emotional intensity, or a concept's fame for verification of consequences. What really needs to be asked is who handled this difference on the basis of which materials, and what changed afterward. The position a difference occupies also changes its weight. The same proof of residence may be no more than an archived document for a child whose student registration is complete, yet directly bear on eligibility for a child applying as the deadline approaches. The proof's contents have not changed, but the stage of the event, the handling node, and the time available differ, and so does the intensity of consequences.

Differences do not gain weight on their own; they have to be extracted by personnel, institutions, or procedures situated at nodes. Nodes are not mere background. Concrete personnel, institutions, or procedures at nodes act on materials and rules to make certain differences seen, handled, rejected, or preserved. When a child enters school, school personnel or procedures for reviewing materials handle proof of residence, student-registration status, application timing, and the completeness of materials; labor arbitration institutions check proof of employment relationships, wage records, and coworkers' testimony; platform operations or ranking procedures read account ratings, response times, completion rates, and customer reviews.

What nodes extract is not a difference laid bare outside the materials. The fact of residence has to be represented through contracts, filings, testimony, or other records; facts of labor likewise enter handling through shift schedules, wages, chat materials, or the accounts of those concerned. Forms of representation affect what personnel can see, but must not be confused with the difference itself. Incomplete materials can only limit the strength of the current determination; they cannot erase real life or labor along with it. Community personnel verify the facts of residence, familiarity among neighbors, and supporting materials, while family members also extract traces of care, support, property distribution, and responsibility from past lived experience.

If no node extracts a difference, it may temporarily remain outside the event's consequences. But not being extracted does not mean not existing—some differences become problems precisely because nodes cannot extract them. A child really lives in a place, but the fact of residence cannot be converted into school materials; a father really works, but the fact of his labor cannot be converted into arbitration materials; a

mother bears care responsibilities, but those responsibilities cannot be converted into an explanation the platform can recognize. These differences are not without weight. Their difficulty lies precisely in not being recognized by appropriate nodes. Analysts must also distinguish the weight borne by the person concerned from the weight assigned by a procedure. Pain may weigh very heavily on the worker, yet personnel making a determination may be unable to connect it to a procedure for assigning responsibility because the materials are insufficient. This does not mean that the pain is unreal or that procedural judgment exhausts the event. Both positions must be retained to explain why real differences have not become formal consequences.

Refusal itself may also provide new analytical leads. When school personnel refuse to accept materials, their reasons indicate which requirement has acquired weight; when a platform's appeal procedure does not accept an account of care responsibilities, the manner of refusal reveals which differences are excluded. Analysts must examine both the materials accepted and the points where materials are blocked. The latter often reveal how nodes narrow the reality that can be recognized.

Once a difference has been extracted, its entry into consequences must still be examined. After school personnel check proof of residence, it gains weight in that event if application rules use it to decide whether an application can be made. An account rating likewise acquires greater weight when a platform's ranking procedure reads it and adjusts recommendation positions accordingly. Continuity of social insurance affects eligibility only after eligibility-review personnel handle it according to continuity requirements; past care affects who continues to bear responsibility only after family members incorporate it into judgments of responsibility.

Weight assignment is not abstract evaluation. It is the process of handling through which concrete personnel or procedures, acting on materials and rules, bring a difference into consequences for eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, relations, or opportunity. Extracting a difference does not mean that it has already acquired high weight. If the extracted difference has not changed these consequences through current handling, its weight remains limited. Changes in consequences can serve as concrete manifestations and checks on judgments of weight, but they are not the sole criterion, still less a synonym for weight itself. Analysis must continually trace nodes, procedures, materials, recognition, refusal, authority, and concrete relational connections. It cannot first use a consequence to prove that a difference has high weight, then invoke that high weight to explain the occurrence of the same consequence.

A difference may look small, but if it determines whether materials are valid, whether an account is recommended, whether eligibility is approved, or whether responsibility falls on a particular person, it may become very weighty. Whether the landlord completes a filing appears to be only one step in renting, but if it determines whether the child's proof of residence is valid, it gains weight. A negative review on a platform appears to be only one evaluation, but if it determines subsequent recommendation positions, it gains weight. A break in social-insurance contributions appears to be only a monthly record, but if it determines whether eligibility remains continuous, it gains weight.

Even after extraction, a difference may receive only limited handling. A staff member sees a supplementary explanation yet makes the same judgment on the basis of other materials; family members acknowledge someone's past care, yet the allocation of responsibility does not change. In these circumstances, “has been seen” cannot be written directly as “has acquired high weight.” Different nodes may also handle the same difference in opposite ways. Community personnel confirm actual residence, but the school's materials procedure does not accept that kind of proof; family members acknowledge care provided, but the platform's procedure still records a slow response as a negative evaluation. Weight cannot become a numerical value

shared by all of society. Analysts must identify the node, the consequence at issue, and the kind of handling that makes a difference heavier or lighter.

II. Tracing Relations While Also Seeing Downweighted Differences

Several paths of weight formation may coexist within a single event. Admission materials affect the child's eligibility, the parents' taking leave also affects family income, and the landlord's filing connects rental and school procedures. These paths can intersect without having to be forced into a single main line. Analysts must compare the consequences each changes before judging which path currently carries greater weight.

Naming a difference does not by itself give it weight. Nodes extract differences and bring them into concrete handling; weight assignment makes them change eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, relations, or opportunity. If the consequences extend further into relational chains involving family, school, market, state, platform, or locality, their effects are transmitted outward. Once handling results are preserved, they may become historical indices for future extraction and form write-back through records. The efficacy with which the content of this write-back subsequently enters real consequences again must still be traced over time.

These observational leads are only entry points for verification, not an operational checklist that events must complete in sequence; they do not necessarily all appear every time. In concrete events, extraction and weight assignment sometimes occur almost simultaneously, and records may have existed long before the current event; after transmission along a relational chain, new people handling the matter will extract the same difference anew. Chapter 09 focuses on extraction, comparison, the assignment of operative weight, and connection to consequences in the current relational field. This chapter traces how nodes, transmission, records, and write-back allow effects to continue. Both sets of entry points must expand or contract dynamically as concrete events develop. A difference may be extracted by a node yet not be given consequences; it may change present consequences without leaving any record; some differences, though recorded, do not become apparent in the short term; others that seem small at present become very weighty in particular future events because they have been preserved. The key, therefore, is to observe how these leads actually appear in concrete events, or where interruptions occur.

Breaks between steps likewise have explanatory power. Materials have been accepted but consequences have not changed: the problem may lie in weight assignment. Current eligibility has been affected but subsequent relations have not changed with it: transmission may have stopped somewhere. A record has been preserved but no one retrieves it later: it has not entered a new event. Finding where the break occurs is often closer to reality than writing the entire chain as a smoothly running process.

Weight is transmitted onward along relational chains. If local admission policy lists rental filings or proof of residence among application materials, a landlord's lack of cooperation may first make the relevant materials difficult to produce and then affect application or admission arrangements. Establishing or updating student registration still presupposes completion of admission registration and student-registration procedures. The family will reassess whether to remain in the locality on that basis. A difference originating in the rental process thus enters education and the family's residential choices.

Wages in arrears affect debt deadlines; debt deadlines affect rent; rent affects residential stability; and residential stability in turn affects the materials for the child's school admission.

Judgments of weight cannot examine only a difference at one node; they must also check whether it continues to be transmitted. If a difference remains local, the scope of its effects may be limited. If it continues through multiple nodes, repeatedly changing eligibility, risk, evaluation, and opportunity, this can provide

observational material indicating stronger effects, but weight cannot be judged simply by the number of nodes traversed. Transmission does not mean that consequences are replicated unchanged. A negative review may take the form of fewer recommendations at a platform node and of insufficient cash flow after entering the family; residence materials bear on eligibility to apply within school procedures and turn into pressure to move when transmitted to the family. Both the form of representation and the kind of consequences may change as a difference passes through different nodes. Analysts need to explain the intervening transformations, not summarize them merely as “a major impact.”

Relational chains may also be blocked. If the landlord subsequently completes the filing, the chain originally leading toward blocked school admission may be revised; if platform personnel accept an appeal and amend the record, the negative review's effect on later recommendations may diminish. An interruption does not prove that the earlier difference never had weight; it shows only that the event's conditions have changed. Judgments of weight should be updated accordingly. Nor does a broad range of transmission necessarily give a difference the highest weight. Small consequences can continue through many positions, while another difference may appear at only one node yet directly determine eligibility. Range, duration, and the intensity of consequences must be observed separately; the number of nodes, the directness of consequences, and their severity cannot individually determine weight.

Judgments of weight must also trace differences that are downweighted, occluded, or excluded. Market pricing mechanisms may downweight time spent on care and wear on the body; state materials systems may occlude actual living circumstances; platform rating procedures may exclude care responsibilities and physical fatigue from evaluation; and school achievement evaluations may occlude adjustment after a transfer, family upheaval, and difficulties with language. Interpreters using narratives of national community sometimes downweight internal differences, while those using class theory may rewrite household registration, accounts, student registration, local recognition, and family fallback support as subsidiary materials.

Occluded differences are not therefore without weight; sometimes they produce stronger consequences precisely because they cannot be recognized. The mother's care responsibilities have not entered the platform's interpretive rules, yet have fed into slow responses and falling ratings. The father's actual labor has not entered the requirements for arbitration materials, yet has fed into the inability to resolve wage arrears, approaching debt deadlines, and strained family cash flow. The child's actual residence has not entered the school's list of materials, yet has fed into inability to apply, unstable student registration, and pressure on the family to move. Occlusion is not simple disappearance; it too produces consequences.

Analysis must distinguish several situations. A difference may not yet have left a record; materials may exist but not have been accepted by personnel; or existing classifications may downweight it so that it can appear only under another name. All these situations produce invisibility, but through different mechanisms. Calling them all “being overlooked” blurs the entry points for correction.

Nor can occlusion directly justify presuming the highest weight. Care responsibilities excluded from platform evaluation may indeed explain response times; travel distances, physical condition, or the handling of an account may also contribute to the consequences at the same time. Analysts must compare on the basis of materials and counterexamples. They cannot reverse direction and declare a difference the sole root cause simply because it was excluded. Downweighting is a relational judgment. It must identify the personnel or procedure, the representation adopted, and the differences whose entry into consequences was thereby made more difficult. Market, state, school, and platform can serve as shorthand in analysis, but concrete personnel,

organizations, and procedures still carry out pricing, registration, review, and evaluation. Only writing in this way can prevent abstract nouns from acquiring autonomous will.

III. Records Re-enter Events over Time

Weight changes with the stage of an event. In a child's school-admission event, the application window and proof of residence may carry the most weight before application; the landlord's filing, community certificates, and school places may gain weight during materials review; after student registration is established, teachers' evaluations, peer relations, and family fallback support may begin to gain weight. As the same event moves forward, new nodes and materials become involved, and differentiating units previously in the background may enter key consequences. Judgments of weight must therefore move with the event, rather than fixing a result at one point in time as the answer for the entire event. Nor is a child's failure to establish student registration smoothly this time simply an obstruction to present admission: school record keepers, subsequent transfer procedures, examination-eligibility reviewers, teachers' evaluations, and the family's judgments about moving may all extract this student-registration event anew in the future and give it consequences.

In the father's wage-arrears event, the date when wages are credited and debt deadlines gain weight when arrears first occur; proof of the employment relationship, wage records, and coworkers' testimony gain weight when the event enters arbitration; enforcement procedures and enforcement nodes gain weight after the ruling. If concrete personnel or procedures preserve the relevant wage, ruling, or enforcement results as differences that can be extracted again in the future, write-back has already formed. Preservation does not guarantee that they will necessarily take effect in the future.

Only when new personnel, organizations, or procedures handling subsequent events identify, extract, interpret, or give real consequences to these contents anew does the content of write-back take effect again, potentially changing judgments about debts, family evaluations, and local reputation once more. Analysts must separate these two moments. They cannot retrospectively make subsequent extraction a condition for the initial formation of write-back.

Historical indices give differences an opportunity to pass through time, but the past does not automatically determine the present. Judgments made by current personnel or procedures may also be preserved and written back as new records, becoming materials that can be retrieved, questioned, and corrected again in future events. Whether a difference can gain weight again in the future depends on whether it is preserved and whether later events can extract it anew. Schools may enter absences in the relevant records under student-registration or day-to-day management rules; personnel handling a matter may enter a penalty in relevant records; interrupted social-insurance contributions may appear in contribution and individual entitlement records. Different records' retention periods, permissions, and subsequent uses must be judged separately.

If a particular platform's published rules provide for negative reviews and account histories, a negative review may enter that record. One negative review on a platform account means more than receiving one fewer order that day: future ranking procedures may extract it and affect later recommendation positions, customer choices, and account levels. A family argument may remain in members' memories of responsibility. An argument over responsibility is more than that evening's unhappiness: family members may extract it again years later as a basis for judging who should care for the elderly, who owes the family, and who neglects it. A local breach of trust may also settle into reputation through acquaintances' evaluations. Records allow differences to enter the future.

For this very reason, historical records themselves also have conditions of formation. Who made the entry, when, why it was recorded at the time, and whether the person concerned is allowed to supplement it all affect how strong a judgment it can support in the future. Detached from its original event, an old evaluation may acquire weight in a new procedure beyond its original purpose. Analysts must not merely ask whether a record exists; they must also check the circumstances in which it formed. Records may conflict with one another: old materials support eligibility while new materials show that circumstances have changed; family members have different memories of past care, while a platform appeal may add explanations absent from the original evaluation. Those retrieving records now need to compare their timing, sources, and scope of application. Historical indices provide materials open to renewed examination, not unalterable verdicts.

The absence of records likewise requires careful interpretation. Missing documents may mean that an event never happened, but may also result from inadequate methods of preservation, the person concerned being unable to obtain them, or records having been lost. Analysts cannot directly equate “no materials found” with “the difference does not exist.” The strength of a conclusion must be proportionate to what can currently be verified.

Weight cannot be judged only once. As an event develops, its nodes, materials, relational chains, and consequences may all change. A difference that initially carried little weight may suddenly become crucial at a new stage; one that initially carried great weight may recede into the background at a later stage. Analysts cannot divide an event into stages arbitrarily. New personnel beginning to handle it, changes in material requirements, eligibility having been established, or consequences reaching another set of relations may all indicate a transition between stages. Analysts must explain the basis of their divisions so that others can examine exactly when a difference gained weight.

Nor do changes of stage necessarily proceed smoothly. An appeal may return an event to materials review, new medical records may force a determination of responsibility to be re-examined, and residence records may be retrieved again for a transfer even after student registration has been established. Events sometimes return to earlier nodes, but this is not mere repetition: the materials and the people bearing consequences have changed, and weight must be judged anew. An analytical report that states only the final outcome erases the movement of weight across stages. Keeping a timeline allows us to see that a difference was once crucial but later lost its effect, and when downweighted materials re-entered procedures. This temporal change is itself part of weight relations.

IV. Comparison Begins with Comparable Circumstances

Comparison of like cases can help calibrate weight. If events are similar in type and in their main conditions of handling, and outcomes also change markedly after a difference changes, there are grounds for judging that the difference has acquired relatively strong weight in the current relational field. For example, if two equally poor children have different admission outcomes because of whether their landlords completed a filing, the landlord's filing becomes a high-weight difference to trace. But comparability must be supported by concrete conditions. Two admission events at different application stages and subject to different material requirements cannot be compared directly merely because family incomes are similar. Analysts should first state the question about the event, the handling nodes, the time frame, and the available materials, then explain which differences can actually be compared. The vaguer the conditions of comparability, the weaker the resulting judgment of weight.

Chapter 35 has already developed the full entry into the relational field of a child's school admission. Here, comparison serves to calibrate weight by examining how the landlord's filing, community registration, school

places, application deadlines, and the way student registrations are accepted change eligibility consequences at different stages. Equally poor families, or families with similar household-registration positions, may also experience different outcomes because their materials and nodes differ.

If one of two workers owed wages has proof of the employment relationship and the other does not, and their handling outcomes differ, this reveals the proof node's role in that event. Two low-income mothers' circumstances may also diverge depending on whether their account ratings are stable. If care responsibilities slow one mother's responses and the platform downweights her, ratings, response times, and ranking procedures enter the consequences together.

Platform events likewise appear in this chapter only as comparisons of weight. Once concrete procedures retrieve account ratings, response times, or customer reviews, they may change opportunities to be recommended and to receive orders. Even if care responsibilities, physical condition, and travel distances do not enter account fields, they may still change responses through real constraints. Chapter 38 provides the full operational analysis of how platform records form compression, how counterexamples are accepted, and how judgments are retained or withdrawn.

Comparison of like cases does not seek a sole cause, nor is it an experimental method of mechanically controlling variables. The cases are comparable because their event types are similar and they face similar material requirements, handling procedures, and questions of consequences. What must be compared are the materials, records, relations, or nodes that actually differ. No two events are identical. Comparison can only help reveal how differences change consequences; it cannot compress reality into an experimental exercise.

Whether comparison is valid depends on whether the explanation more clearly shows which node extracted which difference, which difference acquired strength in shaping consequences, and which relational chain carried the consequences onward. Comparative results are only provisional judgments; new materials may still revise them. At the same time, comparison of like cases must allow inconsistent outcomes: a landlord's filing matters greatly in several events, yet another event may be blocked by school places or continuity of student registration. Such counterexamples prompt analysts to narrow the scope of their conclusions; they do not mean that comparison has failed. A landlord's filing can have relatively high weight under one set of conditions without thereby becoming the universal answer to every admission problem.

Comparison therefore discovers connections between differences and consequences that merit tracing; it does not automatically prove a single causal relationship. If the two events also differ in other important ways, analysts must retain competing explanations. Only when subsequent materials can show how concrete personnel changed their handling on the basis of that difference does the causal judgment gain stronger support.

V. Proof and Responsibility in Labor Disputes

Labor circumstances plainly matter in determinations of work-related injury, but circumstances are not an abstract cause: they must enter consequences through evidence, testimony, materials, determination, and compensation. Judgments of weight must trace this process. Bodily facts and formal determinations must both be retained. If a worker's injury has not been formally recognized, the pain does not disappear on its own; but the existence of pain cannot directly replace the proof required by procedures. The worker really has been injured, but for that fact to enter a determination of work-related injury requires proof of the employment relationship, shift records, witnesses at the scene, medical records, reporting requirements, and the employer's attitude. Without proof of the employment relationship, bodily pain may be unable to connect formally to the chain of responsibility.

The employer's denials must be distinguished. Acknowledging that the worker was present but denying that the injury was work-related calls for different materials to be verified than acknowledging the injury but denying the employment relationship. Summarizing all responses as “refusal to recognize” occludes where the chain of responsibility breaks. Judgments of weight should address the specific disputed point and position of handling. Bringing the fact of injury into a determination involves reporting requirements and the employer's attitude. If medical records do not specify when and where the injury occurred, those records acquire relatively high weight; if coworkers dare not testify, coworker relations and judgments of risk also gain weight.

Different materials carry different contents within procedures for assigning responsibility. Medical records document bodily condition and the time of consultation, shift materials indicate work arrangements, coworkers' testimony supplements the account of what happened at the scene, and the worker's own account preserves the pain and circumstances of injury. Any item of material may have gaps. Analysts must examine where materials support one another and where conflicts remain; they cannot let a single document answer for the whole event. The state of these materials also changes dynamically over time: previously unclear work arrangements may be confirmed through chat materials, coworkers may later be willing to come forward with an account, and new medical records may reveal continuing symptoms. Conversely, fading memories, lost records, or people's departure may make key leads harder to extract. The analytical window must be adjusted promptly as the state of materials changes.

If the wait lengthens, medical expenses, income during the period off work, and family savings may gradually gain weight, and the event's center of gravity will also shift. These consequences must be supported by materials and the actual circumstances of those concerned, not supplied from imagination. When family savings cannot sustain the wait, advance payment of medical expenses and income during the period off work amplify the weight of the entire event.

Handling results also travel into other relations: stopping work affects income, interrupted income affects medical expenses and rent, rent falling due affects residential stability, and bodily recovery affects the next job. Analysts can expand the window in light of these actual consequences. More distant structures can remain in the background for now if they have not changed current materials, eligibility, risk, or relations, but new materials may still support, refute, or revise the preliminary judgment.

The father's wage-arrears event can be analyzed through labor circumstances, arbitration and enforcement, contracting chains and cash flow, family debt, coworkers' testimony, and local relations. Wages, domination, resources, debt, and risk are real differentiating units, but they cannot be compressed into proof of a class entity. Analysts need to trace how the failure to receive wages transmits consequences to debt deadlines, rent, family materials, proof for arbitration, and enforcement nodes, rather than skipping the intervening processes and imposing ready-made categories.

