UNDER CONDITIONS OF LOAD

Continuity through Altered Conditions

Jianjie Ji

August 16, 2026

CONTENTS

Opening

How Relations Continue under Altered Conditions

Materials do not cease to change once a form has appeared. More importantly, change does not occur only within things themselves. A change in one part may alter the conditions under which another part can continue; a change in one relation may alter how other relations can make contact, bear, move, resist, or persist. Change acquires structural significance, then, not simply when it becomes visible, but when it begins to alter the conditions under which subsequent relations can occur.

Under Conditions of Load therefore does not begin by asking how a structure preserves itself. It asks a more difficult question:

How can relations continue when the conditions of their continuation are themselves being altered by what has already occurred?

If continuity were possible only through the preservation of sameness, every genuine change would constitute a threat to continuity. Yet relations do not continue only after change has ceased. They continue through change.

Continuity must therefore be distinguished from preservation, sameness, and succession. It does not mean that a form remains intact, that every relation retains its position, or that one event simply follows another in time. Continuity requires something more exact: what has already occurred must remain capable of altering how subsequent relations can occur.

In this sense, continuity is not a question of what survives change. It is a question of how change remains consequential.

The basic terms of this inquiry are therefore not objects alone, but relations, conditions, and consequences. The structural significance of an event cannot be determined solely by describing what visibly happened. A further set of questions becomes necessary: Did the event alter a relation? Did it alter the way consequences could be borne? Did it render a previously viable mode of continuation no longer viable? Did its consequences enter other relations and alter the conditions of what could happen next?

Ground, Materials, Formation, Continuity, Bearing, Re-ordering, Gravity, Failure, Redistribution, Return under Altered Conditions, and Re-reordering should not be understood as stages in a mechanical sequence. They designate distinct conceptual conditions. Each becomes necessary only when the preceding concept reaches the limit of what it can explain.

The argument of this text can therefore be condensed into a proposition that will recur throughout:

Continuity does not preserve the conditions through which it continues. It changes them.

The task of Under Conditions of Load is to establish precisely how this proposition can be sustained.

Chapter One

GROUND

How Relation Becomes Possible

Before any particular relation can occur, there must be conditions under which relation itself is possible.

Ground, in this sense, cannot simply mean a foundation beneath something else. If Ground were merely a pre-existing surface upon which relations subsequently took place, it would remain external to those relations: relations would occur on it while Ground itself remained unchanged. Such a conception cannot explain how relation becomes possible in the first place.

The theoretical function of Ground must therefore be more precise.

Ground is the condition under which relation becomes available.

Ground is not the sum of all existing conditions, nor is it a first substance from which relations are derived. It names the condition under which contact, dependence, limitation, separation, transmission, bearing, and transformation can become relationally possible.

This distinction is necessary because Ground cannot be replaced by Materials. Materials can tell us something about the histories and capacities of the participants entering a relation. They cannot yet explain why entering into relation is possible at all.

Ground precedes a particular relation, but it should not therefore be understood as an abstract possibility detached from actual conditions. It is a field of availability. It makes relation possible without determining in advance what form that relation must take.

A ground may allow several relations to emerge. It may also make certain relations more viable than others. Ground therefore provides availability rather than command.

Nor is Ground an immutable beginning.

Once relations occur, the consequences they produce may alter the conditions under which subsequent relations become possible. Contact may alter boundaries. Pressure may alter support. Displacement may alter adjacency. Separation may close one pathway while making another available.

We can therefore write:

Ground -> Relation -> Altered Ground

But Altered Ground is not a return to the beginning. It already contains consequences produced by prior relations.

No subsequent relation, therefore, necessarily begins from a neutral ground.

Ground may already carry the consequences of what has occurred before.

This is why Ground must remain an independent concept within Under Conditions of Load. Without it, we may describe what enters into relation, but we cannot yet explain how relation becomes available in the first place.

Yet Ground leaves another question unanswered.

If relations become possible under certain conditions, are the participants entering those relations equivalent to one another?

They are not.

They arrive with different capacities, and those capacities have histories.

The argument must therefore move from Ground to Materials.