Different kinds of materials have different sources and bearers. Wage records may be produced by the party using the labor, shift records or traces of work may be preserved by workers, and coworkers' testimony comes from shared experience. Different sources support different scopes of judgment. Analysts cannot let one item occlude other conflicting records merely because its form is complete. Nor do wage records, proof of employment relationships, and coworkers' testimony produce consequences on their own. Those concerned must submit materials, and relevant personnel and procedures must retrieve, review, and give them procedural consequences within current arbitration, adjudication, or enforcement events. The actions of relevant organizations or personnel in accepting, returning, requesting supplements to, or refusing to confirm materials all change the possibility of those materials entering subsequent procedures. An abstract “state”

does not carry out these actions by itself, nor do documents produce effects on their own. These actions must be located in the personnel who perform them, organizational positions, and procedural nodes.

Family pressures caused by wage arrears can explain how consequences are transmitted, but cannot in turn replace verification of the facts of labor. Debt deadlines, rent, and care arrangements may make an event more urgent, yet do not automatically prove where responsibility lies. Only by separating judgments of responsibility from consequences for life can the reality of both be retained. Different evidence, conditions for testimony, and enforcement nodes may present different counterexamples. Analysts must use these materials to judge whether the original explanation is supported or needs to be limited or revised. This conceptual composite situation does not correspond to any specific law, region, time limit, amount, or actual case.

These labor-dispute materials also show that a difference's existence, extraction, acquisition of weight, formation of write-back, and subsequent renewed effect do not occur at the same moment. Once shift schedules, medical records, wage records, chat materials, or testimony are preserved as materials that can be extracted again, write-back has already formed. Only when concrete personnel in arbitration, determination, appeal, or enforcement positions later retrieve them anew and change responsibility or eligibility do they enter real consequences again.

VI. Comparing Material Chains in Medical Insurance Reimbursement

Access to information itself may also enter consequences. Some people know early that a filing is required, while others discover missing materials only at settlement. Whether relatives can accompany them and whether those concerned can submit materials repeatedly also affect procedural progress. These differences may enter judgments of weight only when supported by concrete actions and records; analysts cannot infer them from identity or status on their own. This example serves only to explain general mechanisms and does not correspond to any particular region, institutional provision, or actual case. Different procedures may use different materials, so these requirements cannot be treated as a fixed checklist. What must actually be verified is which materials current personnel required, which requirement changed the reimbursement result, and whether those concerned had an entry point for supplementation or appeal.

In medical insurance reimbursement, illness itself may be the most conspicuous element, but reimbursement nodes read more than pain and medical condition. Reimbursement procedures read the place of insurance enrollment, filing processes, hospital grades, disease catalogs, referral formalities, continuity of contributions, completeness of receipts, and the capacity to advance cash. With the same illness, one person settles the expenses smoothly because filing was timely, the hospital grade meets requirements, and receipts are complete; another is pushed into debt by a missing filing for treatment away from the place of insurance enrollment, a catalog mismatch, or insufficient cash to pay in advance. Occluded differences here include the ability to obtain information, relatives' time for accompaniment and care, transport costs, and the capacity to wait. Judgments of weight must examine not only an illness becoming more serious, but also which differences in people's lives reimbursement nodes have downweighted.

Medical condition, procedures, and cash flow may form several intersecting relational chains. Medical condition changes treatment needs, procedures determine which expenses can be processed, and the capacity to pay in advance limits how long those concerned can hold on. Analysts can trace each chain separately, then compare which currently changes the most important consequences. Putting everything under “illness” or “the system” loses the intervening positions of weight assignment.

VII. Counterexamples and the Calibration of Weight

Judgments of weight are not completed once and for all. Analysts may initially consider income differences the weightiest, only to discover later that student-registration nodes and application deadlines are the actual obstacles. Household registration may also be given excessive weight: people in the same household-registration position experience very different consequences because landlords' filings, community registration, and school places differ. When platform ratings appear to be the weightiest, new materials may show that care responsibilities, physical condition, and travel distances explain why ratings fell. Counterexamples provide entry points for calibrating weight; they cannot be treated as enemies of explanation. A judgment of weight unable to handle counterexamples becomes a new fixed image.

Counterexamples can indicate several different problems. One may show that a difference originally given importance did not in fact enter consequences; it may reveal that an omitted node is more crucial, or prove that the original conclusion holds only under narrower conditions. These situations call for different revisions. Analysts need not abandon the entire explanation because of one counterexample, but neither can they merely force it back into the original conclusion and refuse to change the scope. Responses to counterexamples must leave changes that can be examined. Which materials were added, which node thereby entered the window, and to what extent the original judgment of weight was lowered or raised should all be made clear. If new materials change only secondary aspects, the core judgment can be retained; if they sever the original relational chain, the conclusion must be rewritten. Calibration aims to keep judgment close to the event; it cannot serve to save a theory's face.

The objections of those concerned may also be sources of counterexamples. A worker points out that shift records omit night shifts; a parent reports that the school did not accept supplementary materials; a person taking orders explains that a negative review arose while they were handling a care event. Such accounts cannot automatically be accepted as valid because of the speaker's identity, but they must enter verification. Analysts must seek the relevant records, procedural responses, and changes in consequences before deciding whether an account can revise the existing judgment.

Applying weight can neither allow a single image to announce the answer in advance nor cancel comparison because differences proliferate. When using limited images of the state, market, family, or nation, analysts can make judgments within a limited scope about concrete questions, and differentiation bias can occur in all such uses. Analysts must disclose which differences they have extracted through these images and which materials and contents they have omitted, explain the scope within which their conclusions hold, and return them to concrete nodes, procedures, and consequences for examination. Acknowledging bias aims to revise models. It neither means that all images are indistinguishable nor that society can be explained only by one total image. The characterization of class theory and Model C follows the established judgment in Chapter 26: they are not placed alongside ordinary limited images, nor are the two mechanisms rewritten here.

Weight helps interpreters make limited, revisable judgments among potentially infinite differences. It is not a number fixed in advance, does not give differences permanent ranks, and does not compress complex events into score sheets. Understanding weight requires tracing, within concrete events, how differences are extracted, given consequences, and transmitted along relational chains, and observing how they are recorded and written back, and how they change as stages advance. Comparison of like cases can make certain weights apparent, while counterexamples may compel existing judgments to be recalibrated. Analysis must also identify which differences are occluded at the same time that another is assigned greater weight. Weight forms within events and changes with nodes, consequences, relational chains, records, and counterexamples.

When completing a judgment of weight, analysts are responsible for stating the materials currently relied upon, the people handling the matter, the event's stage, counterexamples, and what remains unverified. A conclusion can be clear without pretending to hold forever. Once a subsequent event retrieves new historical records, changes the handling nodes, or produces different consequences, the original judgment should be reopened. As long as weight analysis rests on concrete personnel, materials, procedures, and consequences, and accommodates examination through comparison and counterexamples, it can remain an analytical relation without becoming a new social entity.

Chapter 37. Calibrating Applications of Community: Types, Relations, and Boundaries

I. Is There Already a Relation Beneath the Name

Building on the basic terms established in Chapter 16, this chapter does not repeat the definitions and thresholds. It turns instead to concrete materials: has a relation called a family, locality, nation, platform, or movement actually formed traceable interaction, memory, recognition, responsibility, protection, punishment, boundaries, and write-back? Who carries these mechanisms, and in what events do they produce consequences?

A common name can be an entry point, but it is insufficient to certify a real relation. The same surname does not necessarily form a real family community; the same local identity does not necessarily form a local community; the same national name does not mean that every pair of members has a direct relation of responsibility; and the same platform group name does not guarantee that members already have continuing interaction and write-back mechanisms. Similarity is not connection; belonging to the same category is not belonging to the same network.

People who give names, registration personnel, group administrators, or movement organizers may use a name to convene members, and members may use it to recognize one another. But before these mechanisms have formed, a name can at most produce an imagining and short-term mobilization; it cannot by itself prove that a community already exists. Whether a name can continue as a community depends on whether members interact repeatedly, whether recorders preserve shared experience, whether the people involved assign responsibility and maintain boundaries, and whether these materials are retrieved again in later events. As interaction, memory, responsibility, and write-back gradually form, a name that originally served only for classification may also become an index of a real relation. Judgment must be revised with the materials; a name does not complete certification automatically.

For precisely this reason, one name may encompass several networks that are not connected to one another. People who use the same local designation may not know one another and may not share reputation or responsibility. Members covered by the same national name, by contrast, may form connections through layered relays involving different families, languages, rites and customs, and commemorations. A name provides an entry point for searching for materials; analysts cannot merge these relations in advance on the strength of the name alone.

Conversely, people with different names may form a real community. People who live together over a long period, care for one another, bear risks, and preserve memories may still recognize one another and make demands of responsibility in concrete events even without a uniform self-designation. Identifying a community requires tracing the mechanisms that maintain relations; it cannot use only whether members adopt the same label as its criterion.

Real communities can exist. A community is neither a naturally completed whole nor an actor possessing a unified will; it is a set of mechanisms jointly maintained by members, organizers, recorders, interpreters, and various arrangements of relations. These mechanisms differ in strength, depth, and duration, and may be reactivated or gradually weaken in different events. Long-term care by family members, repeated testimony by local acquaintances, and the preservation of shared memories by members of a nation can all produce concrete consequences; these consequences do not require the community itself to have a will. Recognition,

the assignment of responsibility, protection, and exclusion are always carried out by concrete members, organizers, recorders, and procedures within it.

When identifying these mechanisms, analysts must face the limits of knowledge imposed by the range of available materials. A researcher may encounter only public ceremonies and not private care, or read only formal records and be unable to obtain the account of an excluded person. Acknowledging such limits does not cancel judgment; it preserves a proportionate level of force so that later counterexamples can show where the conclusion should be revised.

Applied judgment should therefore distinguish three levels. A descriptive community name can help locate an entry point into the materials; an actual relational network must be supported by concrete interactions and consequences; and a community image that has been essentialized, bloodline-based, or personified turns a name into a natural, unified subject by mistake. These three cannot substitute for one another. Removing essentialism from an image absolutely does not mean denying that real relations have formed.

II. How Does Connection Take Shape, and How Deep Can It Continue?

A family can form a real community, but the name family itself cannot prove in advance that a community exists. Family members and caregivers form longer relational chains through long-term life together, care, arrangements concerning property, responsibility, and kinship evaluations; they also quarrel and divide tasks, and may form continuing connections and write-back. These directions must be traced through concrete materials, not checked off on a fixed list. Concrete members, caregivers, or organizers who form a community can support other members, but they may also use protection and past contributions to demand obedience, or even oppress people who withdraw or dissent.

A local community is not the name of an administrative area or a household-registration label. Local acquaintances, neighbors, landlords, witnesses, and evaluators maintain relations through repeated encounters, testimony, evaluation, the circulation of reputation, guarantees, and spatial visibility. They may protect acquaintances, but may also exclude newcomers, strangers, people with bad reputations, and people without guarantors. These connections may also weaken through migration, population movement, and platformization.

A national community is real and must not be reduced to subjective imagination merely because it contains indirect interaction. A national community is not a bloodline essence, a state registration, a homogeneous whole, a mere label produced by local identification or platform tags, nor an automatically formed unified personality. It does not require every member to know every other member directly; internal differences and shared connections can exist at the same time.

Members of a nation and the various relays among them maintain real relations through long-term interaction, shared memories, shared harms, shared protection, and experiences of responsibility and boundaries. They also do so through families, localities, language, rites and customs, marriage, migration, commemoration, and intergenerational narratives, as well as through concrete people, materials, and procedures in schools, media, and state institutions, which form long-term relays and intergenerational write-back. Members may still occupy different positions and hold different standpoints, interpretations, and responsibilities. Registration by a state institution is only one kind of concrete material and procedure, not the sole certification of a national community's reality.

A platform group is not necessarily a real community. A weak or partial community may form only when group owners, administrators, account holders, and members, through messages, mutual aid, evaluations,

blocking, and the preservation of information, preserve records over time, continue to help one another, form stable recognition, and can provide protection, impose punishment, and write members' conduct back into later relations. This differs from a group that only exchanges information briefly. Some group owners, administrators, and members have in fact formed such weak or partial communities in concrete practice through continuing mutual aid, shared risks, shared records, and stable recognition.

In social movements, movement organizers, ordinary participants, logistical supporters, people who withdraw, and dissenters may likewise form mechanisms of an action community through concrete events, slogans, organizational nodes, shared risks, and narratives of sacrifice, by gathering, reposting, bearing risks, and providing logistical support in shared risk and action. These mechanisms are not irreversible, however. Rising risks, internal differences, organizational rupture, and future disagreements may cause these relations to weaken.

Family, locality, nation, platform, and movement are only several kinds of relation used in this section to display differences among mechanisms; they must not become an exhaustive and closed list. In real events they may connect to and overlap with one another, or only some of their mechanisms may actually enter into consequences. These communities are not one kind of entity recurring in different places. They are maintained by different people, materials, nodes, and relational chains, forming different boundaries, pressures of responsibility, and forms of write-back, and must be judged separately. The core of analysis is to trace whether interaction produces substantive consequences. Two people appearing in the same space, a group using the same label, or several accounts entering the same group cannot directly prove a community relation. Strictly speaking, interaction must be carried out by concrete members and produce traceable consequences in recognition, responsibility, evaluation, protection, punishment, or boundaries.

Frequency of contact is not the sole standard for determining a community. Some members interact frequently and densely in everyday life but do not preserve memories for one another or bear responsibility; other members do not know one another directly and may nevertheless maintain long-term relations through family, language, rites and customs, commemoration, and other relays. The point is how interaction connects, not simply how many contacts occur. Indirect interaction must rely on traceable relay mechanisms: accounts by ancestors, language use, the practice of rites and customs, commemorative activities, and cross-locality communication can bring people who do not know one another into the same relation of memory and responsibility. Who maintains the relay, how materials are preserved, and whether later people continue to retrieve them all affect the depth of the connection. Merely saying orally that “everyone shares a culture” is not enough to explain the concrete existence or efficacy of this relational chain.

A single interaction may also have very strong consequences, but that does not allow us to infer directly that a community has formed. When strangers help one another in danger, real protection is produced. If there is no continuing recognition, memory, or write-back of responsibility afterward, the action may remain a single event. Only when the action is properly preserved by the people concerned and retrieved again in later relations can it become a starting point for the formation of a community. Analysts cannot equate the isolated consequence of rescue in a crisis directly with a community mechanism that continues to operate.

Strength, depth, and duration are not the same thing. A short-term action community may provide strong protection in a high-risk event and then rapidly weaken after the event ends; a family or national community may continue for a long time while direct responsibility between some members remains weak. Analysts must describe these dimensions separately and cannot convert a long history directly into high intensity.

The strength of a community cannot be measured by one type of community as a fixed scale. Whether interaction continues, who preserves memory, whether protection and responsibility actually occur, how

boundaries are maintained, and whether records can be retrieved again in future events all have to be compared item by item. Counterexamples and new materials can still revise the judgment. Interaction, memory, protection, responsibility, boundaries, and write-back can provide dimensions of comparison, but they are not suited to a fixed score because the materials may not support precise quantification. A more defensible formulation is to state in which event and with respect to which consequence a community mechanism appears stronger or weaker, while retaining what has not been verified. A community may also show different depths in different members: a core caregiver may bear long-term responsibility, while a peripheral member is activated only in a commemoration or dangerous event. Both are connected to the community, but the strength of their relations differs. Assessment of the whole cannot look only at the most active person, nor can it use the most distant member to deny all connections.

III. When Does Memory Fall Silent, and When Does It Become Weighty Again?

For community mechanisms to pass through time, someone must preserve the past and materials must carry memory. In family relations, members tell who cared for whom, who owed what to whom, and who remained silent at a crucial moment; relatives make demands of responsibility when dealing with eldercare, loans, illness, or the division of a household. In local networks, acquaintances preserve evaluations of reliability or breach of trust through testimony and reputation, and local evaluators may retrieve these evaluations again in a current event.

Members of a nation, practitioners of a language and rites and customs, participants in commemorative activities, and relevant recorders write shared harms, protection, migration, and experiences of boundaries into narratives or other records. Members of the nation and participants in commemorative activities then reinterpret shared memories in events involving language, boundaries, commemoration, or humiliation.

In platform networks, group owners, administrators, and members preserve group activity through chat records, transaction records, evaluations, and screenshots, and may retrieve chat records in complaints, bans, mutual aid, or pile-ons. Participants and organizers of movements preserve experiences of action, narratives of sacrifice, and taboos, and when risk rises they reevaluate statements, silence, withdrawal, and logistical support.

Community mechanisms need not operate explicitly all the time. Many relations are silent in ordinary periods; only in illness, debt, boundary conflict, public humiliation, platform disputes, movement events, or external pressure do the people involved retrieve kinship relations, care records, shared memories, group records, or narratives of sacrifice. Retrieval is not an automatic reaction. The past does not automatically determine the present. Only when family members, local evaluators, participants in commemorations, group administrators, or movement organizers retrieve old narratives, reputations, rituals, screenshots, or other records in a current event and give them new consequences do historical materials become weighty again.

Shared memory is not only warmth. Care and mutual aid can be remembered, but so can harm, debt, humiliation, exclusion, pile-ons, and coercion. What recorders preserve and ignore, and how interpreters arrange the materials, affect members' positions in later relations. Shared memory often contains disputes: different members may remember different parts of the same harm, and may offer opposite accounts of who provided protection and who should bear responsibility. Analysts need not smooth away disagreements to prove a community. If a dispute itself is preserved over time, repeatedly answered, and changes members' positions, it is also part of a community mechanism.

A medium of preservation does not maintain memory by itself. Photographs, genealogies, chat records, rituals, and commemorative places participate in present recognition only when concrete people use them.

Materials may be lost, displayed selectively, or reinterpreted by a new generation. When identifying shared memory, analysts must look at the preserver, the retriever, the silent person, and the person who raises an objection at the same time.

Forgetting may also be part of a community relation. Someone may deliberately suppress an unfavorable memory; some experiences may fade because no recorder was available; and other contents may lose their opportunity for retrieval after members disperse. Analysts must distinguish shared memory that never formed, memory that once existed and then weakened, and memory still preserved by a small number of members. These have different meanings for the continuity of a community. Members' silence also has different causes: they may temporarily face no event requiring a common response, or may stop participating because of fear, disappointment, migration, or an interruption of relations. To judge whether a community has weakened, one must see whether interaction, memory, responsibility, and boundaries are continually losing their carriers. A period without public activity is still insufficient to declare that a community does not exist.

The same historical material can acquire different strength in different events. Activation is usually selective: illness may retrieve memories of care, a loan may retrieve an evaluation of creditworthiness, and a boundary conflict may retrieve narratives of shared harm and protection. The same community will take out different materials in different events; the content shown by one activation cannot be treated as its entire structure. A relation that does not appear in this event need not be judged to have disappeared permanently. Responses from those concerned, new materials, and alternative interpretations can support, refute, or revise an existing record. Members may accept an established interpretation, or they may offer new materials, point out omissions in the record, and refuse disproportionate demands of responsibility. Community mechanisms can therefore be activated, revised, weakened, or dissolved; they are not permanently fixed by the past.

IV. Who Can Recognize Members and Interpret Shared Memory?

Positions of community membership may be central, peripheral, or temporarily participatory. Some people bear care or recording work over a long period; some provide support only in a particular event; and some maintain a connection through language and memory while rarely entering organizational activity. All these positions may be real. If people are divided only into “members” and “non-members,” many differences in responsibility and cross-boundary relations disappear. A member's withdrawal and re-entry must be traced separately: stopping participation may have interrupted responsibility, or the person may still be constrained by old records and the expectations of others. When an excluded person leaves an organization, other connections in family or national relations do not necessarily disappear at the same time. Who recognizes the withdrawal, which records are still retrieved, and whether interaction later resumes will all change the judgment of the boundary.

Community relations form positions of membership, but recognition and exclusion must both be carried out by concrete people and procedures. Power within a community appears in who is entitled to interpret shared memory, certify a membership position, declare deviation, assign responsibility, and draw boundaries. Family members evaluate who looks after the family; parents, elders, or caregivers may judge who has fulfilled a responsibility. Local acquaintances judge who is reliable; acquaintances, neighbors, landlords, or local elders may provide testimony, guarantees, or negative evaluations. Group owners and administrators may invite, mute, or remove an account; group owners, administrators, and active members may also rely on platform rules and related records to change an account's visibility and membership status.

Portes discusses how network relations may produce exclusion, excessive demands on members, and restrictions on freedom. Elinor Ostrom examines the roles of conditional cooperation, punishment,

information about past behavior, and rules in collective action. Neither account supports a unified will of the community or entails that community demands are naturally legitimate.