Chapter Two

MATERIALS

Histories Carried into Relation

Materials are not merely attributes. Materials carry histories.

This proposition requires an immediate qualification.

To say that materials carry histories is not to say that material and history are identical. Materials have density, hardness, elasticity, composition, internal structure, and other present properties. To reduce material entirely to history would be to overlook precisely those capacities through which it enters relation in the present.

The claim is more specific:

A material cannot be separated from the history through which its present relational capacities became available.

History, in this sense, is neither biography nor memory. It is not a narrative added retrospectively to material. It refers to prior formation: the processes through which a material acquired the capacities by which it can now make contact, resist, absorb, transmit, deform, adhere, separate, or bear consequences.

The past matters here not because it deserves to be remembered, but because it remains operative as present capacity.

Materials therefore enter relation through capacities already conditioned by their histories of formation.

This qualification is important. Under Conditions of Load does not attempt to provide a complete ontology of material. Its concern is narrower: to explain why the participants entering a relation can never be treated as neutral and interchangeable units.

Different materials carry different histories of formation. They therefore enter relation with different relational capacities.

They do not receive pressure in identical ways. They do not maintain contact in identical ways. They do not permit displacement, resist deformation, transmit consequence, or sustain dependence in identical ways.

Difference, then, is not a variable introduced into a structure after relations have already formed.

Difference is already present in the conditions under which participants enter relation.

This point will become crucial when Gravity is introduced later. Gravity does not create relational difference. Rather, it gives persistent directional consequence to differences that are already present.

Without the historical differentiation established at the level of Materials, the unequal availability of relations under Gravity would have no adequate basis.

But the history carried by material is not closed.

A material enters a relation with capacities conditioned by prior formation. The relation then produces consequences. Those consequences may alter how that material can enter subsequent relations.

The sequence can therefore be written:

History -> Capacity -> Relation -> Consequence -> Altered Capacity -> Further Relation

This sequence should not be understood as a linear chronology in which one stage simply replaces another. Earlier formation remains operative insofar as it continues to condition present capacity, while new consequences enter and alter that capacity further.

Material, therefore, does not passively preserve history.

History becomes active through what material is presently capable of doing in relation.

The past is not simply behind the material. It is operative in the ways the material can participate now.

This also means that history should not be confused with the accumulation of traces. A trace may remain without materially altering a subsequent relation. Conversely, a prior formation may leave no immediately visible trace while continuing to determine how a material responds, resists, transmits, or bears.

What matters is not whether history can be seen.

What matters is whether it remains relationally consequential.

The distinction between Ground and Materials can now be stated precisely.

Ground asks: Under what conditions can relation become possible?

Materials asks: With what historically conditioned capacities do participants enter relation?

Neither concept can replace the other.

Ground without Materials would leave the participants in relation abstract and undifferentiated.

Materials without Ground would presuppose the very possibility of relation that still required explanation.

Together, they establish two initial conditions: relation must first be possible, and whatever enters that relation does so with capacities that have already been formed.

Yet this is still not enough to constitute a structure.

Participants may enter relation while remaining only contingently connected. Contact alone does not establish organization. Difference alone does not establish organization. Even repeated interaction does not necessarily mean that one relation has begun to condition another.

A further threshold must therefore be identified:

When does one relation begin to alter the conditions under which another relation can occur or continue?

At that point, relation becomes more than contact.

It begins to become Formation.

Chapter Three

FORMATION

When Relations Become Organization

Ground makes relation possible. Materials enter relation with historically conditioned differences in capacity. But the occurrence of relation is not yet Formation.

Two participants may come into contact without becoming structurally dependent upon one another. A difference may exist without altering how another relation can continue. Relations may coexist while remaining, to a significant degree, independent.

Formation begins at a more precise threshold:

Formation begins when one relation starts to alter the conditions under which another relation can occur or continue.

At this point, relations cease to be merely adjacent. They begin to become conditions for one another.

This requires a distinction between Formation and Organization.

Formation is the process through which relations become mutually consequential; organization is the relational condition thereby produced.