A national community's membership positions cannot be decided automatically by a name. Its interpretive power is carried by many kinds of people, materials, and procedures. Family narratives, the practice of language and rites and customs, concrete people in schools and media, commemorative rituals, and community organizers may all affect how shared memory is preserved and retrieved. Families, practitioners of language and rites and customs, concrete people in schools and media, participants in commemorative activities, and community organizers participate in recognition through memory, language, experiences of boundaries, and responsibilities of protection, and may interpret silent people, dissenters, people who withdraw, or peripheral members differently. Records and procedures in state institutions may also affect how shared memory is preserved and retrieved. State registration can produce real consequences, but it cannot monopolize or create the whole reality of a national community.

In a movement, organizers and participants recognize members on the basis of action, the bearing of risk, or a standpoint. Movement organizers, slogan-makers, core participants, and interpreters of narratives of sacrifice may also judge who is a member, who has withdrawn, and who is regarded as having deviated. Ordinary participants, logistical supporters, people who withdraw, and dissenters may not accept these judgments; their responses and counterexamples must enter the analysis. The power to certify is real power, not an unquestionable truth. Recognition may be real and unfair, and exclusion may be effective and unreasonable. Analysts must state who makes the judgment, on what materials, whether the person concerned can respond, whether peripheral members can offer alternative interpretations, and whether an excluded person still has a possibility of re-entry or correction of their position. Explaining a real mechanism does not mean granting it legitimacy in advance.

Interpretive power is usually distributed across different positions. In a family, elders may control old narratives, actual caregivers may control everyday experience, and younger members may offer new materials not covered by old records. Within a national community, families, practitioners of language and rites and customs, participants in commemorative activities, and organizers may likewise interpret the same memory differently. A louder voice cannot be treated as the community's sole will merely because it is louder.

Access to materials affects the power to certify. An administrator may see a complete chat history while an ordinary member retains only fragments; personnel in a state institution may control registration materials, while family and local members preserve another set of memories of life. Who can submit, consult, preserve, or delete materials changes which interpretation more readily acquires consequences. This asymmetry must be explained rather than hidden beneath an abstract “community determination.” Even when a formal account occupies the higher position, informal memory need not be canceled. Registration, an organizational announcement, or an administrative decision can directly change eligibility, while family testimony and local evidence may preserve interaction not covered by formal materials. The two kinds of material have different strengths of consequence and may also refute one another. The identifier must describe them separately; official status must not be equated with completeness.

V. How Does Protection Become a Demand of Responsibility?

When community mechanisms are real, they usually produce protection through concrete members. Whether protection exists depends on concrete actions and the costs borne. Verbal support may provide emotional support, while care, shelter, guarantees, or sharing risks can change more direct consequences. Both may be real, but their strength differs. Analysis must therefore neither write one statement of support as long-term protection nor deny support that has occurred because protection is incomplete.

In family relations, caregivers look after the sick, support children, pay expenses in advance, or intervene on someone's behalf. Family members may demand responsibility for caring for elders, repaying a favor, or maintaining dignity. But protection may also be reinterpreted by the person making the current demand as a reason for obedience; relatives may use past care to demand repayment.

In local acquaintance networks, acquaintances provide testimony, introductions, guarantees, and reminders, and may also demand that people keep faith, help acquaintances, or protect a reputation. A protection mechanism may likewise be reinterpreted by the person making the current demand as a reason for obedience; local evaluators can turn recognition by acquaintances into exclusion of outsiders.

Within a national community, members and related organizers may provide shelter in danger; participants in commemorations and recorders preserve shared experiences; and members may make demands of shared responsibility. Members and organizers may demand that history be remembered, members protected, or shared dignity maintained. In this process, organizers may use protection as a reason to downweight internal differences.

Within a platform group, members provide information, mutual aid, reposts, and support, while group owners and members may demand responses, reposts, or compliance with group rules; members may turn mutual aid into a pile-on. In a movement, participants provide logistics, care, and risk-sharing, while organizers and participants may demand participation, support, silence, or the bearing of risk. In the name of unity, organizers may misrecognize those who remain silent and those who withdraw.

Punishment is the other side of protection: who carries it out, against whom, on the basis of what records, whether its intensity is proportionate, and whether members can refuse or contest it all require continuing examination. Punishment is not limited to formal expulsion. Silent treatment, withdrawal of help, negative reputation, refusal to testify, or repeatedly retrieving an old mistake may all change a member's position. These consequences must be supported by the actions and materials of concrete people. A community does not punish anyone by itself, and an abstract name cannot replace a concrete judgment of responsibility.

Protection can certainly form shared responsibility, but a protected person does not thereby automatically bear unlimited responsibility. Being within the same network only makes shared responsibility possible; it does not mean that all members automatically bear equal responsibility. Who provided protection, who has the capacity to bear responsibility, who is directly connected to the event, who is only a peripheral member, and who has withdrawn or raised an objection all change the object, proportion, and strength of responsibility. A common name cannot flatten members in different positions into completely equal responsibility.

Responsibility requires a definite object, scope, and time. Whom a member cared for, what help they once received, and whether they currently have the capacity to bear responsibility all affect the force of a demand. The position of a remote member differs from that of a direct participant, and a person who once provided protection cannot be given the same power to make demands as someone who merely shares a name. Dividing responsibility equally among all members only cancels real differences within a community. In the face of a concrete demand, the person addressed may accept, refuse, negotiate, or offer a counterexample.

Past protection and recognition may support a demand of responsibility, but new materials may also revise it; a demander cannot extend responsibility into an unlimited duty solely from membership. The pressure of responsibility is part of a real community mechanism, but whether it is justified and proportionate must still be judged within the concrete relation and event.

Refusing responsibility does not necessarily mean leaving a community. A member may oppose the proportion of a particular demand, question an old record, or point out other obligations they are bearing. If these responses enter discussion, they may instead show that responsibility is still being negotiated. Refusal may be connected to community decline only when interaction, recognition, protection, and memory are interrupted over a long period.

VI. How Do Boundaries and Records Change Positions?

Community boundaries have real consequences. They may be formed by kinship, familiarity, shared memories, language and rites and customs, risk, responsibility, platform permissions, or relations of action. Family members, local acquaintances, practitioners of language and rites and customs, group administrators, and movement organizers retrieve these materials in concrete events to judge who may enter, who is protected, and who must bear responsibility. Boundaries can protect and can exclude. Who draws a boundary, what materials are used, how it is enforced, whether contestation is allowed, and how the result of drawing the boundary is recorded and written back into future relations are all part of its actual operation. A group with no boundary at all is unlikely to form a community; a boundary that is too hard may oppress both internal members and outsiders.

A boundary is not an eternal essence. A new member may gain a position through continuing interaction and relations of responsibility; an existing member may withdraw or be excluded; and peripheral members and cross-boundary relations may connect several communities at once. Boundaries are maintained, but they also change through new materials, responses from members, interrupted relations, or renewed acceptance.

Community boundaries can be layered. Someone may be recognized as a member in culture and memory but not appear on the formal roster of an organization; another person may have a registered position without continuing interaction or a relation of responsibility. Each boundary produces its own consequences, and neither layer can substitute for the whole judgment. State registration is material that may acquire high weight; it is not the sole source of a community. Boundaries often overlap. Family relations can cross localities; a national community can cross state borders; and a platform group may connect members from different localities and nations. Crossing a boundary does not automatically erase an existing community, nor does it guarantee that a new community has formed. Analysts must see in which layer of relation concrete interaction and responsibility fall.

A community boundary need not remain visibly prominent in everyday life. Everyday dealings may be quite open, while the people involved distinguish inside from outside only in an event involving resource distribution, danger, commemoration, or responsibility. Which person activates a boundary in which event is more explanatory than the abstract question “Where is the boundary?” Different events may also retrieve different boundaries.

Write-back has formed when the outcome of handling within a community is preserved by concrete members, recorders, or procedures as a difference that can be retrieved again later. Preservation does not mean that it will necessarily be used in the future. Only when members, organizers, or procedures in a later event reidentify, retrieve, interpret, or give these contents real consequences does the written-back content become effective again. Later retrieval is not a condition for write-back to be established for the first time.

Write-back is completed by concrete recorders, materials, and later retrievers. These materials change a member's position only when they are retrieved again in a later event and given consequences. Family members preserve care, property distribution, and actions at crucial moments through narratives and family records; relatives may bring up years later a refusal to provide care. Local acquaintances preserve evaluations of reliability or breach of trust through testimony and reputation; local evaluators may cite a past breach of trust again.

Members of a nation and participants in commemorations write statements, protection, deviation, and sacrifice into narratives or related records. Group owners, administrators, and members preserve group action through chat records, screenshots, evaluations, and ban records; group administrators may retrieve a past statement or screenshot.

Movement participants and organizers preserve participation, withdrawal, opposition, and logistical support. A participant may reinterpret a single silence. The interpretation made by the retriever cannot directly prove the motive of the person concerned.

The person concerned may point out an error in the record, add an omitted action, or offer a different interpretation of silence, withdrawal, or opposition. New materials may support an old record, or lower, change, or revoke its consequences. Write-back affects future positions but is not a permanent final decision. It may also change how later people understand an earlier event. If a withdrawal once preserved as “deviation” is accompanied by new materials showing the risks faced by the person concerned, family or organizational members may rewrite the original evaluation. The consequences once produced by the original record do not disappear for that reason, but future recognition and responsibility may change. That is precisely why write-back can be calibrated again.

A missing record cannot be treated as negative evidence either. Care may have left no documents, local mutual aid may exist only in oral accounts, or part of a chat history may have been deleted; all of this limits verification. Analysts may lower the force of a conclusion and look for other carriers, but cannot directly infer that interaction never occurred. Absence of material and material proving absence are two different situations.

The object of write-back must also be specified. A record may change eligibility within one organization only, or it may travel through family narrative or local reputation into other relations. The broader the range of transmission, the more necessary it is to verify who retold the interpretation in the middle and who accepted it. A record does not cross a community by itself; concrete members and procedures always carry the connection.

VII. How Does One Person Face Several Communities?

In a general composite situation presenting multiple positions, a young worker may at the same time be a family member, an outsider in a locality, a member of a nation, a platform account holder, a member of a group of fellow workers, and a movement participant. This does not point to a particular person or a verified event. People within these relations may make conflicting demands: family may ask the person not to take risks, fellow workers may ask the person to testify, and movement organizers may demand a statement of position. At the same time, group administrators and members may preserve the person's statements, while people and procedures in state institutions may record the person's actions. Analysis must trace these concrete demands and recorders separately; it cannot merge them into the unified will of one community.

Multiple communities are not a row of parallel labels. One network provides protection while another may demand action; one relation demands silence while another may demand testimony. In comparison, it is

necessary to distinguish who makes which demand, which materials are retrieved, and which responsibilities conflict, and to see how the person's choices are written back into a future position by different recorders. The person concerned is not merely a passive bearer of multiple demands. They may choose which members to ask for help, refuse a responsibility, or use material supplied by one community to answer a demand from another. These actions may change the weights of different relations and may produce new recognition or exclusion. Analysts must preserve the person's position as an actor, rather than merely listing identities.

Conflict may also force a community to redraw its boundaries. Testimony by fellow workers worries a family, movement participation affects the position of a platform account, and local reputation may alter an opportunity for work. Each chain of consequences has different carriers. Combining them as “social pressure” loses the position of responsibility and makes it impossible to see which relation provided protection.

VIII. Illusory Construction, Real Consequences, and the Limits of Judgment

A common name, a common enemy, a common emotion, a common slogan, common registration, and short-term intensity of circulation may all serve as entry points to a community. People who name, mobilize, register, or participate in circulation may use them to form a temporary connection, but a temporary connection cannot replace long-term interaction, preservation of memory, distribution of responsibility, generation of boundaries, and write-back mechanisms. An illusory community construction describes a temporary connection as a long-term mechanism, a common name as shared responsibility, and a common emotion as shared memory.

A shared identity name, common emotion, or common enemy cannot directly prove a real community. Mobilizers may use a common enemy to convene a crowd, and short-term emotion may produce exclusion, attack, or obedience; these consequences must be acknowledged. They prove that mobilization and classification have force, but do not automatically prove that a long-term community has formed. If a short-term action is later preserved, retrieved repeatedly, and turned into a relation of responsibility, the judgment must change accordingly. The existence of an illusory construction likewise cannot deny traceable real mechanisms within family, local, national, platform-group, or movement communities.

A real community is not naturally legitimate. Concrete members and organizers may provide protection and may also impose oppression; recorders may preserve shared memory and may also ignore counterexamples; people making demands of responsibility may sustain mutual aid and may also create coercion; people maintaining boundaries may protect members and may also exclude outsiders and internal dissenters. Judgment of reality must be separated from judgment of legitimacy.

Checking in the reverse direction which mechanisms are missing from a claim about a community is an important route for identifying an illusory construction. If there is only a name without continuing interaction, only emotion without a carrier of memory, only slogans of responsibility without actual protection, or only boundary exclusion without write-back among members, the judgment of the community's reality is weakened. The absence of one mechanism does not require an immediate judgment that the community is false, but the strength of the claim made by the analysis must be strictly proportionate to the materials at hand.

Identifying a community must be grounded in concrete carriers: how members interact; who preserves and interprets shared memory; who recognizes or excludes members; who provides protection or imposes punishment; who makes demands of responsibility of whom; who maintains a boundary; and which actions and records are written back into future relations. A community has no fixed entity, but it does not thereby lose reality. Boundaries have consequences, but are not eternally fixed. Shared memory must be preserved by

concrete members, materials, rituals, organizations, or procedures and retrieved again by current people in concrete events; the past does not automatically determine the present.

This mode of identification is not a procedure with a fixed order. The mechanisms listed above may enter analysis from different positions, and their order is not fixed. Some events first expose a conflict of responsibility; others first leave a record of exclusion. Analysts should trace relations according to the materials and should not turn the process into a box-ticking table. Only when these concrete carriers have been made clear can “community” serve as a shorthand for a mechanism of relations. Its purpose is to explain how concrete people, materials, rituals, organizations, and procedures form mechanisms and consequences, not to praise them in advance.

How strong a mechanism is, how long it lasts, and in which events it is retrieved again must also be grounded in materials. Responses from members and alternative interpretations can support, refute, or revise an existing record. Similarity is not connection; belonging to the same category is not belonging to the same network. Belonging to the same network only makes shared responsibility possible; it does not produce automatic, unlimited, or completely equal responsibility.

After reaching a judgment, its effective scope must still be stated. The available materials may be enough to confirm that a family or group had real community mechanisms in one event, but not enough to infer that all members bear responsibility in the same way in other events. New interactions, withdrawals, records, and counterexamples may all change the conclusion. The reality of a community is supported by traceable, dynamic relations and must always remain open to later calibration.

When the materials support only some mechanisms, the conclusion may also remain partly established. If continuing interaction can be confirmed but stable responsibility cannot, judgment should stop honestly at that level. If shared memory can be seen but there is no evidence that it is changing members' positions, there is no need to announce a strong community in advance. A limited judgment preserves more room for later revision than a single definitive classification.

Chapter 38. Operational Calibration of Complexity Compression

I. Making Limited Judgments about Complex Events

Faced with the overlap of social events, analysts must make necessary limited compressions while preventing the result of compression from posing as what society fundamentally is. A child's admission to school may simultaneously involve household cash flow, proof of residence, a landlord filing, school places, the student-registration system, teacher evaluations, and local recognition; a case of a father's unpaid wages may involve the fact of labor, the contracting chain, wage records, debt deadlines, arbitration materials, and enforcement nodes; a mother's work taking platform orders may involve account ratings, response times, care responsibilities, bodily condition, customer evaluations, and platform ranking.

Multiple sets of differentiating units, multiple kinds of nodes, multiple relational chains, multiple kinds of records, and multiple instances of write-back may exist at the same time in these concrete situations. Acknowledging that an event is complex is not a reason to abandon analysis and comparison. If one stops merely on the ground that "it is too complex, so no judgment is possible," one is in substance using complexity to cancel comparison itself.

Complexity has different sources. Some events are complex because of the quantity of materials; some because the handlers and levels of relations involved are interwoven; and others because they undergo repeated write-back over a longer period. The quantity of materials, levels of relations, and extension through time must not be conflated. Identifying which kind of complexity is presently at issue is what makes it possible to see what a concrete judgment may have omitted.

A limited judgment can still be established even when the materials are incomplete. In an admission-to-school event, for example, an analyst may confirm that a landlord filing has already changed the admission materials while acknowledging that school places, household cash flow, and local relations have not yet been fully verified. What is known and what is unknown must be kept separate. The unknown does not cancel an established fact; treating everything unknown as unanalyzable would instead deprive the materials already available of their effect.

Analysts need to state their position of observation. People directly involved are situated in everyday life and can see its continuing difficulties; staff may encounter only procedural requirements; researchers reconstruct relational chains from the materials they have obtained. Compressions formed from different positions may complement one another, and they may also conflict. Making an observation position public helps calibration, but this disclosure does not mean that all accounts are equally reliable.

An analyst cannot lay out all the differences in an event in equal measure at the same moment; explanation can unfold only under limited compression. Compression begins with the choice of a question: deciding which question to answer also decides which materials to read first, how long a temporal range to take, and which background to leave outside for the time being. This choice is constrained by the event itself and cannot be completely neutral. Making the reasons for the choice public allows others to check whether the compression is too narrow or has departed from the question.

On the basis of the question selected, analysts extract relevant differences, arrange materials, identify nodes, and trace relational chains before forming a provisional judgment open to discussion and examination. People

who use limited explanatory images such as the state, market, nation, family, platform, and movement may respectively extract distinct differences: registration and enforcement; prices and transactions; shared memory and responsibility; care and property; accounts and visibility; and shared dissatisfaction and directions of action. When using these images, their applicable scope must still be stated. No image may be allowed to pose as what society fundamentally is.

The same body of materials can support different limited compressions and produce different uses. Admission records can be used to analyze eligibility, and they can also be used to trace the consequences of a family's relocation. Materials concerning unpaid wages can be used both to define the allocation of responsibility and to examine how debt is transmitted to a family. The two explanations need not be mutually exclusive. The key is to compare what each answers, which differences it extracts, and which relations it leaves out.

It must be clarified that explanatory images of different kinds have no will of their own and do not select materials by themselves. It is concrete people, when using images such as the state, market, or family, who decide how to name differences, arrange evidence, and form conclusions. For precisely this reason, the same image may produce entirely different results when used by different people. Returning responsibility for the selection of materials and the argument to the analyst can prevent an abstract concept from being personified as an acting subject.

The fact that compression is less than reality does not mean that a judgment is necessarily false. A map is less than the roads themselves, and a concept is less than the event itself; so long as analysts make the use and boundaries public, these can still assist comparison and judgment. Without limited distinction extraction, events would merely scatter into details too difficult to handle. The validity of a judgment depends on what it extracts, what it omits, the nodes and relational chains in which it holds, and when it ceases to hold.

A provisional judgment is therefore never arbitrary. From the outset it is substantively constrained by the materials, the consequences of the event, the responses of the people concerned, and counterexamples. Faced with a complex event, analysts need not make covering all of reality a prerequisite, but they must keep the process of limited distinction extraction open to verification and challenge by counterexamples.

II. How Scope and Granularity Can Be Compared

Compression involves the granularity of observation, which depends on the concrete question and the materials at hand. Take "household cash flow" as an example. It is suitable for summarizing overall economic pressure; but if one goes on to examine how that pressure is formed, it can be broken down into rent, transportation, leave taken from work, and the costs of preparing materials. A summary that is too coarse will conceal mechanisms, while a breakdown that is too fine may lose the present line of inquiry. Analysis has no permanently correct smallest unit.

Effective compression reduces materials while retaining the differences relevant to the question. If the object is to study an obstacle to school admission, proof of residence, the time of submission, and the way student registration is received may need to be retained, while remote background not yet connected to the present consequence may temporarily be omitted. An omission must have reasons, and new materials must be allowed to bring the background back into the analysis.

The delimitation of scope must be supported by the actual extension of the materials. If a difference has so far been extracted only at a particular node, the conclusion should initially stop at that node. Only when consequences have in fact been transmitted to the family, the locality, or another procedure does analysis

have grounds to expand outward. The importance of a background in itself does not mean that it has already entered the present consequence. This distinction can prevent compression from expanding without limit.

Several limited compressions can coexist: a family image displays care arrangements, a market image displays prices and income, and a state image displays eligibility and enforcement. The local explanatory power formed by the relevant differentiating units and the processes through which they are handled must be brought back to the event for comparison. We cannot declare that only one approach is effective merely because the approaches differ, nor can we erase their differences merely because all of them are limited.

Whether a compression is effective must be judged by returning it to the concrete relational field. Analysts need to state the event at issue, the differentiating units extracted, the nodes and relational chains in which they operate, and the differences that have been occluded, and then use new materials or counterexamples to decide whether an existing judgment must be weakened, supplemented, or withdrawn.