Formation is a process. Organization is the relational condition generated through that process - a condition that can itself enter and condition subsequent processes of formation.

If Formation and Organization were treated as interchangeable terms, Formation would become merely another name for an already existing organization. The distinction is necessary because it allows us to describe how organization emerges without treating organization as a completed state.

The relation can therefore be expressed as:

Formation -> Organization -> Altered Conditions -> Further Formation

Organization is not the endpoint of Formation. It becomes a condition of what can form next.

The minimum threshold of Formation does not require a complex system. Consider only two relations, A and B. If a change in A alters the conditions under which B can continue, then A has already become consequential for B.

A alters the conditions under which B can continue.

From this moment onward, A and B cannot be understood as entirely independent relations.

The significance of Organization therefore does not lie in the achievement of harmony, equilibrium, or formal completion. An organization may contain asymmetry, tension, displacement, interruption, local termination, and continuing adjustment.

What makes it an organization is not that every relation remains stable. It is that relations have become mutually consequential.

A change in one relation can now alter the conditions of another. That second relation, once altered, may in turn change the conditions of the first or of further relations.

Organization is therefore not a fixed arrangement of parts. It is a condition in which relations have begun to participate in one another's possibilities.

This is the first point at which structure acquires a more rigorous meaning.

Structure does not begin when a recognizable form appears. It begins when relations can no longer change without potentially altering the conditions under which other relations continue.

In this sense:

Organization precedes form.

This does not mean that an invisible form exists prior to its appearance. It means that relations may already be conditioning one another before any stable or recognizable configuration can be identified.

Form, where it appears, can therefore be understood as a temporarily legible condition of organization rather than as the origin of organization itself.

Formation does not simply produce a structure. It also produces the conditions under which further Formation must occur.

A relation forms an organization. That organization alters conditions. Those altered conditions change how subsequent relations can occur. And those subsequent relations, in turn, may alter the organization again.

Thus:

Relation -> Organization -> Altered Conditions -> Further Relation

The importance of this sequence lies in what it refuses.

It refuses the idea that Formation proceeds toward a final state in which organization becomes complete and change becomes unnecessary.

Formation continually produces the conditions of further Formation.

But this creates a problem.

If Formation continually alters relational organization, then what exactly continues?

If every change simply replaces what preceded it, there is only a succession of different organizations.

A -> B -> C.

Nothing in such a sequence yet explains why B should carry anything of A, or why C should remain structurally connected to what occurred before it.

The question therefore becomes:

How can an organization continue without remaining the same?

Or, more precisely:

How can what has already occurred remain active within relations whose conditions have changed?

Formation cannot answer this question by itself.

To answer it, a distinction must be made between mere succession and something more demanding.

That distinction is Continuity.

Chapter Four

CONTINUITY

How Change Remains Consequential

Continuity is easily mistaken for preservation.

A form remains, therefore it is continuous. A structure does not collapse, therefore it continues. A relation remains present, therefore continuity has been maintained.

Such formulations bind continuity to sameness. They assume that change threatens continuity and that continuity succeeds only insofar as something resists change.

But if A occurs and B follows, the fact that A precedes B does not mean that A continues in B.

Suppose A disappears entirely and has no bearing on how B occurs. In that case, A and B are connected only by temporal sequence.

Succession is not continuity.

A distinction is therefore necessary between one event following another and one event entering the conditions under which another event becomes possible.

This requires a more precise account of consequence.

A consequence is a change in the conditions under which another relation can occur or continue.

Not every effect is therefore consequential in the sense developed here.

An event may produce an effect that remains local to itself. A change may occur and disappear without altering any subsequent relation. Such an event may be causally significant, but it does not yet establish the kind of continuity at issue here.

A consequence becomes structurally significant when it enters the conditions of another relation.

It may alter what remains possible. It may restrict what had previously been available. It may open a relation that did not previously exist. It may require another relation to bear something it had not previously borne. It may make a previously available pathway more difficult, or render another pathway newly consequential.

In each case, what has occurred is no longer confined to the event in which it occurred. Its consequence has entered what can happen next.