Therefore, no image may cross its boundary and subsume other mechanisms. In events involving materials, certification, and enforcement, analysts may use a state image to extract important differences, but must not let it swallow family care, market pressure, platform ranking, and local relations in advance. In handling events involving accounts, records, and visibility, analysts may likewise use a platform image, but must never let it swallow bodily condition, care responsibilities, state real-name identification, and market credit. Stating an effective scope publicly is meant to make an explanation open to comparison and revision, not to display weakness.

This effective scope includes at least three levels: the question, time, and consequences. A compression may be suitable for explaining the stage of materials review but insufficient for explaining a family's relocation after the review. It can be effective early in an event but may lose its focus once the event enters an appeal or enforcement stage. Analysts must not arbitrarily expand effectiveness at a particular moment into an all-purpose summary of the entire matter.

Comparison among limited models also depends on this scope. An explanation using a family image may have greater explanatory power for care responsibilities, while one using a platform image may be stronger for account visibility. The purpose of this comparison is not to rank models permanently, but to test which compression, for the concrete question at hand, can more accurately re-expand into the event, accommodate counterexamples, and accept revision.

III. A Generalization Must Be Able to Return to the Event

When an analyst speaks of "unpaid wages," this is in essence a compressed generalization. To truly enter the event, that generalization must be re-expanded into wage records, proof of the employment relationship, testimony from co-workers, the contracting chain, arbitration materials, enforcement nodes, debt deadlines, rent pressure, and household cash flow. Re-expansion does not require laying out every omitted material in infinite detail. It requires the analyst to state clearly what has been omitted and to unfold the concept again into the differentiating units, nodes, relational chains, historical indexes, and write-back mechanisms relevant to the question at hand.

Materials cannot produce consequences by themselves; every kind of relation must be carried by concrete people and procedures. The materials described above must be submitted, preserved, retrieved, and interpreted by the people concerned, providers of materials, and personnel handling the matter in concrete procedures before they can take effect. A compression that cannot be re-expanded tends to stop at a slogan.

Returning to the relations of support, refutation, or conflict among the materials is what gives subsequent calibration an entry point.

The generalization "platform labor" likewise needs to be unfolded through concrete subjects and procedures. Analysts may certainly trace account ratings, response times, completion rates, customer evaluations, appeal deadlines, recommendation positions, bodily fatigue, care responsibilities, and family time, but they must not treat the platform or the records themselves as acting subjects with a will. The actual consequences arise from rules set by personnel of the platform enterprise, the invocation of system procedures in particular events, and the actions and interactions of reviewers, appeal personnel, and order-takers themselves.

The same applies to "a child's admission to school." It must be re-expanded into concrete matters such as proof of residence, landlord filings, community registration, school places, application windows, student-registration nodes, household cash flow, and teacher evaluations. Whether these materials enter into consequences depends on the parents' submissions, the review by relevant staff, and the concrete handling performed through registration or student-registration procedures.

In concrete operations, re-expansion can begin with the most important connections within a concept. When analyzing "market pressure," one must specify who proposes the price, how the terms of transaction change, and to whom the income consequences are transmitted. When examining "family responsibility," one must specify who previously provided care, which memories were retrieved, and how the demand was brought to particular members. A concept acquires substantive content that can be verified only when it is grounded in these actual carriers and points of connection.

The process of re-expansion itself nevertheless has limits. Unpaid wages may indeed be traced through work arrangements, the local economic structure, and even more remote background, but analysts need not restore all historical materials without end. Once the re-expansion already available sufficiently explains the principal nodes, relational chains, counterexamples, and parts that remain unknown, analysis may provisionally close. If new evidence appears later, the relevant position can be opened again and supplemented.

Finally, when unfolding materials, their evidentiary force must be carefully distinguished. Statements by the people concerned, documents, procedural responses, and records made by observers each support a different range of facts. Setting them out together in no way means that all materials have equal evidentiary force. Analysts must state who formed each item of material, when it was formed, and how it relates to the event at hand.

IV. How the Total Image Swallows Differences

Chapter 26 has already fully established the formal formulation of Model C, class theory, and the dual mechanism. This chapter does not redefine those theories. It translates the Chapter 26 ruling into two questions for operational checking: Has the current explanation begun renaming other valid mechanisms as subsidiary material of the same total image? Has the current analysis used complexity as a reason to cancel distinctions in evidentiary strength, comparison among explanations, and provisional judgment? The first question checks subsumption; the second checks the erasure of distinctions between explanations. They cannot replace one another. At the same time, analysis must check whether the current compression retains other valid explanations and an entry point for counterexamples, and whether the original judgment actually changes when the materials change.

Once an interpreter rewrites all social differences through a single image, other real mechanisms become obscured. If every consequence is written as the will of the state, family care, market pressure, platform

ranking, local familiarity, and community responsibility disappear outside the image. If every relation is written as transaction and price, care, dignity, memory, local reputation, and the pressure of responsibility are likewise downplayed. A national community has real mechanisms of long-term interaction, multi-level relay, language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. Analysts must not reduce a national community to bloodline essence, state registration, a platform label, or a propaganda illusion, nor use shared identity to downplay its internal inequalities, different positions of participation, illusory boundary constructions, and oppression within the community.

The danger of a total image lies not only in its concepts being too large, but also in its rewriting of counterexamples. When a user encounters family care, national responsibility, or platform ranking that the image cannot explain, if the user reduces all these materials to surface forms of the same central force, the image loses the possibility of correction. It appears to absorb more materials, but in fact cancels the differences among them. The erasure of distinctions between explanations operates from the other direction: it conceals the cost of error. If all claims are treated as equally limited, it becomes impossible to identify which explanations ignore the people concerned, misuse records, or cancel a real community. Acknowledging complexity still requires identifying where the evidence is stronger, where inference breaks down, and where withdrawal is needed. Calibration unfolds precisely across these differences.

A total image may also produce real-world consequences. Organizers, managers, or interpreters who use it to allocate responsibility, identify friends and enemies, or arrange resources will change the positions of concrete people. These consequences prove that an image has force after people use it; they cannot be inverted into proof that the social entity claimed by the image exists. Analysis must separate the act of using an image from an ontological judgment. Social Differentiation Network Theory must accept this limit as well. If users rewrite every event through one set of differentiation terms while refusing other limited explanations and counterexamples, it too will slide toward a total image. Non-ontologization is not only a declaration; it must appear in the public statement of scope, the permission to re-expand, and continuing calibration.

This set of positions is only an entry point for calibration, not a closed table of types. Discovering over-compression may require narrowing the scope; discovering a misaligned image may require unfolding the materials again or changing the limited image; discovering that counterexamples never change the conclusion should lead to a reduction in judgment strength or even withdrawal. A sound acknowledgment of complexity retains these comparisons and revisions; it does not belong to Model C.

V. What Part of a Judgment Must a Counterexample Change?

Counterexamples do not calibrate an explanation by themselves. The people concerned, providers of materials, and analysts must put forward, preserve, and examine counterexamples in a concrete event, and explain whether they form a relation of support, refutation, or conflict with the existing materials, before an existing judgment can be adjusted. Objections by the people concerned are one source of counterexamples: a parent points out that supplementary materials were refused; a worker points out that a shift record omitted a night shift; an order-taker explains that a bad review occurred while the person was carrying a care responsibility. These accounts do not become true automatically because of who offered them, but neither may they be ruled out in advance by the existing compression. Analysts must seek the corresponding materials and procedural responses.

Children who are equally poor may face different consequences because landlord filings, school places, and application windows differ. Analysts need not immediately abolish a poverty explanation, but they must add

the landlord, school, time window, and student-registration node. Workers who are owed wages may likewise have different outcomes because proof of the employment relationship, co-worker testimony, and enforcement nodes differ; the proof, testimony, arbitration, and enforcement mechanisms must then be added. If order-takers with the same low income have different consequences because their account ratings, response times, care responsibilities, and platform ranking differ, accounts, records, care, and ranking must be added. On the basis of new materials, analysts must decide whether the materials support or refute the original judgment and then decide whether that judgment must be weakened or withdrawn. The people concerned and analysts may still question the calibration again in light of later events.

A counterexample can point to problems at different levels. It may show that a difference never entered into the consequences at all; it may show that a key node was originally omitted; or it may narrow an apparently general conclusion to particular conditions. These three situations require different corrections and cannot all be handled by saying "add more factors." Compression can have three kinds of problems. When an interpreter compresses multiple differences into one main axis and demotes the other differentiating units to subsidiary material, the result is over-compression. When an interpreter uses an image unsuited to the current event to handle consequences without examining the nodes and relational chains actually operating, the result is misaligned compression. When an interpreter refuses to adjust after counterexamples and new materials appear and merely forces them back into the original image, the result is refusal of calibration.

Over-compression first changes scope. An explanation originally applicable only to wages and resources is extended to national memory, family care, and state certification, and the other differences thereby lose their own positions. Misaligned compression may have a narrow scope yet answer the wrong question, for example by using price changes to explain an eligibility result produced mainly by the receipt of materials. Refusal of calibration occurs in time. An original judgment may once have been effective, but after new nodes and counterexamples appear the user still refuses to adjust it. This is not exactly the same as compression that was misaligned from the beginning. Distinguishing when the error occurred can help analysts decide whether to narrow the scope, change the image, or withdraw the existing conclusion. All three problems may also occur together: one image first swallows multiple differences, is then placed in an unsuitable event, and finally renames every counterexample. The classification is only for locating an entry point for correction; it must not become a new fixed diagnostic table. Concrete judgment must still return to materials and consequences.

Refusal of counterexamples does not always appear as direct denial. An interpreter may change the name and call materials that do not fit expectations a secondary phenomenon; continually raise the evidentiary demands placed on counterexamples without imposing the same demands on the original conclusion; or retain only records supporting the image while leaving conflicting materials outside the scope of analysis. All these practices deprive judgment of revisability. Correcting an explanation is not the same as absorbing a counterexample. A real correction changes the scope, strength, or relational chain of the original judgment and states which old conclusion no longer holds. If the conclusion never moves and new materials are merely assigned a subsidiary position, the counterexample has had no real effect. Analysts can check whether calibration occurred by asking whether the conclusion actually changed.

Changes after calibration must be recorded. It must be stated which difference was added, which conclusion was weakened, and where the effective scope was narrowed. If new materials cut an existing relational chain, the core judgment must be rewritten; if they only fill out a secondary part, the original compression may be retained within a narrower scope. Conflicts among materials also cannot be decided in advance by a single image. One registration may support an eligibility judgment yet be insufficient to prove the full content of a residence relation; one account record may show a procedural result yet cannot explain care pressure by itself.

Analysts must separate what the materials prove from what remains to be confirmed. A concept must not complete the inference on behalf of the materials.

Limited comparison does not require all models to handle the same batch of materials. Analysts can first establish which question each explanation answers and then compare how each handles the relevant materials. A family image may better explain care arrangements, while a state image may better explain an eligibility procedure. Their effective scopes differ, but it remains possible to check whether each omits a key node and whether each allows counterexamples to enter. Retaining uncertainty is not the same as canceling judgment. An analyst may say that one relational chain has stronger material support, that another still lacks a procedural response, and that one consequence can only be provisionally conjectured. Such distinctions allow for gradations in judgment. If all materials are simply called uncertain, known differences and unknown parts are again mixed together.

The results of comparison may also be provisionally set side by side. If two limited explanations account for different consequences and the available materials are insufficient to determine which relational chain carries greater weight, analysts may retain both judgments together with their respective conditions. Setting them side by side is not a declaration that all explanations are the same; it truthfully marks a difference that has not yet been resolved. When new materials enter, comparison must be carried out again.

VI. Following One Order to Trace Compression and Write-Back

When facing the event of a mother taking an order, analysts can begin from order prices and competitive pressure; account ratings and response times; care responsibilities and family time; bodily fatigue and travel distance; and real-name information and payment records. These angles can extract real differences, but they must not subsume one another. At different stages of the event, the weight of each difference shifts accordingly. Before an order is accepted, account ratings and recommendation positions become more weighty; when an order is taken, response time, travel distance, and bodily condition become more weighty; after a bad review, the appeal procedure, appeal deadline, and historical evaluations become more weighty.

A platform is not a unified personality, and it cannot be assumed to be a subject that judges by itself. Procedural stages such as order acceptance, completion, evaluation, recommendation, and appeal may be handled separately by different people and systems, and their weights across links may not be the same. Concrete ranking and appeal consequences arise from rules set by personnel of the platform enterprise, the system's invocation of records, and the concrete actions of reviewers, customers, and order-takers in the event. Analysts need to trace how records cross nodes. A historical bad review does not automatically determine the present; whether it affects later recommendations depends on how the current procedure retrieves it and assigns it weight.

An account record preserves only what the procedure has written down. An interruption in care, bodily fatigue, a change in transportation, or a temporary risk may not enter a field; nevertheless, such differences still have real effects on the order-taker. The failure of a record to present a difference does not mean that the difference does not exist, and real existence does not mean that the current procedure will necessarily recognize it. The two judgments must be kept separate. Care responsibilities, bodily fatigue, order prices, customer evaluations, and platform records may support one another or conflict with one another. Analysts must retain the order-taker's response and appeal and revise the existing judgment in light of new materials and later events. This conceptual composite situation does not refer to a particular platform or algorithm.

After an order-taker submits an explanation or appeal, whether handling personnel retrieve earlier records and how they interpret new materials may change the person's subsequent position. If a bad review, appeal, or

account-handling result is recorded by concrete people or procedures and preserved as a difference that can be retrieved later, write-back has formed. The written-back content takes effect again only when the relevant records are retrieved, interpreted, or given weight by concrete people or procedures in a later recommendation, appeal, or order-handling process. This must not be written as data automatically controlling the future, nor may one result be treated as a permanent final decision. After an account rating falls, platform recommendations may decrease, thereby affecting income; the change in income then enters household cash flow and ultimately affects care arrangements, rent payments, and the preparation of materials. Reduced recommendations, lower income, and tightened household cash flow are real consequences transmitted along relational chains; they do not mean that household cash flow itself has been written back.

Whether a compression can still be used depends on whether it can preserve both procedural records and real differences outside the records. If "platform ranking" merely summarizes rating, recommendation, and appeal positions and can be re-expanded into concrete personnel, rule invocation, conflicts among materials, and subsequent handling, it retains analytical value. If it excludes care, the body, transportation, and family time altogether, or explains every counterexample as a problem that the account had from the beginning, analysts must unfold the materials again and change the judgment.

The cases of a child's admission to school and a dispute over unpaid wages serve here only as comparisons of boundaries and compression. If admission is explained only through poverty, household registration, or educational resources, one must check whether landlord filings, community materials, application windows, school places, and the way student registration is received have been obscured. If new materials cut the original relational path, the strength of the original judgment should be reduced or its scope narrowed. In a wage dispute, wage records, proof of the employment relationship, co-worker testimony, the contracting chain, arbitration, and enforcement nodes can test whether the generalization "unpaid wages" can be re-expanded. Household debt and rent pressure show the transmission of consequences; they cannot replace verification of responsibility in the opposite direction. The full tracing of distinction extraction in relational fields and of weight in these two cases was undertaken respectively in Chapters 35 and 36.

VII. A Shared Slogan Does Not Eliminate Differences in Participation

Movement organizers can use a slogan to connect dispersed differences to a common expression, and different participants may temporarily act in the same direction. This connection has real organizational force, but a slogan is not a unified personality and does not mean that everyone expects the same result. Workers, students, family members, local residents, and platform workers may extract different contents from the same slogan: wages, security, opportunities, risks, protection, local dignity, accounts, and instability of responsibility. The formation of a common direction is itself a result of continuing interaction.

A shared slogan can compress the direction of action, but it cannot flatten the reasons for participation. Some people value wages, some value safety, and some care about local protection or family responsibility. The stronger the slogan's compression, the more organizers and analysts must examine participation costs, positions of silence, strategic disagreements, family pressure, and exit risks. If organizers are to maintain a common expression, they must handle these differences; they cannot assume that the slogan has already completed understanding for everyone. A slogan can form a connection, but it cannot pose as the movement's total reality.

Differences within a movement may reappear in later events, and participants and analysts must use them to examine and correct the existing common expression. Records left by action also need to be retrieved again

by people in the present. Meeting records, public expressions, participants' memories, and later narratives may preserve different contents. If later interpreters select only one kind of material, they may rewrite disagreements that once existed as unanimity. A historical index can support calibration, but it does not provide a single answer by itself.

A community formed within a movement may contain real interaction, shared risks, demands for protection, and pressure of responsibility. Acknowledging such a community does not mean that internal disagreements disappear, nor that all participants remain permanently in the same position. Analysts must retain both the common connection and internal differences, avoiding the reduction of a movement to a pure illusion while also refusing to treat it as a closed entity.

VIII. Leaving an Entry for Reopening Judgment

Whether a compression can continue to be used depends on several interrelated calibration dimensions; they cannot be converted into fixed steps carried out in a prescribed order. Analysts must ask whether the compression has extracted the key differences in the current event, state what it has extracted and what it has omitted or occluded, and determine whether it can be re-expanded into differentiating units, nodes, relational chains, relational pathways, historical indexes, and write-back mechanisms. How the relevant people or procedures extract, assign weight to, connect, transmit, and write back differences must be stated clearly. Analysts must also ask whether the compression can handle counterexamples, whether it passes a local validity off as an overall reality, or whether it rewrites other differences as subsidiary material.

After new event consequences and materials enter, analysts must first decide whether they support or refute the original judgment, then decide whether the original judgment needs to be weakened or withdrawn, and record exactly how its scope, strength, and content changed after the counterexample entered. These calibration dimensions have no fixed order, score, threshold, or automatic answer. They serve only provisional judgments that can be compared and revised; they are not a score sheet, decision tree, or algorithm. The fact that a compression can continue to be used does not mean it must remain unchanged. Analysts may narrow its applicable scope, change the strength of a conclusion, add a node previously omitted, or set two compressions side by side for comparison. So long as the correction is made public, the old name may be retained; if the name remains while the conditions of judgment have changed, that change must be stated to avoid creating a merely superficial continuity.

Some situations require only that a question be retained. When materials are insufficient, analysts may suspend a strong conclusion about responsibility or causation while recording known consequences and nodes still to be examined. Suspension is not abandonment of judgment; it brings the strength of the judgment back into line with the evidence, with analysts deciding whether to supplement, limit, or withdraw it once further materials appear. If a compression continues to obscure key differences, refuses objections from the people concerned, and cannot state its effective scope, it should not be retained merely because it has been used for a long time. Withdrawal is also part of calibration. Analysts must state the reason for withdrawal and explain which materials may still be left available to other limited explanations.

To judge whether a compression is usable, one must also examine what kind of opening for correction it leaves. An explanation that can identify gaps in materials, possible counterexamples, and nodes awaiting confirmation can later receive verification. If a conclusion writes every unknown as support for itself, external materials can no longer change it. The problem then is not whether the conclusion is concise, but that it has closed calibration. Interpreters must also distinguish the convenience of a name from the accuracy of its content. Continuing to use generalizations such as "family pressure," "market risk," or "platform ranking"

helps maintain the line of discussion, but whenever a generalization enters a key inference it must still be unfolded into concrete carriers and handling processes. A name may be brief; causal explanation may not be omitted for that reason.

This judgment does not require all events to use the same scale. When analysts face school admission, unpaid wages, platform labor, or a movement, they may adjust the granularity of compression according to the question, but the sources of materials, handlers, relational chains, and consequences remain present. The scale may change; the requirements of accepting counterexamples and stating boundaries publicly may not disappear.

Re-expansion and calibration are not tasks to be added only after research is complete. Once conflicts among materials, objections from the people concerned, or new procedural responses appear during analysis, the existing compression may need to be unfolded again. A judgment may therefore provisionally close while leaving an entry for reopening. In this way, limitation becomes a condition of revisability rather than an excuse to evade responsibility. Records preserve some handling results and omit experiences that were never recorded; when later people or procedures retrieve the records, they must still face new materials and new event conditions. The past cannot automatically control the present, and current write-back cannot close the future. This temporal limit keeps calibration open.

The necessity of compression and the danger of a total image can both hold at once. The former enables analysts to form judgments from limited materials; the latter reminds us not to elevate a provisional result into society itself. An explanation retains value so long as it remains open to re-expansion and comparison, accepts counterexamples, and makes its corrections explicit. When it loses these conditions, its strength must be reduced, its scope narrowed, or it must be withdrawn. What remains here, therefore, is a set of open handling decisions: retain the existing judgment, reduce its strength, narrow its applicable scope, unfold the materials again, or withdraw the judgment when relational chains and counterexamples have rendered the original explanation ineffective. This chapter does not declare the final boundary of the book in advance. Chapter 39 will complete the theoretical closure on the basis of these operational conditions.