This allows Continuity to be defined more strictly:

Continuity is the capacity of consequences to enter subsequent relations.

Continuity therefore does not require the preservation of form. It does not require the preservation of every participant. It does not require every relation to remain active. And it does not require a particular organization to persist unchanged.

A relation may end while its consequences continue.

An event may end while its consequences continue.

This distinction is fundamental.

The past does not enter the present simply because it remains present as the past. It enters the present when what occurred has altered the conditions under which the present can occur.

The persistence of consequence, rather than the persistence of an event, is what establishes Continuity.

We can therefore make a stronger distinction:

Continuity is not what survives change. Continuity is how change remains consequential.

This proposition reverses the usual relation between continuity and change.

Change is no longer what continuity must overcome. Change itself can become a condition of continuity.

Indeed, continuity may sometimes require the interruption of particular relations.

A relation may have to end for its consequences to enter other relations. A pathway may close while the consequences previously borne through it continue elsewhere. A particular organization may cease to be viable while what it has already produced continues to condition what follows.

The disappearance of a relation therefore does not necessarily entail the disappearance of Continuity.

This is why:

A -> B -> A

and

A -> A' -> A'' -> A'''

must not be understood in the same way.

The first may describe recurrence: something identified as A appears, gives way to B, and later appears again.

The second is not merely a sequence of states.

The primes indicate that what follows has been conditioned by what preceded it.

A' is not simply later than A. It is a condition whose availability has already been altered by the consequences of A.

A" is likewise not merely the next state. It occurs under conditions already altered by A', which itself carried consequences of A.

The sequence therefore does not describe the preservation of an object through successive states.

It describes a continuity in which conditions are repeatedly altered by what has already occurred.

This is consequential inheritance.

Continuity requires consequential inheritance, not merely temporal succession.

Inheritance, however, must not be confused with replication.

A consequence does not pass unchanged from one relation into another.

The subsequent relation has its own history, capacities, position, constraints, and prior consequences. When it takes up what preceded it, it necessarily alters how that consequence can continue.

Continuity therefore already contains transformation.

What continues need not remain identical in order to remain consequential.

This also places an important limit on the concept.

Continuity cannot be assumed in advance.

If every termination were automatically redescribed as another form of continuation, Continuity would become impossible to test. Whatever happened could simply be declared continuous at another level.

That would make the concept theoretically empty.

There must therefore be circumstances in which Continuity ends.

If the consequences of a relation no longer enter any subsequent relation - if they cease to alter what can occur or continue - then there is no reason to claim Continuity.

Continuity is possible, not guaranteed.

This limitation is essential because it prevents Continuity from becoming a metaphysical principle according to which everything always continues somehow.

Some relations terminate. Some pathways close. Some possibilities disappear. Some consequences cease to remain active.

Yet the termination of one particular relation does not, by itself, tell us whether Continuity has ended.

The decisive question is whether its consequences remain capable of entering what follows.

This gives us a more exact distinction:

Termination concerns the persistence of a relation.

Continuity concerns the persistence of consequence.

The two may coincide, but they need not.

A relation may persist while becoming largely inconsequential. Another relation may disappear while its consequences continue to condition everything that follows.

Continuity must therefore be located not in the persistence of entities, but in the transmission and transformation of relational consequence.

But this definition creates a further problem.

If consequences enter subsequent relations, how do they enter them?

A consequence cannot continue abstractly. It cannot remain suspended between relations. For a consequence to become part of the conditions of what follows, some relation must take it up.

Something must carry the dependency. Something must receive the altered condition. Something must continue under a consequence that did not originate entirely within itself.

Continuity therefore requires a more concrete relational mechanism.

That mechanism is Bearing.

Chapter Five

BEARING

How Consequences Are Taken Up by Relations

Continuity tells us that consequences can remain active by entering subsequent relations. But consequences do not continue by themselves. They must be taken up by relations.

This is the point at which Bearing becomes necessary.

The distinction can be stated immediately:

Continuity names the persistence of consequence.

Bearing names the relational taking-up of consequence.

Continuity describes the condition under which what has occurred remains consequential. Bearing describes how that consequence is concretely carried by relations.