Chapter 39. What This Theory Is Not: Society Is Not a Class Plane but a Differentiation Network

I. Society Forms and Exists as a Differentiation Network

The phrase “but is a differentiation network” in the chapter title summarizes the book’s positive proposition in social ontology: society forms and exists as a differentiation network, and the differentiation network has a real status in social ontology, replacing the class entity and the pre-existing class plane. Here, “differentiation network” means the real, dynamic, open, relational social structure and handling process situated in relational fields and formed through the joint operation of people, materials, records, nodes, and relational pathways. It is emphatically not an image temporarily adopted by a researcher, still less an analytical tool that may be replaced at will.

It is not a fixed, closed, pre-completed, personified ultimate entity that exhausts society; it is not a final explanation of the universe, nature, life, and everything that exists; nor is it a closed and uncorrectable final naming of the essence of society. At the end of the book, the theoretical boundary of Social Differentiation Network Theory must be drawn clearly, together with the judgment it finally retains. A defensive list of misreadings cannot substitute for a conclusion, and the closure need not be written as a manifesto. What must be answered is which total images this theory rejects, how it maintains a limited yet revisable explanation, and what its real content, conditions of support, and theoretical boundaries are.

Drawing the boundary first requires preventing readers from simply bringing familiar grand terms back in. If a reader still treats class, identity, or the state as a pre-existing social skeleton and then fills it with differentiating units, the problematic at stake in this theory has already been rewritten. Analysis should begin with the differences, handlers, and consequences that actually appear in an event, rather than first deciding which image society must obey. Closing the book does not mean repeating every preceding chapter. Relational fields, weight, community, compression, and calibration jointly perform one task here: limiting the interpreter’s inferences. They remind analysts to disclose materials and scope, state the subjects and actions clearly, and change a judgment when counterexamples appear. What the final chapter must preserve is this limitation, not the number of concepts.

Social Differentiation Network Theory does not install an eternally unchanging entity beneath society, nor does it treat class, the state, the market, the nation, the family, the platform, identity, or a list of differentiating units as the final constitution of society. Replacing the old underlying entity with differentiating units or a network would merely repeat the procedure this theory opposes. Substantialist ontology often first assigns an event a center and then places materials later observed around that center. Social Differentiation Network Theory takes the opposite direction of work: first identify which people, organizations, materials, and procedures are present in the event, and then trace what connections they form.

The author and interpreters who use this theory must trace how the people concerned, organizational members, and concrete procedures handle differences, which materials support a judgment, which nodes change consequences, and which counterexamples require correction. These constraints keep the theory grounded in reality and prevent interpreters from closing relational structures into a new ontological image. Even when analysis temporarily reaches a stable conclusion, it may not infer that an eternal entity lies behind all events.

The fact that relational structures have real efficacy does not mean that they are things that act. School personnel receive materials, family members put care memories forward, and institutional personnel make certifications; these concrete actions join into continuing processes that form and sustain social reality. The word “network” abbreviates the relational form of these real connections. It does not turn the expression itself into an entity. Apart from its carriers, materials, and events, it has no independent will and cannot produce consequences on its own.

For precisely this reason, society is not a class plane, and the consequences of concrete events cannot be handled by a single class axis. The real differences involved in a child’s school admission, unpaid wages, and platform labor may include household registration, student registration, materials, accounts, income, family burdens, local recognition, state enforcement, and community boundaries. These differences do not disappear because the class entity is rejected, nor do they constitute the whole or a part of a class entity. In concrete relational fields, people, organizations, and procedures extract, assign weight to, connect, transmit, and write back differences, thereby forming a changing differentiation-network order that explains how social reality forms and exists.

The class plane projects different events onto the same main axis. Eligibility tied to materials in school admission, proof and enforcement in an unpaid-wage case, and account ranking in platform labor are all finally rewritten as manifestations of class position. This compression strips concrete nodes of their independent explanatory standing and pushes responsibility toward an abstract entity. The differentiation-network order, by contrast, retains the direction and variation of relations. A difference may receive greater weight at one node and be downweighted at another; an existing record may be retrieved by later personnel, or it may be refuted by new materials. Because the order is formed through concrete handling, branching, interruption, reorganization, and write-back can occur without assuming a single center. Rejecting the class plane still permits recognition that some labor and resource differences are extremely important in particular events. Analysts must explain where that importance comes from, how it is transmitted into consequences, and under what conditions it changes. This preserves the concrete forms of inequality better than assigning every consequence to class in advance.

II. How Differences Become a Real Relational Order

A differentiating unit is not a new class, an identity label, a fixed factor, or a social atom. It is a unit of difference that can be distinguished, represented, and compared. Relevant people or procedures may extract it, assign it weight, connect it, transmit it, and write it back within a concrete relational field, thereby changing position, eligibility, risk, evaluation, responsibility, action, or consequences. Differentiating units can be subdivided, combined, and represented anew as relations and events change; there is no final closed list. An interpreter cannot first list a set of isolated variables and then declare that society is made of them. The interpreter must state who extracts a difference from which materials, who records or adjudicates it, and which later people or procedures carry the existing result into a new event.

The same difference can receive different representations in different relational fields. A living arrangement may be written as an address, a filing, an account of co-residence, or local testimony; a fact of labor may be carried by wage records, traces of work, and testimony from others. These representations cannot automatically substitute for one another. Analysts must state which material the current procedure accepts and which facts of life have failed to enter the record. A differentiating unit is not an indivisible smallest particle either. Care can continue to be distinguished by time, responsibility, bodily exertion, and memory-bearing, and it can form new combinations with property, kin evaluations, or work arrangements. Whether further

division is needed depends on the current question: stopping too early occludes consequences, while unlimited subdivision loses the line of judgment. The value of a differentiating unit therefore lies in making a difference traceable, not in providing a permanently applicable table of social elements. If an interpreter fixes common differentiating units into a list, the interpreter falls back into factor ontology. A new event can represent an existing difference anew, and it may also extract a difference previously unnoticed.

Concrete people or procedures handle, transmit, and reorganize differences along relational chains at multiple nodes. The real relational structures and processes thereby formed are what this book calls a “network.” This requires separating the real network, the theoretical image, and the acting subject. The differentiation network is neither a decorative metaphor nor simply the network diagram drawn by a researcher: that diagram is a limited representation and may be wrong or revised. Family relations, community ties, institutional authority, materials, and records may exist before a particular event, and may operate before an analyst discovers, names, or draws them. Even an erroneous image drawn by a researcher does not cancel these real connections. But the prior existence of a local relation does not imply a fixed, pre-completed total network covering every event.

A differentiating unit is a unit of difference capable of entering consequences. Materials and records carry existing determinations; concrete people or procedures at nodes preserve, identify, certify, or transfer differences according to rules; and extraction, weight assignment, transmission, and write-back are still carried out by people, organizational positions, technical systems, and procedures. The network itself has no will and is not an entity that acts on its own. Only by retaining these divisions of labor can the network avoid becoming the empty claim that “everything is connected.” The foregoing proposition in social ontology therefore retains reality while refusing to personify or close the relational structure. Concrete applications must still remain open to materials, counterexamples, and revisions of scope.

In a platform setting, enterprise personnel and procedures form, preserve, and retrieve account, rating, recommendation, customer-evaluation, and appeal records, then carry the results of handling into income opportunities. Family members may preserve or recount care, property, silence, and responsibility evaluations and put them forward again in a new dispute. Past records do not operate automatically. Only when current people or procedures retrieve them and assign them weight can records enter present consequences. A node must not be understood as a dot on a diagram; it is a location where concrete handling occurs and may be carried by people, an organizational position, or a procedure. Materials can be received, recast, certified, rejected, or preserved within a node. Different actions can send the same difference into different relational chains and thereby produce different consequences.

A relational chain is not a simple sequence of before and after. An earlier handling may constrain a later procedure, or it may be refuted or recast by later materials. Acceptance of residence materials does not guarantee a place; retrieval of an account rating does not necessarily decide an appeal. Analysts must distinguish connection, transmission, and causal inference. Mere proximity of events does not prove that a consequence has been established. A network claim has content only when it can be re-expanded. If an interpreter cannot say who extracted the differentiating unit, where materials were transferred, and how a determination was written back, “network” is only rhetoric. Re-expansion remains limited: the analyst need not restore all background, but must unfold enough to verify the judgment at hand.

Within these concrete processes, family members may put care, property, kin evaluations, silence, and responsibility forward again in a dispute. Local residents and community personnel may retrieve familiarity, reputation, testimony, and interaction records in a local event. Members of a national community may maintain boundaries through language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection,

and demands of responsibility, forming intergenerational write-back. These processes cannot all be replaced by class subordination or state registration. Personnel in state institutions may handle registration, eligibility, materials, and enforcement in concrete procedures. Personnel and procedures of platform enterprises may handle accounts, ratings, rankings, and visibility. Movement organizers and participants may connect dissatisfaction, risk, action memory, and future imagination. Social Differentiation Network Theory traces these real actions and their relational consequences; it does not treat the state, platform, movement, or network itself as an actor.

Operation in an event also includes interruption. Materials may not be received, records may not be transferred, and members may refuse an existing responsibility. Interruption is not an exception outside the network; it changes whether a difference can be transmitted and who bears the consequence, so analysts must trace connection and rupture together. The differentiation-network order may also reform over time. A past determination retrieved by current personnel may be supported or limited by new materials; new handling leaves records that can be put forward again in the future. A historical index provides an entry for retrieval but does not automatically prescribe the conclusion of every event. Describing society through relational structures does not mean that every person is directly connected to everyone else. Many consequences travel through materials, organizational positions, and layers of relays, while other relations are completely broken. Analysts must identify the actual relays instead of replacing concrete explanation with "everything is connected."

III. From Identities and Lists to Events

An identity name can serve as an entry point for analysis, but it cannot replace tracing a concrete mechanism. Faced with a label such as "outsider," an interpreter must determine who, in what concrete event, retrieves materials such as residence, filings, eligibility, or local recognition; through which nodes those materials pass; and how they change the opportunities of the person concerned. In a residence or school-admission situation, whether a landlord cooperates with a filing, how school personnel examine proof, and which procedure community personnel follow in handling an application may all change the real weight of the same identity name. An identity does not extract materials or assign consequences by itself. All handling comes from concrete people and procedures.

"Platform laborer" is likewise only an entry point. When handling orders, ranking, or appeals, enterprise personnel and corresponding procedures may retrieve account ratings, response times, completion rates, and customer evaluations, then write the handling results into subsequent recommendations and income opportunities. Unless one traces who formed a record, how it was retrieved again, and how it affected household cash flow, the classification is not an explanation. An identity name has the convenience of temporarily gathering similar experiences; it must not be mistaken for a shared mechanism. Two people both labeled "outsiders" may face entirely different landlords, material requirements, school nodes, and local relations. A shared name merely indicates where to look; it cannot predetermine that they bear the same weight or consequences.

An identity may also be remade within an event. The person concerned submits materials, staff select fields, institutional procedures form records, and if later personnel retrieve them again, the visible content of the identity may change. This is not the identity growing on its own, nor does a category naturally possess force. Its force comes from concrete handling and from the way the result of handling enters subsequent relations. In addition, differences not covered by the name—family fallback support, bodily condition, local familiarity, language ability, and past records—may change the real position of the same identity. If analysis only adds

more identity names without tracing how they enter consequences, its categories may become more detailed while its explanation remains where it was.

Listing poverty, household registration, education, family, the state, the market, the platform, locality, and nation looks comprehensive, yet may still fail to explain any consequence. A factor list usually places contents from different levels side by side: poverty may be a living condition; household registration and student registration may appear as records; family and the state involve many kinds of members, institutions, and procedures. Putting them in one column easily occludes how differences are represented and who has the authority to receive, reject, or reinterpret materials. A good analysis may retain a list as a reminder, but must leave the side-by-side format and enter the relational chain: determine how differences connect, where a chain is interrupted, which part of the inference new materials may change, which differentiating units receive greater weight in the event, which are downweighted or occluded, and who did what and with what consequence.

In a child's school-admission situation, parents provide proof of residence; a landlord cooperates with or refuses a filing; school personnel examine materials according to procedure and handle places and application timing; and a student-registration procedure preserves the current result for later retrieval. This relational chain changes eligibility, time pressure, and future opportunities, but it is not a fixed checklist. How materials operate still has to be judged by the event, procedures, and counterexamples. Early in an application, whether materials are complete may directly affect reception; at a later stage, places, continuity of student registration, or a family's relocation may become the principal consequences. Weight changes dynamically with the event and its handling. It is neither an inherent property or score of a difference nor something that can be read directly from a factor's name.

An interpreter must bring an identity name back into a concrete event and ask: who extracts the identity from which materials, who or what procedure assigns it consequences, along which relational chains it is transmitted, and which differences it occludes. An identity does not automatically submit to examination. Records formed by relevant people can participate in a new determination and write-back only when they are retrieved again in a future event. A platter of identities mixes together names from different levels, originating in sources such as administrative records, the person's own account, or other people's evaluations. Without distinguishing how they were formed, it only adds labels and cannot explain how eligibility, responsibility, or risk changed.

Likewise, listing class, the state, the market, the family, the nation, the school, the platform, locality, and movement does not complete an explanation; a longer list is not necessarily closer to reality. Analysts must trace where a difference becomes heavier or is downweighted, and which counterexamples would overturn the current judgment. A factor list writes every factor into the text, but if it does not say which one enters the consequences at the current node, it evades the distinction between primary and secondary. Weight is neither a permanent ranking nor a numerical allocation. It must be judged concretely by how people or procedures handle materials and how the result of handling travels into subsequent relations.

Once analysis leaves the platter and the list, it returns to the event itself. Whether an identity is retrieved, whether a material is recognized, and whether a difference becomes heavier because of a new record all require step-by-step tracing. That tracing may yield several relational chains, but it explains reality better than accumulating names.

IV. The Class Image Cannot Replace Real Differences

The class entity does not exist. Real differentiating units—labor conditions, wages, income, employment, property, debt, housing, available exits, relations of domination, and risk—do exist and may produce grave consequences in concrete relational fields. But these real differences do not constitute the whole or a part of a class entity. Opposition to the class entity is in no way a denial of the objective reality of unpaid wages, exploitation, poverty, injustice, or the shifting of risks. It is a refusal to bind concrete conditions a priori to an entity-name.

An interpreter who adopts class theory extracts, assigns weight to, connects, applies low-dimensional compression and projection to, and names one set of high-weight differentiating units. The local explanatory capacity comes entirely from these real differentiating units and their handling processes; the class image itself is only a low-dimensional output. An interpreter may indeed identify certain labor and resource conditions through that label, but this local explanatory efficacy can never prove the existence of a class entity, still less serve as an excuse to ignore household registration, student registration, accounts, local recognition, family burdens, state enforcement, community boundaries, and historical write-back.

The local explanatory capacity formed by real differentiating units and the processes of their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression must be strictly distinguished from class theory; the class image is only a low-dimensional output. Class theory is not Model A or Model B. From the outset, its basic structure belongs to the Model C direction of total-image subsumption. Interpreters who adopt class theory elevate a limited image into society itself and thereby demote, dissolve, or cancel other valid explanations. Class theory does not become Model C only after overuse, expansion, or abuse. This distinction must therefore never be softened into the compromise statement that “class exists, but is not complete enough.”

Real differences that can be traced separately—labor, income, debt, property, housing, domination, and risk—may connect with one another in a concrete event and may simultaneously carry greater weight. Yet these connections still generate no class entity. Local distinction extraction cannot become a refuge for class theory. Faced with a class image, analysts may bring some of the labor and resource differences it marks back into a concrete relational field and examine, one by one, mechanisms involving household registration, student registration, family, national community, state enforcement, local recognition, and platform procedures. If every material is ultimately taken back into the total class image, local analysis has become only an entrance to subsumption.

Opposing class theory is in no way an excuse for inequality. Unpaid wages, deprivation of resources, shifting of risks, and relations of domination can all form real and grave consequences. The point is that interpreters should directly trace how concrete differences are extracted and assigned weight. They must not replace concrete responsibility with a non-existent class entity, nor allow the class name to occlude other mechanisms of oppression that are present.

V. How Other Explanations Enter Comparison

Social Differentiation Network Theory does not bring other explanations to an end. Explanations centered on the state, market, family, nation, school, platform, and movement may point to real differences within limited scopes, but they cannot thereby be presumed equally effective, nor can they receive priority merely from traditional status. Interpreters may compare limited images, but each time an image is used they must disclose what they have extracted, what they have downweighted or occluded, which events the conclusion applies to, and which counterexamples would force correction. They must still compare the images by materials, scope, consequences, counterexamples, and capacity for revision.

Limited use requires separating an explanatory image from the real carriers that support it. An abstract name may help generalization, but when it enters causal judgment its actions must be returned to people, organizations, and procedures; they cannot be handed over to an abstract noun to complete on its own. Opposing the subsumption of reality by an image does not mean opposing every relation that image concerns. Analysts must retain mechanisms and consequences. What they reject is elevating a local image into the only answer. Retaining other explanations also does not mean that the author abandons the theory's own judgment. Social Differentiation Network Theory still insists on returning to the real processes through which differences are extracted, assigned weight, connected, transmitted, and written back.

In a concrete domain, personnel in state institutions may handle registration, certification, and enforcement; the state does not register by itself. An explanation using a state image may have greater explanatory power for material certification and enforcement. Criticizing state procedures cannot deny the real efficacy of registration and enforcement, but use of the state image may not ignore family, market, locality, or platform, and a state explanation may not fuse different institutions and procedures into a single will. Market participants may transfer risk through transactions and prices; the market does not transact by itself. Use of a market image may not ignore care, responsibility, memory, or dignity.

Family members may preserve care, property, responsibility, and long-term evaluations. An explanation using a family image may have greater explanatory power for care and responsibility. Criticizing family oppression cannot cancel care, but users of the family image may not naturalize kin responsibility as inherently legitimate, and a family explanation may not assume that all members bear the same responsibility.

School personnel and procedures may handle student registration, evaluations, and qualifications. Enterprise personnel and procedures may handle accounts, ranking, and visibility. When using a platform image, bodily conditions, care, state real-name identification, and market pressure must still be retained. Movement organizers and participants may connect dissatisfaction, risk, and action memory. Users of a movement image must not erase distinctions in participants' positions and costs of participation.

In the domain of the nation, a national name may be compressed or put to use; criticizing the essentialization of the nation cannot cancel a real community. A community may form through long-term interaction and multi-level relays, and through language, rites and customs, shared memory, shared harm, shared protection, demands of responsibility, experiences of boundaries, and intergenerational write-back. State registration is not the only source of a community. An interpreter using a national image may extract long-term memory, shared harm, and shared protection. A national explanation must retain a real national community while facing internal differences and oppression within the community. It cannot assume that shared memory is completely uniform, nor can internal differences and community oppression be swallowed by a shared name.

The explanatory scopes supported by these images need not be the same. Whether an image can be used depends on the current event and materials; no permanent hierarchy can be set in advance. A limited image

that flattens its own internal structure likewise requires calibration. Different explanations can constrain one another: materials an interpreter extracts through one image may become counterexamples to an explanation supported by another, and a family consequence may force a state-procedure explanation to unfold again. Mutual constraint does not require combining multiple images into a larger total image. It makes each scope of application clearer.

Real differentiating units—labor, wages, property, debt, housing, risk, and domination—and the processes of their extraction, weight assignment, connection, and compression can form local explanatory capacity; the class image is only a low-dimensional output. This local distinction extraction does not prove that a class entity exists and does not constitute a repair of class theory. As a total image, the basic structure of class theory belongs from the outset to Model C. It cannot be downgraded to Model A or Model B in the name of "limited use," nor thereby returned to the ranks of ordinary limited models.

VI. Responsibility Cannot Be Replaced by Abstract Names

If a person, family, group, state institution, or platform enterprise is first judged good or evil and the evaluation is then used in place of mechanism analysis, the explanation stops at moral judgment. The interpreter needs to trace who extracted a difference, formed a record, and assigned a consequence; who received recognition or suffered exclusion; and how the current determination was preserved as material that could be retrieved again in the future. Moral and responsibility judgments may arise, and real harm cannot be canceled. Family members may oppress others by using interpretive authority, care memories, or arrangements of property. Personnel and procedures of platform enterprises may also produce injustice through accounts, ratings, rankings, appeal deadlines, and income opportunities. After identifying a consequence, one must still explain its formation mechanism rather than stopping at "this family is bad" or "the platform is bad."

Mechanism analysis does not cancel moral responsibility. Who formed a record, who rejected materials, who set a procedure, and who continued the handling after knowing its consequences may all affect the judgment of responsibility. When analysts make actions and consequences clear, responsibility has real carriers and is not carried away by abstractions such as "that is how the institution works" or "that is how the market works." In the same event, harm and responsibility may also be distributed across different nodes: one person makes the direct decision, another maintains the record, and a later procedure enlarges the result. Analysts should not place all responsibility on a single person, nor say that no one is responsible merely because the relational chain is long. The scope of responsibility must be judged by action, knowledge, position, and actual consequence.