Bearing should therefore not be reduced to weight-bearing in a narrowly mechanical sense. Nor should it be understood as an independent force.

Bearing is a relational condition.

It occurs when the consequence produced through one relation must be taken up through another relation if Continuity is to continue.

A relation no longer deals only with what originates within itself. It begins to carry consequences generated elsewhere in the organization.

This is also where Load can be defined more precisely.

Load is not simply weight.

Load is the condition under which consequences must be borne through relations.

Load is therefore relational before it is mechanical.

What matters is not merely how much force is present, but how a consequence becomes something another relation must take up.

A relation under Load is a relation whose continuation can no longer be understood in isolation. It has become implicated in consequences produced by other relations.

This changes the meaning of Bearing.

To bear is not simply to receive.

A bearing relation is not an empty channel through which an unchanged consequence passes.

Every relation already has a history. Every relation has capacities. Every relation occupies a particular position within an organization. Every relation is subject to constraints and may already carry consequences of prior relations.

When a consequence enters such a relation, the consequence is taken up under those conditions.

The relation is changed by what it bears. And what it bears is changed by the relation through which it continues.

Bearing is therefore transformative in both directions.

This can be expressed simply:

To bear is already to change.

But this statement must be understood carefully.

Change does not need to become visibly dramatic in order to be structurally significant.

A relation may remain in the same position. Its external form may remain apparently unchanged. Its material configuration may remain recognizable.

Yet if it now carries a dependency that it did not previously carry, its relational condition has changed.

Its future availability has changed.

It must now continue under consequences that have become part of its conditions.

Suppose B initially exists under one set of relational conditions.

After taking up consequences produced through A, B becomes B'.

B' does not simply mean "B at a later time."

It means:

B after Bearing.

B' now carries a history that B did not yet carry.

This matters because the next act of Bearing does not occur through the same conditions as the first.

A relation that has already borne consequences does not encounter subsequent consequences as though nothing had happened.

The first Bearing changes the conditions of the second.

Bearing therefore acquires history.

And once Bearing acquires history, Continuity can no longer be understood as the neutral transmission of consequence through an unchanged structure.

The relations that sustain Continuity are themselves transformed by sustaining it.

Hence:

The same relation that sustains a structure also transforms it.

This proposition is central.

A structure does not continue because certain relations somehow escape the changes they carry.

It continues because relations are capable of taking up consequences while themselves becoming altered.

This allows a second proposition:

Bearing sustains continuity through changes in organization.

Yet this statement also requires a limit.

If every change occurring within a bearing relation were immediately called Re-ordering, then Re-ordering would add nothing to the theory.

Bearing already entails change.

Therefore:

Not every change in Bearing is Re-ordering.

A bearing relation may change while the basic organization through which consequences are borne remains viable.

B may become B'. Its capacity may be altered. Its degree of dependency may increase. Its relation to other parts may become more demanding.

Yet consequences may still continue through essentially the same relational pathway.

In such a case, Bearing has changed, but the organization of Bearing has not yet necessarily been re-ordered.

This distinction is decisive.

Change within a bearing relation is not yet necessarily a change in the organization of bearing.

Bearing describes the taking-up of consequence.

A further concept becomes necessary only when the way consequences can be taken up through relations itself changes.

The question therefore becomes:

When does a change in relations cease to be merely a change within Bearing and begin to alter the organization through which Bearing is possible?

At that point, we enter Re-ordering.

Chapter Six

RE-ORDERING

When the Organization of Bearing Changes

Bearing already entails change.

A relation that takes up a consequence does not remain exactly what it was before. Its capacities, dependencies, and future availability may all be altered by what it has borne.

For this reason, Re-ordering cannot simply mean that relations have changed.

If it did, the concept would be redundant.

A stricter distinction is required:

Change within a bearing relation is not yet necessarily a change in the organization of bearing.

A relation may change while consequences continue to be borne through essentially the same relational pathway. Its condition may be altered, its capacity reduced or enlarged, and its dependence on other relations intensified, without the organization of Bearing itself having changed.