When moral evaluation comes before materials, it readily treats counterexamples as excuses. Mechanism analysis requires first retaining the response of the person concerned, records of conflict, and procedural materials, and then determining how harm formed. This does not reduce the force of criticism; it prevents names of good and evil from replacing proof. At the same time, Social Differentiation Network Theory contains the author's definite judgment about social reality and must not be weakened into an arbitrary analytical tool or a list of methods. Relational fields, materials, nodes, and relational chains can be entry points for research, but they are not the whole theory. Neither the author nor users of the theory may replace a positive account of how society forms with operational convenience. What is drawn here is the boundary between method and theory.

In concrete research, this theory cannot replace historical research, institutional analysis, field investigation, economic analysis, legal and political judgment, or literature and lived experience. The author thereby states a

bounded theoretical position and a requirement of calibration, enabling interpreters to make limited, traceable, comparable, and revisable judgments. It is not the ultimate answer that explains everything. This theory cannot obtain materials for a researcher. The experience of the person concerned, the background in which a document was formed, the actual operation of a procedure, and historical records each require their own research methods. Social Differentiation Network Theory supplies a direction for questions and judgments: it tells researchers which differences, carriers, and relational chains to trace, but it cannot replace actual verification.

Nor does it guarantee that every event will yield a complete conclusion. Some materials cannot be obtained, some relational chains have been interrupted, and other consequences are still forming. Analysts may offer a restricted judgment and state what remains unknown. If they add connections unsupported by materials merely to appear complete, the theory slides from limited explanation into self-closure. There is a clear boundary between “usable” and “explaining everything.” This theory can assist analysis of difference-handling in families, localities, nations, states, markets, schools, platforms, and movements, but it cannot guarantee in advance that the same set of concepts occupies the center of every question. The relational field changes, and the focus of analysis must change with the materials.

VII. The Boundaries of Limited Judgment and of the Theory Itself

Limited judgment is not arbitrary choice, and still less does it mean that all explanations are the same. The interpreter must disclose the materials used, the relational-field window, the differentiating units extracted, the basis of weight, the nodes, relational chains, scope of application, and conditions for correction, so that different limited explanations can be compared by explanatory power, comparative power, revisability, and differentiation bias. Limitation requires the interpreter to distinguish the strength of judgments: one relational chain may already be supported by several mutually corroborating materials, another inference rests only on a statement by the person concerned, and responses have not yet been obtained from some nodes. Keeping these states separate allows a judgment to stand provisionally while preserving room for later correction. Different explanations may answer different questions. An explanation using a family image may better explain care responsibility, while one using a state image may better explain an eligibility procedure. Analysts must still check whether each extracts the key differences, can be re-expanded into materials, and refuses counterexamples. Comparison does not require compressing them first onto one scale.

Acknowledging social complexity, the possibility of omitted materials, and the need to correct a judgment is a healthy awareness of limitation; it does not belong to Model C. Complexity does not mean that all differences have equal weight at the same time. Family care, eligibility tied to materials, income pressure, and local recognition can coexist, but their times and paths of entry into consequences may differ. Analysts must locate the relational chains currently operating and mark where materials have not yet been obtained. A healthy awareness of complexity makes judgment more precise. It requires the interpreter to acknowledge omission rather than lay all differences out in equal measure. Some differences may temporarily remain outside the relational-field window, so long as the reason for omission is disclosed and counterexamples are allowed to bring them back into analysis. People, institutions, and concrete procedures can preserve records, retrieve materials, make certifications, transmit determinations, and write the results back as differences that can be retrieved in the future; differences, history, and records do not perform these actions on their own. New materials or later events may still lead people concerned and interpreters to question an existing write-back. Write-back is therefore not a permanent settlement.

Many differences, many nodes, and complex relational chains are no grounds for canceling judgment. The problem with relativism is not acknowledging multiple viewpoints but canceling the difference among viewpoints. If sufficient materials and missing materials, revisability and refusal of revision, limited validity and arbitrary collage are all treated as the same, an explanation cannot bear responsibility. Social Differentiation Network Theory retains multiple limited explanations while requiring them to disclose what can be examined.

When an interpreter elevates a limited image into society itself, the total-image subsumption mechanism of Model C comes into operation. When complexity is used to cancel comparison, counterexamples, and correction, the mechanism for erasing distinctions between explanations comes into operation. Complexity-based conflation secretly substitutes “cannot be judged” for “not yet complete.” Once all explanations are called limited and equally unsuccessful, differences in material strength, errors in inference, and capacity for revision can no longer be distinguished; valid models, erroneous models, and junk models are placed on the same level. The erasure of distinctions between explanations appears to respect complexity but in practice cancels criticism of erroneous explanations. Subsumption and the erasure of distinctions between explanations move in opposite directions, yet both destroy the conditions for comparison, correction, and calibration among limited explanations.

The proposer and users of Social Differentiation Network Theory face these two risks as well. If they treat differentiating units as final entities, elevate the network claim into an all-purpose image, or demote all other theories into subsidiary materials of their own, the theory will slide toward Model C’s total-image subsumption. Preventing total-image subsumption requires interpreters to state which questions the theory cannot answer alone. Historical context, legal responsibility, institutional detail, and the experience of the people concerned still require research through corresponding materials. The theory may organize questions, but it cannot reduce other research to a storehouse of examples for itself.

The other risk is to use social complexity and the limitation of explanation to cancel comparison, counterexamples, and correction among models, writing valid models, erroneous models, and junk models as equally unsuccessful. This slides into Model C’s direction of erasing distinctions between explanations. Healthy humility does not fall into this category. Interpreters must still disclose boundaries, offer provisional judgments, and accept calibration; they cannot cancel valid comparison in the name of humility. Preventing the erasure of distinctions between explanations requires a judgment open to criticism. After acknowledging what is unknown, the interpreter must still say which material currently has greater supporting force, which relational chain is more likely to hold, and what counterexample would cause the conclusion to be withdrawn. If only “everything is complex” remains, the theory too loses its comparative capacity.

The proposer and users of the theory must therefore allow other limited explanations to be compared with it within concrete scopes, and must ensure that their own judgments can be re-expanded, remain open to counterexamples, and can be revised in the face of new materials. Self-calibration does not mean repeatedly rewriting the core position. The class entity does not exist; class theory belongs from the outset to Model C’s total-image subsumption direction; and healthy awareness of complexity does not belong to Model C. These are theoretical boundaries the author has confirmed. What must be corrected with materials are judgments about concrete events and their scope, not a clear position turned into a vague compromise. This self-limitation does not soften the judgment that class theory belongs from the outset to the total-image-subsumption form of Model C. It can instead prevent Social Differentiation Network Theory from becoming self-immunizing.

VIII. How This Theory Accepts Examination

The book's final position retains both a positive proposition in social ontology and a way of judging subject to real constraints. The former is this: society forms and exists as a differentiation network, and the differentiation network has a real status in social ontology. It is not the ultimate ontological ground of the universe, a fixed and closed total network, or a super-entity that acts on its own. The latter requires interpreters to carry out calibration when confronting concrete events.

The book's judgments do not all stand on the same grounds, so their examination has layered requirements. Concepts must first remain consistent in their use across the text and be able to face boundary cases. An ontological judgment about how society exists must state which carriers, continuing relays, memory, responsibility, and consequences support real relations.

Once one enters a concrete event, materials, comparison, and contrary cases determine whether an empirical conclusion should be maintained, weakened, narrowed, or withdrawn. A research approach must also allow readers to trace the basis on which a concept was formed, return to materials, nodes, and relational chains for re-examination, and retain the original judgment together with the reasons for its revision. Normative claims about what ought to be, priority, rights, or duties require their own value grounds, rules for conflict, and exceptions; they cannot be inferred directly from relational facts.

These checks constrain one another but do not replace one another. If a relational-chain, weight, or write-back judgment in one event fails, the first requirement is to weaken, narrow, or withdraw that application-level conclusion. If a meso-level mechanism cannot account for the materials, its scope must also be adjusted. If a core term expands and contracts arbitrarily across settings so that different social structures can no longer be distinguished, the problem rises to a loss of conceptual discriminating power. The challenge faced by the overall proposition in social ontology is broader still: it cannot establish itself merely by naming every relation after the fact as a differentiation network, nor is it immediately refuted by a mistaken judgment in an ordinary case.

This foundational proposition must still accept real criticism. Concepts must remain consistent across contexts and distinguish themselves from the empty claim that "everything has relations." They must be able to make substantive distinctions among different social structures and provide explanatory content beyond "society is made of relations." If social continuities or consequences remain insufficiently explained by extraction, weight assignment, connection, transmission, preservation, and write-back, the theory should acknowledge what it has not explained. If a competing social ontology can explain the same materials with fewer assumptions and clearer boundaries, that constitutes a genuine challenge. Faced with continuing counterexamples, the theory must be able to narrow its scope, adjust its concepts, or withdraw a meso-level explanation that no longer holds.

If continuing counterexamples or a competing social ontology reveal problems that point to the foundational proposition itself, the theory cannot preemptively reduce every problem to an individual misjudgment or meso-level mechanism failure. It must state openly why the relevant materials can or cannot still be explained through the three-level formulation, and on that basis make clear the foundational proposition's scope, what remains unexplained, and which formulations may require correction. Accepting this challenge does not mean that an ordinary case alone can overturn the foundational proposition, nor does it mean that the book thereby withdraws the three-level proposition in social ontology already established. This examination prevents the foundational proposition from becoming self-immunizing while preserving its theoretical level as something different from a one-off empirical hypothesis.

When facing concrete events, this way of judging does not require a fixed order and does not constitute a step table, decision tree, score sheet, or algorithm. The concepts provide dimensions of calibration; they must not be arranged as an operating procedure that automatically generates answers. Some events begin with a conflict among materials, while others may have their relational field opened first by an objection from the person concerned. Community mechanisms, weight, and historical indexes may also appear in different sequences depending on the question.

When entering a relational field, the interpreter must state which people, materials, and consequences the event actually involves. In limited distinction extraction, the interpreter must state what differentiating units were extracted and what was downweighted, and must explain which real relations provide the basis for weight, because weight is not an innate numerical value carried by a differentiating unit. Limited distinction extraction remains constrained by reality. An analyst cannot select only differences that fit a position or arbitrarily change the scope after a counterexample appears. The analyst must state the reason for the selection, preserve materials that were downweighted, and state when the conclusion ceases to hold. Limited does not mean arbitrary; it makes the responsibility of judgment more concrete.

Tracing nodes and relational chains requires determining who preserved records, who retrieved materials again in the current event, who certified or transferred them, and who wrote the handling result back as a difference that can be retrieved again in the future. The past does not automatically control the present, and write-back does not permanently determine the future. New materials and later events can still open objections, responses, and correction.

When identifying a community, one must examine whether long-term interaction, memory, recognition, boundaries, shared responsibility, and shared burden are actually maintained by members and their relay relations. An explanatory compression must also state its scope and effective boundary. It may not elevate a total class image or any single image into society itself, nor may it use complexity to cancel a valid judgment.

Social Differentiation Network Theory does not claim to have explained the whole of society. It retains a theoretical position of undertaking limited distinction extraction, disclosing grounds, comparing explanations, accepting counterexamples, and revising judgments. Concrete people, organizations, and procedures can change the connection, transmission, and write-back of differences, causing the differentiation-network order to change, branch, fracture, or reconnect. Every theoretical judgment can hold only within its materials, scope, and counterexample conditions. The book’s final position is not a closed answer but a place that others can inspect: where did the materials come from, who handled the differences, which node changed the consequence, which records were retrieved again by the current event, and which objections require correction? So long as these questions can still be opened, the theory will not pass its own compression result off as society itself.

References and Chapter Reading Guide

This editorial appendix lists 61 distinct resources: 25 scholarly articles, three primary works or extracts, 32 legal or policy instruments, and one news report. Entries 1–19 are comparative readings added during the bibliography expansion; entries 20–53 come from the book's original reference inventory; entries 54–61 are editorial sources used in earlier source checks. The consolidated list restores one historical rental regulation that had been read but omitted from the later inventory. Distinct resources are not necessarily independent studies, nor do they support every proposition in the book.

Primary works clarify objects of criticism and the scope of their claims; articles provide specific research or methodological comparisons. Legal and policy sources are used only within their stated versions, jurisdictions, matters, and provisions. Uses, recorded reading scopes, and unestablished claims are distinguished. The scopes inherit earlier checks, not a fresh reading of every work in this round. Issue dates may differ from online-publication dates, and recorded links do not guarantee continuing webpage availability. English titles of Chinese legal and policy documents are editorial translations for identification, not certified official translations; document numbers are romanized.

The book's body, terminology, political position, and arguments remain unchanged. Inclusion neither asserts that the book's author read every listed work nor implies endorsement by the other authors. Similar concepts do not become equivalents of the book's differentiating units, weight, write-back, or social ontology.

I. Added Comparative Readings and Chapter Guide

1. Manifesto of the Communist Party

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1848. Manifesto of the Communist Party. Translated by Samuel Moore in cooperation with Friedrich Engels, 1888. Marxists Internet Archive, transcription identifying Marx/Engels Selected Works, vol. 1 (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969) as its source. Chapters I and II.

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/index.htm

Chapter connections: Preface and Chapters 1–3, 18, 26, 29, and 34

Use: Primary text for critical comparison

Chapters I and II provide primary formulations concerning class struggle, the bourgeoisie and the state, property, family, education, and national relations. Chapter I presents the bourgeoisie as the product of historical development and describes competition among workers and the repeated disruption of their organization. Engels's 1888 note qualifies the opening historical claim as referring to written history. These qualifications matter when identifying the precise object of criticism. The book's judgment concerning class theory remains its own theoretical argument.

The consulted scope is the online preamble, Chapters I and II, and the notes to Chapter I, rather than the entire work and all edition prefaces.

2. Preface.

Marx, Karl. 1859. "Preface." In A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy. Marxists Internet Archive, online text identifying the Progress Publishers edition (Moscow, 1977) as its source.

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm

Chapter connections: Preface and Chapters 1, 3, 18, and 26

Use: Primary text for critical comparison

The preface sets out Marx's account of relations of production, economic structure, legal and political superstructure, and the relation between social existence and consciousness. It also distinguishes changes in the economic conditions of

production from the ideological forms through which people become conscious of conflict. This is a primary text for examining the position the book criticizes. Editorial material appended to the online transcription should be distinguished from Marx's signed preface.

The complete signed preface was read in the online transcription; it was not collated page by page against the 1977 print edition. The webpage does not name a translator.

3. Engels to J. Bloch.

Engels, Friedrich. 1890. “Engels to J. Bloch.” Extract dated September 21, 1890, in the consulted transcription. Marxists Internet Archive, citing Historical Materialism (Marx, Engels, Lenin) (Progress Publishers, 1972), 294–296.

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1890/letters/90_09_21.htm

Chapter connections: Preface and Chapters 3 and 26

Use: Primary comparison and scope clarification

The extract distinguishes an ultimately determining economic element from an exclusively determining one. It acknowledges the influence of political, legal, and religious forms and the interaction of individual wills, while retaining the ultimately determining role of the production and reproduction of real life. It is relevant to assessing the scope of claims about the tradition being criticized, not evidence that Engels denied every non-economic influence. This distinction does not replace the book's own judgment concerning Model C.

All five substantive paragraphs displayed on the linked page were read. The page supplies an extract with omissions, not the complete letter. Its cited print pages were not independently collated.

4. Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. “Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness.” American Journal of Sociology 91(3): 481–510.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/228311

Public copy: https://sociology.stanford.edu/sites/sociology/files/economic_action_and_social_structure.pdf

Chapter connections: Introduction and Chapters 3, 8, 15, 27, 31, and 36; a comparison of explanatory scope for Chapter 39

Use: Related relational mechanisms and explanatory scope

Pages 481–493 examine action within ongoing social relations, including the conditions under which relations produce trust or create opportunities for wrongdoing. Pages 502–508 address organizational explanations and the scope of embeddedness analysis. Page 506 explicitly limits the analysis to proximate causes rather than claiming to answer broad questions about the nature of modern society. This makes the article useful for comparing relational mechanisms while keeping the book's differentiating units, write-back, and ontological claims separate. It is a different work from Granovetter's 1973 article, “The Strength of Weak Ties.”

The verified reading covers pages 481–493 and 502–508, twenty distinct pages rather than the full thirty-page article.

5. Manifesto for a Relational Sociology.

Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1997. “Manifesto for a Relational Sociology.” American Journal of Sociology 103(2): 281–317.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/231209

Public copy: https://scispace.com/pdf/manifesto-for-a-relational-sociology-jjhfxdfudt.pdf

Chapter connections: Introduction and Chapters 5, 6, and 39; comparison of theoretical positions in the Preface and Chapter 1

Use: Comparison of relational ontology and method, including differences of position

The article distinguishes analyses that begin with preformed entities from those that give priority to processes and relations. Pages 286–287 explain how the terms within a transaction acquire meaning and identity through their functional roles, rather than merely connecting already fixed individuals. Pages 303–308 identify unresolved problems of boundaries, entity formation, network dynamics, and causal mechanisms; pages 309–310 discuss normative judgment. These questions can be read alongside the book's account of differentiating units, concrete consequences, and positive social ontology, while keeping the two conceptual schemes distinct. Pages 288–290 both recognize relational elements in Marx and criticize tendencies to reify class interests. The article does not share the book's entire judgment on class theory and Model C. Its critique of categories must not be presented as the book's denial of real national communities.

The verified reading covers pages 281–291 and 303–312, twenty-one distinct pages rather than the full thirty-seven-page article. The publicly displayed PDF reproduces journal pagination and was checked against the DOI metadata.

6. The Ethnography of Infrastructure.

Star, Susan Leigh. 1999. “The Ethnography of Infrastructure.” American Behavioral Scientist 43(3): 377–391.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1177/00027649921955326

Public copy:
https://ics.uci.edu/~wscacchi/GameLab/Recommended%20Readings/ethnography-infrastructure-Star-1999.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapters 5, 6, 17, 20, 30, 32, and 36

Use: Comparison of classification, infrastructure, and the interpretation of records

Star treats infrastructure as relational to organized practices: what operates smoothly in the background for one person may be an obstacle for another. Pages 380–382 discuss standards, conventions, installed systems, and breakdown; pages 384–387 examine classifications in forms, invisible work, and small obstacles amplified through workflows. Pages 387–388 distinguish an artifact with practical effects, a record of activity, and information treated as a faithful mirror of reality. These distinctions offer comparisons for the book's accounts of formatting, connections between materials, positions of responsibility, and the consequences of records. The article does not establish the book's sequence of write-back, nor does the existence of a form alone establish a fact of life or eligibility. The Moses bridge example on pages 388–389 is explicitly described as controversial and is not treated here as an independently verified historical fact.

All fifteen pages, 377–391, were read, including the notes and bibliography. Reading that bibliography does not establish that its listed works were checked. The public copy is hosted in a UC Irvine faculty teaching directory.

7. Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions.

Moynihan, Donald, Pamela Herd, and Hope Harvey. 2015. “Administrative Burden: Learning, Psychological, and Compliance Costs in Citizen-State Interactions.” Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory 25(1): 43–69. First published online February 27, 2014.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muu009

Public copy: https://digitalgovernmenthub.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/muu009.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapters 5, 17, 20, 30, 32, and 36

Use: Comparison of administrative procedures, cost allocation, and service access

The article defines administrative burden through citizens' experiences, distinguishing the learning costs of finding out about programs and application processes, psychological costs such as stigma and lost autonomy, and compliance costs such as forms, documentation, and renewals. Pages 53–62 examine Wisconsin Medicaid across three governorships, tracing how political preferences, administrators, federal requirements, and procedures shaped applicants' experiences; the evidence includes twenty-four interviews and policy documents. This can be compared with the book's distinction

between facts of life, procedural acceptance, authority at different nodes, and actual consequences. The authors do not regard all burdens as useless or malicious. Page 50 also identifies weaker evidence for the effects of psychological costs on take-up, so the three components must not be presented as equally established. This is research on US welfare administration, not legal authority for Chinese admissions, student registration, medical insurance, archival correction, or judicial enforcement.

The verified reading covers pages 43–65, twenty-three distinct pages comprising the substantive article text. The remaining acknowledgments and bibliography on pages 66–69 are not counted as read. Tables 1 and 2, including the continuation of Table 2, were checked on the original pages. The public copy is supplied by the Georgetown-affiliated Digital Government Hub.

8. Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy.

Folbre, Nancy. 2006. “Measuring Care: Gender, Empowerment, and the Care Economy.” Journal of Human Development 7(2): 183–199.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1080/14649880600768512

Public copy: https://online.fliphtml5.com/pfug/pcyd/

Chapter connections: Chapter 27, with Chapters 5, 32, and 39

Use: Conceptual and measurement comparison of care responsibilities and contributions of time and money

Folbre distinguishes the inputs required by care from outcomes such as health and education. Pages 186–188 differentiate care by its relation to markets, the labor process, and its beneficiaries, rather than restricting it to unpaid housework. Pages 192–194 emphasize that supervisory and on-call responsibilities can constrain other activities while escaping adequate measurement in surveys that record only primary activities. This can be read alongside Chapter 27's tracing of bedside attendance, leave from work, advances of money, and lost opportunities to change jobs; it also helps frame Chapter 32's refusal to reduce all family support to income. The article retains both the costs and rewards of care, rather than treating care itself as depletion alone. Pages 194–195 warn against treating market services as perfect substitutes for family care. Pages 195–197 propose six possible indices of responsibility, not a single scale already validated internationally. These indices do not replace the book's tracing of specific bearers, relational chains, and historical materials, or establish its overall social ontology.

The verified reading covers pages 183–197, fifteen distinct pages, through the final proposed index and acknowledgments. The remaining bibliography on pages 198–199 is not counted as read. Reading used original journal page images in a public reader, with Crossref metadata checked for title, author, journal details, year, pagination, and DOI; the reader is not a publisher website. No PDF was obtained in this batch. OCR served only as an aid; key definitions, Table 1, measurement limits, and the index proposals were checked against page images. This is conceptual and measurement work, not legal authority for Chinese hospital signatures, care leave, inheritance, or admissions. Statistics and studies cited within it are not counted as separately verified sources in this batch.

9. Neighborhood Institutions as Resource Brokers: Childcare Centers, Interorganizational Ties, and Resource Access among the Poor.

Small, Mario Luis. 2006. “Neighborhood Institutions as Resource Brokers: Childcare Centers, Interorganizational Ties, and Resource Access among the Poor.” Social Problems 53(2): 274–292.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1525/sp.2006.53.2.274

Public copy: https://inequality.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/media/_media/pdf/Reference%20Media/Small_2006_Social_Networks.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 28, with Chapters 5, 27, 32, and 39

Use: Comparison of mechanisms connecting local organizations, personnel's actions, and resource access

Small studies sixteen childcare centers in three high-poverty New York City neighborhoods to examine how residents obtain information and services through centers' ties to other organizations. Here, resource brokerage connects individuals to organizations, rather than merely introducing two acquaintances; brokering external resources also differs from directly providing a center's own services. Pages 283–285 distinguish formality from dependence on staff action. The four cells of Table 4 mark ends of two continua, not four fixed categories. Referrals, workshops, bulletin boards, membership arrangements, and informal introductions work through different mechanisms; sharing a location does not by itself establish that resources have reached someone. This can be compared with Chapter 28's requirement to return to specific personnel, records, procedures, and relational pathways. The article allows for divergent interests among organizational members and examines external requirements and professional norms; an organization or local network should not be recast as a unified personality. Pages 287–288 explicitly present the propositions about stability, resilience, and sensitive resources as hypotheses, not established universal causal laws.

The verified reading covers pages 274–289, sixteen distinct pages comprising the abstract, theory, methods, findings, and conclusion. The bibliography on pages 290–292 is not counted as read. The first page, sample Table 1, and mechanism Table 4 were visually checked in Stanford University's public PDF. This is a mechanism-oriented case study, not a representative survey of all New York City childcare centers. Footnote 5 on page 289 mentions preliminary survey findings from a larger project; those must not be conflated with this article's sixteen cases. Access to some resources through organizations does not imply that every locality offers such channels or that kinship ties can be replaced wholesale. The article does not establish specific Chinese residence, community-certification, or admission requirements.

10. Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families.

Lareau, Annette. 2002. “Invisible Inequality: Social Class and Childrearing in Black Families and White Families.” American Sociological Review 67(5): 747–776.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.2307/3088916

Public copy: https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/savvy/images/members/docs/pdf/featured/lareau.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 32, with Chapters 2, 27, and 39

Use: Empirical comparison of family conditions and institutional encounters, with the difference in class-theoretical framework made explicit

Lareau combines interview data on families of eighty-eight children with intensive observation of twelve families, examining daily schedules, language use, kin ties, and parents' and children's encounters with teachers, healthcare professionals, and others. She characterizes two childrearing logics as concerted cultivation and the accomplishment of natural growth; these are her terms, not new concepts introduced into this book. The institutional encounters on pages 766–771 connect opportunities to ask questions, obtain information, raise objections, and seek adjustments to resources and actual interactions. Less frequent visits to school by parents or greater reserve toward officials cannot simply be equated with lack of concern for children. Pages 768 and 772–774 retain unsuccessful interventions, within-group variation, and differing costs of both approaches; neither is presented as intrinsically preferable. These observations invite comparison with Chapter 32's tracing of family fallback support, teachers' interpretations, and conditions for remedy. Lareau nevertheless explicitly organizes her explanation through class analysis, differing from this book's rejection of class entities and the total class image. Citing her observations implies neither her endorsement of this book nor a revision of its judgment on class theory into a limited acceptance of class entities.

The verified reading covers pages 747–755 and 761–774, twenty-three distinct pages including methods, Tables 1–2, later case material, institutional encounters, and discussion. The remaining case material on pages 756–760 and bibliography on pages 775–776 were not read; this is not a claim of full-article reading. The public PDF is supplied by the American Sociological Association. Pagination follows the original first and last pages; OpenAlex's incomplete last-page value of 747 was not copied. This is a nonrandom US sample, and the author explicitly limits generalization beyond the cases studied. The sample groupings are not based on income alone, and the article does not establish innate or hereditary differences or directly support conclusions about all Chinese families, schools, or admissions procedures.

11. Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers.

Rosenblat, Alex, and Luke Stark. 2016. "Algorithmic Labor and Information Asymmetries: A Case Study of Uber's Drivers." International Journal of Communication 10: 3758–3784.

Source or bibliographic link: https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/4892

Public copy: https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/download/4892/1739/21331

Chapter connections: Chapter 33 on platform personnel, records, ratings, visibility, and appeals; Chapter 31 on market evaluation authority and responsibility; Chapter 36 on verification of materials

Use: Comparison with a historical platform case and its specific mechanisms

The study brings together driver forums, interviews, interface design, and corporate communications to examine how dispatch information, demand prompts, passenger ratings, and support responses shape work. Page 3765 is particularly useful alongside the book's treatment of conflicting records: some drivers valued the accountability afforded by trip records, while one interviewee described obtaining a fare correction by supplying his own dashcam footage. This is not evidence that all appeals necessarily fail. An interviewee's generalization about corporate favoritism must also be distinguished from a universal fact established by the researchers. Pages 3771–3775 invite comparison with the book's distinctions among evaluators, customer-service authority, and the consequences of ratings. Corporate claims about algorithms, actual interface messages, and the complete operation of backend software are different kinds of evidence; this article does not provide a comprehensive audit of backend code. These observations do not alter the book's judgments about class entities and Model C, or imply that the two scholars endorse its social ontology.

Verified reading covers printed pages 3758–3778; page 3778 is already bibliography and supplies no additional substantive evidence. Key original pages and all six interface figures were also inspected visually. The main forum study ran from December 2014 to September 2015 and used five forums, approximately 1,350 archival items, and semi-structured interviews with seven drivers; the article also cites later public materials. The authors state that the sample is not necessarily representative of all drivers and that forum names, driver identities, and quotations were modified for confidentiality. Historical fares, rating thresholds, and city rules are not treated as current universal rules. This article neither supplies legal authority for the book's Chinese institutional examples nor establishes that a successful appeal restores every consequence. The citation follows the journal's printed range, 3758–3784, rather than treating a publisher page field of 27 as pagination. No journal DOI was established, so none is supplied.

12. Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy.

Wood, Alex J., Mark Graham, Vili Lehdonvirta, and Isis Hjorth. 2019. "Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy." Work, Employment and Society 33(1): 56–75.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616

Public copy: https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/articles/journal_contribution/Good_Gig_Bad_Gig_Autonomy_and_Algorithmic_Control_in_the_Global_Gig_Economy/26430187

Chapter connections: Chapter 33 on ratings, ranking, work opportunities, and living conditions; Chapter 31 on income, control, and risk; Chapter 36 on comparisons of weight

Use: Cross-regional empirical comparison of remote digital labor, with attention to method

A central contribution of this study is to retain autonomy and control together. Interviewees could exercise real discretion over methods, clients, and schedules, while ratings, client deadlines, competition, and income needs could also induce faster work, night work, or longer hours. Page 64 distinguishes work being directed away from poorly rated workers from the direct deactivation of an account; some monitoring arrangements were also valued as protection against non-payment. Pages 68–70 examine skills, reputation, labor supply and demand, and differences in job quality. These can be compared with the book's tracing of specific distributions of opportunity, without attributing every outcome to technology or income alone. The article's marketplace bargaining power, structural power, and symbolic

power belong to its own theoretical framework. They are not interchangeable with the book's weight or differentiating units, and their inclusion does not require the book to recognize class entities.

Verified reading covers pages 56–71, including the abstract, methods, findings, and conclusion; bibliography pages 72–75 are not counted as read. The analysis uses interviews with 107 workers in six countries and a non-probability survey of 679 workers in Southeast Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, concerning two leading remote labor platforms. The 679 respondents must not be described as a representative sample of the six interview countries. Invitation response rates on the two platforms were 30% and 7%; recruitment, exclusions, and self-selection issues are discussed. Sample percentages are neither global workforce proportions nor causal effects from a randomized experiment. Remote digital work cannot simply be equated with delivery or passenger transport, and the article does not verify the book's particular family, care, or appeal examples. The journal issue is dated 2019; first online publication was in 2018.

13. Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook.

Bucher, Taina. 2012. "Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook." New Media & Society 14(7): 1164–1180.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812440159

Public copy: https://computingeverywhere.soc.northwestern.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Bucher-Facebook.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 33 on ranking, visibility, user interaction, and rule changes; Chapter 36 on verifiable scope and comparison methods

Use: Comparison with a historical news-feed case and a theory of visibility

Drawing on Foucault's analysis of power, Bucher examines a pressure different from being permanently watched: content may disappear from the feed, encouraging participants to pursue interaction and exposure. Pages 1167–1169 discuss the then-known EdgeRank factors, default settings, and cycles of interaction; pages 1172–1174 present observations from her own account. This offers a comparison with the book's distinction between ranking and actual visibility: existing content is not guaranteed to be seen, and interaction signals do not fully establish its value. Increased exposure need not bring only benefits, and a low ranking should not automatically be described as a penalty or ban; these still require judgment within the book's concrete events. Bucher's 'threat of invisibility' is her analytical concept, not a new term coined for this book. It must not replace the author's differentiation-network ontology with Foucault's theory or a checklist of platform technologies.

Verified reading covers pages 1164–1178 through the substantive conclusion; the remaining notes and bibliography on pages 1179–1180 are not counted. This is theoretical analysis combined with two months of observation of the author's personal account in March–April 2011, not a randomized multi-account experiment or a complete backend-code audit. She explicitly acknowledges undisclosed operations and the effects of her own usage frequency. Single-day proportions cannot be generalized into platform-wide or present-day exposure rates. Page 1178 also records a September 20, 2011 redesign that removed the original separation between the two feeds. Tentative statements about particular ranking weights must not be promoted into directly tested, fixed rules. Nor does this study establish current appeal, penalty, or data-retention arrangements across platforms.

14. Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." American Journal of Sociology 82(6): 1212–1241.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/226464

Public copy: https://users.ssc.wisc.edu/~peoliver/SOC924/Articles/McCarthyZald1977.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 34 on organizational nodes, resource allocation, and positions of participation; read alongside Chapter 2 on resource differences and Chapter 37 on community mechanisms

Use: Comparison of concepts and mechanisms, rather than empirical verification of the book's specific scenarios or its ontology as a whole

This theoretical article distinguishes movements from movement organizations and groupings of organizations. It also separates those who endorse goals, those who provide resources, potential beneficiaries, bystanders, and opponents. These positions can overlap; an organizational name or a shared demand does not establish equal contributions or benefits. The authors further distinguish people involved in decision-making, paid staff, and people who intermittently carry out tasks, examining how time, money, facilities, outside support, and existing connections affect sustained participation. These distinctions can be read alongside Chapter 34's attention to actual bearers, task allocation, and participation costs, and Chapter 37's distinction between temporary mobilization and a continuing community.

The passages checked are on printed pages 1212–1228 and 1235–1238; only the concluding paragraph on page 1238 supplies substantive evidence, with the remainder consisting of references. The public scan includes a cover sheet, so file-page numbers differ from journal pagination. The article develops concepts and illustrative hypotheses, relying mainly on American cases and disproportionately on organizations of the left. It explicitly offers a partial theory, not a completed cross-societal validation. Its assumptions about organizational survival, resources, and preferences are not equivalent to the book's differentiating units, weight, or differentiation network. They cannot be used to weaken the author's denial of class entities or to substitute organizational names for concrete personnel.

15. Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer.

McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." American Journal of Sociology 92(1): 64–90.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/228463

Public copy: https://users.ssc.wisc.edu/~peoliver/SOC924/Articles/McAdamHighRisk.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 34 on participation, withdrawal, risk, and cost; read alongside Chapter 37 on the formation and weakening of action communities and Chapter 38 on differences among participants using a shared slogan

Use: Historical research with specific sampling and measurement limits, used to compare participation mechanisms and research methods

McAdam studies applicants to the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer project. He uses applications completed before the campaign to compare those who subsequently participated with those who withdrew, rather than simply treating attitudes formed after participation as its causes. The article distinguishes costs in time, money, and energy from anticipated legal, physical, social, and financial dangers. Participants and withdrawals could both strongly support the movement's goals: commitment did not guarantee participation, while prior organizational and interpersonal ties were associated with participation. This offers a comparison for Chapter 34's distinctions among positions of participation, differing risks, and reasons for withdrawal. The article also explicitly rejects an inevitable progression from low-risk participation to more intensive involvement; it supplies no law by which movements necessarily become revolutions.

The relevant text, methods, results, and conclusions checked span pages 64–89; the references beginning on page 89 are not counted as additional evidence. This is a historical sample selected through an application process, not a randomized experiment involving the general population. Page 72 reports 239 withdrawals, while the abstract and some tables use 241; this discrepancy is retained rather than imposing one number on every analysis. Tables 8 and 9 use a regression sample of 794. The study operationalizes strong ties as names listed directly on an application and weak ties as connections through an intermediary; these measures cannot be generalized to every close or distant relationship. The expected direction of constraints such as marriage and employment was not consistently confirmed, and the summed personal constraints and prior activism were not statistically significant in the principal multivariable models. These hypotheses must not be presented as laws established by this study. Nor does a comparison among selected applicants directly verify the student-registration, debt, account, or care consequences in Chapter 34's composite scenario.

16. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.

Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” Annual Review of Sociology 26: 611–639.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Public copy: https://users.ssc.wisc.edu/~peoliver/SOC924/Articles/BenfordSnowAnnRev2000.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 34 on slogan compression, attribution of responsibility, internal dissent, and consequences of action; Chapter 37 on the distinction between a common name and a community; Chapter 38 on shared slogans and differences in participation

Use: Comparison with a conceptual research review, without equating framing theory with this book or counting every study it cites as newly verified

This review distinguishes identifying a problem and attributing responsibility, articulating a remedy, and offering reasons to act. Agreement that a problem exists does not automatically establish agreement about responsibility or remedies; securing agreement and securing action are also distinct tasks. The authors discuss how slogans accent selected experiences, how organizations and participants contest interpretations, and how extending a frame can generate disagreements or fail to produce the intended results. These analyses can be read alongside Chapters 34 and 38, where shared slogans do not erase differences in reasons for participation. They also prompt attention to the distinction in Chapter 37 between temporary joint action and continuing community mechanisms.

The public copy bears typesetting proof marks. Its authors, title, and pagination were checked against the publication metadata; word-for-word identity with the final published version has not been certified. The text checked runs from page 611 through the conclusion on page 633; the bibliography beginning on page 633 is not treated as additional substantive support. This is a selective conceptual and theoretical review, not a quantitative synthesis of effect sizes or a direct test of all movements. Its discussion of empirical credibility on page 620 concerns whether people regard material as credible, not whether a claim is true. Pages 626 and 632–633 retain unresolved questions about causal explanation, movement outcomes, and methods. Frames, master frames, and resonance must not silently replace the book’s images, total images, weight, or write-back. Changes in frames do not substitute for the book’s sequence in which preservation forms write-back and later renewed extraction makes the preserved content effective again. An account of organizational force does not establish the existence of class entities or weaken the author’s position that class theory belongs to Model C from the outset, his opposition to communism, or the positive ontology of differentiation networks.

17. Understanding Process Tracing

Collier, David. 2011. “Understanding Process Tracing.” PS: Political Science & Politics 44(4): 823–830.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429

Public copy: https://polisci.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/people/u3827/Understanding%20Process%20Tracing.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 38 on evidentiary force, temporal sequence, alternative explanations, and counterexamples; Chapter 39 on examining concrete events, research grounds, and reasons for revision

Use: Methodological comparison concerning within-case evidence and causal inference

Collier defines process tracing as the systematic examination of diagnostic evidence in light of research questions and hypotheses. Pages 823–825 emphasize that analyzing change requires adequate descriptions of situations at particular moments. Whether evidence distinguishes explanations depends on background knowledge, assumptions, and observable implications. Pages 825–828 distinguish clues that only modestly increase plausibility, tests that a hypothesis must pass but that do not by themselves confirm it, and evidence that more strongly supports an explanation. This can be read alongside Chapter 38 on the differing evidentiary force of statements, documents, procedural responses, and records, and Chapter 39 on why a particular judgment should stand, be narrowed, or be withdrawn. Tracing the order of events still requires identifying which materials support the asserted connections; temporal narration alone is not causal proof.

The consulted scope comprises the main text, Tables 1–7, and conclusion on pages 823–829. Notes and bibliography on page 829 are not counted as additional substantive support, and page 830 was not treated as new research. The Sherlock Holmes story is a teaching illustration, not social evidence. Pages 825–827 make the classification of tests dependent on assumptions rather than rigid rules; page 828 retains problems of omitted variables, measurement error, and probabilistic relationships. The article supplies no score sheet that automatically adjudicates all theories, and it does not turn the book's calibration dimensions into fixed steps. This methodological comparison neither replaces nor directly proves the book's positive ontology of differentiation networks, its denial of class entities, or its judgment that class theory belongs to Model C from the outset.

18. Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options

Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." Political Research Quarterly 61(2): 294–308.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077

Public copy: https://aceproject.org/electoral-advice/archive/questions/replies/614466876/555642411/Gerring-Case-selection-Techniques-in-Case-Study.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 38 on scope, comparison, and contrary cases; Chapter 39 on scope conditions, conceptual discrimination, and different levels of examination

Use: Methodological comparison concerning case selection and the scope of generalization

This methodological article gives different purposes to typical, diverse, extreme, deviant, influential, most similar, and most different cases. Pages 294–300 require researchers to explain how their cases relate to the population of interest. A typical case that fits a model may still reveal that its proposed causal mechanism is absent, and a small residual does not guarantee representativeness when the model is misspecified. Pages 301–306 distinguish unusual values from departures from a model's expectations and explain why a design suited to discovering an explanation cannot simply be presented as confirmation of the new hypothesis. These distinctions help readers understand the book's requirements to retain contrary materials, state the scope of comparisons, and preserve reasons for revision. The article allows research designs to change with findings; this does not license arbitrary changes of scope merely to save a conclusion.

The consulted scope is the main text, Tables 1–2, and conclusion on pages 294–307. Notes and bibliography on page 307 are not counted as additional substantive support, and page 308 was not treated as new research. Page 296 primarily limits the approach to causal research that infers from a few cases to a larger population, rather than every descriptive study or inquiry concerned only with a particular event. Statistical selection requires available data, defensible measurement, and model assumptions. The development-and-democracy illustrations on pages 299 and 305 use explicitly simplified assumptions, not universal laws independently verified here. Page 302's discussion of a single deviant case refuting a deterministic proposition cannot be applied indiscriminately to the book's overall ontology. The book's conceptual composite situations remain conceptual illustrations; adding this reference does not turn them into a sample survey. Weight, differentiating units, and relational fields do not directly equal regression coefficients, variables, or statistical samples. This does not exempt the foundational proposition from criticism: Chapter 39 requires a public account of its boundaries, unexplained matters, and formulations that may need correction when continuing counterexamples challenge the foundational proposition itself.

19. Experimental Designs for Identifying Causal Mechanisms

Imai, Kosuke, Dustin Tingley, and Teppei Yamamoto. 2013. "Experimental Designs for Identifying Causal Mechanisms." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society) 176(1): 5–51.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2012.01032.x

Public copy: https://imai.fas.harvard.edu/research/files/Design.pdf

Chapter connections: Chapter 38 on connections among materials, evidentiary force, and alternative explanations; Chapter 39 on distinctions among empirical claims, methodological conditions, and ontology

Use: Technical comparison of causal-mechanism identification and its assumptions, not a statistical definition of the book's concepts

Imai and colleagues explicitly define the mechanism studied as the process through which a treatment affects an outcome through a mediator, formalized as a natural indirect effect. Pages 5–11 explain that randomizing treatment can help identify an average treatment effect but does not automatically identify mediation: the mediator–outcome relationship may remain confounded. Pages 12–14 further show that separately observing a treatment's effect on a mediator and a mediator's effect on an outcome does not generally establish the proposed natural indirect effect. The authors present a parallel experimental design with additional conditions. They emphasize that the act of manipulating the mediator must not change the outcome through other pathways and distinguish an absence of interaction at the individual level from equality on average. This can be read alongside the book's requirement to establish whether a connection actually operated in an event: drawing a relational chain, observing a temporal sequence, or estimating an association does not remove the need to examine alternative mechanisms and identification conditions.

The consulted scope is pages 5–14 and the conclusion on pages 25–26. The remaining designs' full derivations, appendix proofs, replication materials, and appended discussion were not verified. The published range, pages 5–51, includes discussion; statements by discussants must not all be attributed to the three authors. The volume year is 2013; 2012 is the advance-publication and copyright year. Page 7 assumes no interference between units and a binary treatment, while pages 8–9 acknowledge that this is not the only meaning of mechanism. These conditions cannot be applied directly to the book's interpersonal transmission, continuing relays, and write-back across events; the research question and defensible assumptions must first be specified. An average indirect effect is not the book's weight, and a mediator is not a differentiating unit. The article supplies no value grounds for deriving rights, duties, or legitimacy from relational facts, nor does it empirically validate the book's overall ontology.

II. Scholarly Works in the Original Reference Inventory

20. The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory

Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." American Journal of Sociology 113(4): 970–1022.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/522803

Recorded reading scope: 970–982 and 1008–1011

Use and limits: Boundary categories and behavioral dimensions offer a comparison of boundary mechanisms. Page 981 rejects treating ethnic categories as unitary actors; page 982 distinguishes group-level analysis from ontological collectivism. Probabilistic and consensus conditions remain, and some hypotheses on page 1011 await testing. This does not independently establish the book's ontology of national communities.

21. The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences

Lamont, Michèle, and Virág Molnár. 2002. "The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences." Annual Review of Sociology 28(1): 167–195.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.28.110601.141107

Recorded reading scope: 167–173 and 181–190

Use and limits: Symbolic and social boundaries are distinguished on pages 168–169; community, national, and local interactions and membership conditions are discussed later. The category/community discussion on page 182 differs from this book's position and must not be imported as its theory. Pages 189–190 are bibliography, not additional substantive evidence.

22. Collective Memory and Cultural Identity

Assmann, Jan. 1995. “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity.” New German Critique no. 65: 125–133. Translated by John Czaplicka.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.2307/488538

Recorded reading scope: 126–132, with pages 125 and 133 checked for framing and translation credit

Use and limits: Intergenerational practices, carriers, objectification, reconstruction, and organization support a comparison of memory-maintenance mechanisms. Page 125 concerns cultural socialization, not phylogenetic or racial memory. Page 133 identifies John Czaplicka as translator, not coauthor. The complete article spans pages 125–133.

23. Social Memory Studies: From “Collective Memory” to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. 1998. “Social Memory Studies: From ‘Collective Memory’ to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices.” Annual Review of Sociology 24(1): 105–140.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.105

Recorded reading scope: 105–112 and 121–135

Use and limits: The discussion rejects reification and a mystical group mind, treats memory as process, and considers socialization, media practices, dispute, change, and continuity. Page 135 is bibliography, not a new argument. These comparisons do not give a collective name a unified personality.

24. Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. “Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology.” Annual Review of Sociology 24(1): 1–24.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1

Recorded reading scope: 1–7, 15–18, and 21–23

Use and limits: Resources, relations, sources, and effects must be distinguished. Exclusion of outsiders, excessive claims on members, restrictions on freedom, and downward-leveling norms are retained. The article warns against reversed causation, circular definition, and unconditional celebration of community. Page 23 is bibliography, not independent argument.

25. Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital

Coleman, James S. 1988. “Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital.” American Journal of Sociology 94: S95–S120.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/228943

Recorded reading scope: S98–S105 and S109–S116

Use and limits: The specified sixteen pages concern obligations and expectations, information channels, and relations within and outside families as resources. Heterogeneity on page S98 and design and proxy-variable limitations on page S113 remain. The article is not evidence that the book’s differentiation network or a class-reproduction claim has been proved.

26. The Strength of Weak Ties

Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. “The Strength of Weak Ties.” American Journal of Sociology 78(6): 1360–1380.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1086/225469

Recorded reading scope: 1360–1369 and 1373–1378

Use and limits: Tie strength and bridging have a conditional relationship: weak ties are not necessarily bridges. The West End explanation on page 1375 is acknowledged as speculation lacking data; page 1378 sets out a limited exploratory agenda. The article does not establish a unified community will. This is distinct from the 1985 embeddedness article.

27. Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Felton Earls. 1997. “Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy.” Science 277(5328): 918–924.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918

Recorded reading scope: 918–924

Use and limits: The study concerns 8,782 respondents in 343 neighborhood clusters in 1995; note 21 specifies 7,729 people with complete data for the relevant analysis. Its measures, models, and limits must be retained. Page 923 identifies the cross-sectional design and single-city scope; causation is not established. The underlying data and formulae were not independently recomputed.

28. Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms

Ostrom, Elinor. 2000. “Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms.” Journal of Economic Perspectives 14(3): 137–158.

Source or bibliographic link: https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.14.3.137

Recorded reading scope: 137–143 and 148–156

Use and limits: The cited version is the 2000 journal article, not the 1999 working paper. Conditional cooperation, punishment, information about past conduct, and rules provide bounded comparisons. They do not establish a unified community will or make community demands inherently legitimate. Pages 155–156 are references, not additional substantive evidence.

III. Legal and Policy Sources in the Original Reference Inventory

29. Compulsory Education Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2018 amendment

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/guoqing/2021-10/29/content_5647617.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 11–13; the previously checked central framework.

Use and limits: Use is limited to the cited framework and specified provisions. Provincial arrangements and particular admission procedures require their own evidence; this is not verification of every article.

30. Measures for the Administration of Student Registration in Primary and Secondary Schools

Version and identification: Jiao Ji [2025] No. 1

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A06/jcys_jyzb/202502/t20250207_1177647.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 3–8 and 27–30; the recorded check of links on the Ministry of Education page.

Use and limits: The provisions describe creating records after enrollment and categories of basic information. They do not establish a nationwide checklist of documents for parents. No document-attachment link was found in the recorded page check.

31. Measures for the Determination of Work-Related Injuries

Version and identification: Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security Order No. 8; effective January 1, 2011

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2022-08/31/content_5711327.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–27; the attached application form was not separately read.

Use and limits: Application, investigation, determination, and remedies have different responsible parties. Article 6 permits other evidence of an employment relationship; a written contract is not the only permissible proof.

32. Civil Procedure Law of the People's Republic of China

Version and identification: 2023 amendment

Source or bibliographic link: https://cicc.court.gov.cn/html/1/218/62/83/443.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 66–75, 171–182, and 235–269; the latter range includes the originally specified Articles 250–255.

Use and limits: The grounds and deadlines for appeals and the conditions for enforcement differ. Providing asset information does not guarantee recovery. Provisions on ordinary commercial arbitration must not be treated as covering labor arbitration. The two earlier citation ranges are consolidated here without losing either use. The checks do not establish every enforcement prerequisite or the probative force of evidence in an individual case.

33. Measures for the Administration of Work Capacity Appraisal

Version and identification: Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security and National Health Commission Order No. 55; 2025

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/2025/issue_12106/202506/content_7028414.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–39; attachments omitted from the gazette page were not counted as read.

Use and limits: Articles 17–29 address service, renewed appraisal, review, and expert conduct; Articles 7–16 set out the initial application chain. This bibliographic clarification does not silently replace the book's originally cited range.

34. Law of the People's Republic of China on Mediation and Arbitration of Labor Disputes

Version and identification: 2007

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.beijing.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengcefagui/qtwj/201912/t20191219_1307906.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–54.

Use and limits: Confirmation of an employment relationship, evidentiary duties, remedies against different awards, and enforcement after failure to comply when due are distinct. Their existence does not make every procedure mandatory in every case.

35. Administrative Reconsideration Law of the People's Republic of China

Version and identification: 2023 revision

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/yaowen/liebiao/202309/content_6901584.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 11, 19–20, and 30–79.

Use and limits: Work-injury determinations may be challenged through administrative reconsideration as provided by law. Acceptance, supplementation, evidence, hearings, and decisions are not the same process as renewed work-capacity appraisal.

36. Regulations on Work-Related Injury Insurance

Version and identification: 2010 revision; reproduced in the 2011 State Council Gazette

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2011/content_1778064.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 17–19, 21–28, 30, 33, and 62.

Use and limits: Injury determination, appraisal, benefits, and the liability of uninsured employers must be distinguished. Article 18 does not require a written contract as the only employment evidence; Article 30 limits reimbursable items.

37. Supreme People's Court Provisions on Restricting High Consumption and Related Consumption by Persons Subject to Enforcement

Version and identification: 2015 amended and republished text

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.court.gov.cn/fabu/xiangqing/15046.html

Recorded reading scope: Republished Articles 1–11 and the amending decision.

Use and limits: Prerequisites, restricted items, decisions, assistance or public notices, and lifting restrictions each have conditions. These rules do not establish that every record has effects on employment, loans, or departure from the country.

38. Measures for Reviewing and Confirming Minimum-Livelihood Assistance

Version and identification: Min Fa [2021] No. 57

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2021-07/29/content_5628296.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 5, 9–18, 20, 25–26, and 30–32.

Use and limits: The checked acceptance, verification, and supplementation mechanisms concern minimum-livelihood assistance, not every form of social assistance.

39. General Office of the State Council, Opinions on Improving Medical Insurance and Assistance for Major and Serious Diseases

Version and identification: Guo Ban Fa [2021] No. 42; October 28, 2021

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/content/2021-11/19/content_5651446.htm

Recorded reading scope: Parts II–VIII.

Use and limits: Medical assistance, minimum-livelihood assistance, and basic medical insurance are distinct. The source does not establish that every medical expense is paid in full.

40. Regulations of the People's Republic of China on Household Registration

Version and identification: 1958; consulted official reproduction

Source or bibliographic link: https://gat.zj.gov.cn/col/col1229098252/art/2026/art_a71c53257b474e938a30ebd0f6294d18.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–3, 7, and 17–19.

Use and limits: Birth registration, changes or corrections to registered particulars, names, and family changes must be distinguished. Correction after verification does not imply that registration creates the underlying facts of life.

41. Regulations on Marriage Registration

Version and identification: 2025

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/2025/issue_12006/202504/content_7021465.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–4 and 7–10.

Use and limits: Application categories, required documents, personal attendance, and networked verification have defined scopes. Requirements for mainland residents in 2025 must not mechanically retain the older household-register requirement.

42. Interim Regulations on Real Estate Registration

Version and identification: 2019 amended text

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2019/content_5468903.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 2, 8, 15–16, and 27–28.

Use and limits: Applications and access to registration information each have conditions concerning persons, documents, matters, purposes, and confidentiality. Not everyone may retrieve all information without restriction.

43. Administrative Penalty Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2021 revision

Source or bibliographic link: http://www.npc.gov.cn/npc/c2/c30834/202101/t20210122_309857.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 44–67.

Use and limits: Verification of evidence, records of the whole process, publication and withdrawal of specified penalties, confidentiality, decisions, service, hearings, and enforcement are distinct. Publication does not authorize permanent and unconditional use.

44. Resident Identity Card Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2011 amendment

Source or bibliographic link: http://www.npc.gov.cn/npc/c2/c12435/201905/t20190522_81831.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 13–15.

Use and limits: The right to prove identity, specified occasions for presenting a card, and police inspection powers are distinct. Confidentiality, alternative proof, and restrictions on retention of cards remain relevant.

45. Social Insurance Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2018 amendment

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/guoqing/2021-10/29/content_5647616.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 4, 58, 74, and 83.

Use and limits: There are direct provisions on enrollment, contributions and entitlement records, checking records, and remedies. They do not establish that retrospective contributions restore every eligibility condition or period of continuous coverage.

46. Archives Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2020 revision

Source or bibliographic link: http://www.npc.gov.cn/npc/c2/c30834/202006/t20200620_306637.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–53.

Use and limits: The checked text did not establish a general procedure for individuals to correct factual errors in personal archives. Article 21 prohibits falsification; Article 28 concerns access; Article 46 concerns reporting unlawful conduct. These are not interchangeable with correction of recorded facts.

47. Regulations for Implementing the Archives Law of the People’s Republic of China

Version and identification: 2024

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/2024/issue_11166/202402/content_6931883.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–52.

Use and limits: Articles 39–40 concern authenticity and traceability, Article 46 investigation of violations, and Articles 48–51 orders to rectify unlawful management. These do not establish a general procedure for correcting factual errors in personal archives.

48. Shanghai Municipal Education Commission, Implementation Opinions on Admission to Compulsory-Education Schools in Shanghai in 2023

Version and identification: Hu Jiao Wei Ji [2023] No. 10

Source or bibliographic link: https://edu.sh.gov.cn/xxgk2_zdgz_rxgkyzs_02/20230330/c1c9c715418e49faad3a32981aeb4830.html

Recorded reading scope: The recorded provisions of the 2023 Shanghai admissions policy.

Use and limits: Use remains limited to the stated year, jurisdiction, and applicant categories. Detailed document requirements need specific supporting passages; this is not a nationwide or present-day general rule.

49. Beijing Municipal Education Commission, Opinions on Compulsory-Education Admissions in 2024

Version and identification: Jing Jiao Ji Er [2024] No. 4

Source or bibliographic link: https://jw.beijing.gov.cn/xxgk/2024zcwj/2024xzgfwj/202404/t20240423_3632758.html

Recorded reading scope: The recorded 2024 admissions provisions on employment in Beijing, actual residence, and the Beijing residence permit.

Use and limits: These are local and annual admission conditions, not uniform national rules. The archived page’s status label does not extend the policy to every later admission year.

50. Dapeng New District, Guide to Applications for Grade-Seven Places in the 2024–2025 Academic Year

Version and identification: 2024–2025 academic year

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.dpxq.gov.cn/ztzl/mszt/jypx/tzgg/content/post_11320115.html

Recorded reading scope: The archived guide’s specified passages on application, housing, social insurance, and supporting materials.

Use and limits: Parents' online entry, alternative housing routes, issuers of community documents, social-insurance exceptions, and exclusion of retrospective contribution periods from the relevant calculation remain distinct. They do not establish the book's entire admissions chain in Chapter 30. The retained evidence is an archived guide, not a newly retrieved current webpage.

51. Baiyun District, Guangzhou, Measures for Points-Based Admission of Accompanying Children of Migrants to Guangzhou

Version and identification: Yun Jiao Gui Zi [2024] No. 1; issued April 30, 2024

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gz.gov.cn/gfxwj/qjgfxwj/byq/qbm/content/post_9630491.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 2–7 and the archived page's validity information.

Use and limits: The four routes in Article 4(3) are alternatives, not cumulative requirements. The page records an expiry date of April 10, 2025. The document is retained as a historical example, not described as a current 2026 rule.

52. Labor Contract Law of the People's Republic of China

Version and identification: 2007 text, with the 2012 amending decision checked for the cited provisions

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/gongbao/content/2007/content_711013.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 7, 10, and 30, together with the 2012 amending decision.

Use and limits: The employment relationship begins with the commencement of work; written-contract and wage obligations are distinct. The 2012 changes to Articles 57, 63, 66, and 92 did not amend these three cited provisions.

53. Notice and Attached Procedures on Direct Settlement of Basic Medical Insurance Expenses for Treatment across Provincial Boundaries

Version and identification: Yi Bao Fa [2022] No. 22; notice dated June 30, 2022; procedures effective January 1, 2023

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2022-07/26/content_5702881.htm

Recorded reading scope: Previously checked provisions including Articles 2, 8, 32, 43, 44, and 64 of the procedures.

Use and limits: Use is limited to the specified interprovincial basic-insurance arrangements. The book's family advances and care obligations remain the author's scenario; this source does not establish a nationwide checklist for it or every local rule in 2026.

IV. Editorial Sources Used in Earlier Verification

54. Military Service Law of the People's Republic of China

Version and identification: 2021 revision; authorized Xinhua publication

Source or bibliographic link: http://www.xinhuanet.com/politics/2021-08/20/c_1127781601.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 5, 11, 14–15, 18–26, and 65.

Use and limits: Military-service obligations, registration, and conditions for recruitment are distinct. The source supplies a statutory comparison, not a proof of the book's social ontology.

55. Regulations on Recruitment for Military Service

Version and identification: 2023 revision; reproduced by People's Daily/People.cn

Source or bibliographic link: http://cpc.people.com.cn/BIG5/n1/2023/0413/c64387-32663139.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 11–27 and 74, with Article 7 on confidentiality.

Use and limits: Household-registration rules and exceptions for recruitment elsewhere, physical examinations, political assessment, and approval are distinct steps with their own conditions.

56. Regulations on Housing Rental

Version and identification: 2025; Xinhua text reproduced by People.cn

Source or bibliographic link: http://politics.people.com.cn/n1/2025/0721/c1001-40526641.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 2, 8, 13, 15, 27, 30, 33, 41, and 50.

Use and limits: Filing routes do not establish retrospective satisfaction of school-admission requirements. Penalties applicable to enterprises cannot be extended indiscriminately to every individual.

57. Two Departments Call for Further Deepening and Standardizing Tax–Bank Cooperation

Version and identification: China News Service policy report; April 2, 2026

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.chinanews.com.cn/cj/2026/04-02/10597592.shtml

Recorded reading scope: The archived news report through the final paragraph quoting the responsible official.

Use and limits: This is a secondary report, not the full notice. It gives indirect support concerning tax-credit financing and authorization. It is not an independent replication of the policy facts also documented by the notice listed separately.

58. Measures for the Administration of Individual Social Insurance Entitlement Records

Version and identification: Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security Order No. 14; 2011

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2022-08/31/content_5711330.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–6 and 14–23.

Use and limits: Article 16 provides for a written checking request, supporting documents, review, and correction of verified errors. This supports a record-checking mechanism, not retrospective contributions or recognition of school-admission eligibility.

59. State Taxation Administration and National Financial Regulatory Administration, Notice on Further Deepening and Standardizing Tax–Bank Cooperation

Version and identification: Shui Zong Na Fu Fa [2026] No. 19

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/202604/content_7064570.htm

Recorded reading scope: Parts I–IV of the notice and its signature date.

Use and limits: The notice directly concerns using tax data in credit models, assessments, and enterprise classification. Voluntary authorization, minimum necessity, and restricted access matter; this does not establish a rule for every statutory administrative matter.

60. Interim Regulations on Enterprise Information Disclosure

Version and identification: 2024 amended text

Source or bibliographic link:
https://www.samr.gov.cn/xyjgs/flfg/art/2024/art_be55c2e3a54a43e5ab12794c9dc87600.html

Recorded reading scope: Articles 2–3, 6–7, 10, 14–19, and 23.

Use and limits: Disclosure, spot checks, evidence collection, abnormal operations, unlawful or dishonest conduct, and specified credit constraints have direct textual grounds. Public access also prevents treating the book's word "only" as an externally established rule covering every possible use of enterprise information.

61. Measures for the Administration of Commodity Housing Rental

Version and identification: Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development Order No. 6; effective February 1, 2011

Source or bibliographic link: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2022-01/25/content_5711968.htm

Recorded reading scope: Articles 1–28; the earlier recorded reading is retained.

Use and limits: Articles 14, 16, and 23 concern filing and correction after delay, within the housing scope of Article 2. They do not establish retrospective compliance with admission deadlines. The relationship to the 2025 rental regulations and local rules has not been established here; no claim of general current applicability is made.

Thematic Navigation

- Objects of criticism and theoretical scope: 1–3; comparisons of relational theory: 4–5.

- Classification, infrastructure, and administrative burden: 6–7.

- Family care, local resources, and educational opportunities: 8–10.

- Platform labor, algorithmic management, and visibility: 11–13.

- Social movements, organization, and differences in participation: 14–16.

- Theory examination, case selection, and mechanism identification: 17–19.

- Previously cited boundary, memory, and relational research: 20–28.

- Previously cited education, labor, judicial, assistance, identity, and records provisions: 29–53.

- Earlier editorial checks of military-service, rental, insurance, enterprise, and tax–bank sources: 54–61.

Editorial consolidation date: October 10, 2026.