Re-ordering begins only when something more specific occurs.

Re-ordering occurs when a change in relations alters the way consequences can be borne through those relations.

The distinction can therefore be stated concisely:

Bearing concerns the taking-up of consequence.

Re-ordering concerns a change in how consequence can be taken up.

This changes the way structural change must be identified.

A structure cannot be said to have undergone Re-ordering simply because something visible has happened.

Fracture, detachment, displacement, compression, removal, covering, or separation are events.

They may participate in Re-ordering.

But none of them, taken by itself, proves that Re-ordering has occurred.

A visible event may leave the organization of Bearing substantially unchanged.

Conversely, Re-ordering may occur without any immediately dramatic visible event.

A relation may remain materially present and spatially recognizable while its role within the organization of Bearing changes fundamentally.

A pathway that had previously carried little consequence may become indispensable.

A relation that had functioned as a primary pathway may become secondary.

A dependency may shift from one relation to several.

A formerly peripheral relation may become necessary to the continuation of the organization.

What matters is not the appearance of the event.

What matters is whether the event changes relational availability.

Which relations can now bear consequences? Which can no longer do so in the same way? Which pathways have become more consequential? Which have become restricted? Which dependencies have been transferred, divided, intensified, or newly formed?

These questions determine whether Re-ordering has occurred.

Removal Is Not Necessarily Reduction

It is tempting to assume that when something is removed, the structure simply contains less.

But structural significance cannot be inferred from subtraction alone.

Suppose relation A is removed.

If the consequences previously associated with A disappear with it and nothing else in the organization is altered, then removal may remain primarily a local event.

But suppose the consequences previously borne through A must now be taken up through B and C.

B and C are no longer in the same relational conditions as before.

Their Bearing has changed because a dependency formerly carried elsewhere has entered them.

The organization through which consequence can continue has therefore changed.

Removal, in such a case, is not merely reduction.

It becomes Re-ordering.

Removal is not necessarily reduction. It may be Re-ordering.

The same principle applies to addition.

Adding another relation does not necessarily expand structural capacity. A new relation may remain inconsequential. Conversely, a relatively small addition may profoundly alter the organization of Bearing if it creates a new pathway through which consequences can continue.

Structural significance cannot therefore be measured by the quantity of material added or removed.

It must be understood through changes in relation.

Covering Is Not Restoration

The same distinction is necessary for covering.

A surface may be covered. A rupture may no longer be visible. A separation may appear to have disappeared.

Yet none of these conditions demonstrates that the previous organization has been restored.

If covering establishes new contact, changes constraint, redistributes dependency, or creates another pathway of Bearing, it does not return the organization to what existed before.

It produces another organization.

Covering is not necessarily recovery.

What appears visually continuous may be relationally different.

This distinction will later become essential to the problem of Return.

A form may return. A position may return. A surface may again appear continuous.

But none of these returns establishes that the conditions of relation have returned.

Event and Structural Consequence

The distinction between event and Re-ordering also prevents another problem.

If every fracture, displacement, addition, removal, or covering were assigned a fixed structural meaning, the theory would become a taxonomy of actions.

But the same event can have very different relational consequences.

A fracture may alter Bearing profoundly. Another fracture may change almost nothing.

A removal may terminate Continuity. Another removal may make Continuity possible by forcing consequences into other relations.

A covering may merely conceal an event. Another covering may establish a new condition of Bearing.

Therefore:

The structural meaning of an event lies not in the event itself, but in how it alters relational conditions.

This also means that the distinction between spontaneous change and deliberate intervention is not, at this level, theoretically primary.

Different causes may produce comparable relational consequences.

Comparable actions may produce entirely different relational consequences.

Under Conditions of Load therefore does not begin by classifying change according to intention.

It asks what the change does to relation.

Re-ordering and Formation

Re-ordering must also remain distinct from Formation.

Formation concerns the emergence of relational organization.

Re-ordering concerns alteration within an organization in which relations have already become consequential for one another.

The distinction is temporal only in a limited sense.

It is more fundamentally conceptual.

Formation asks:

How do relations begin to become mutually consequential?

Re-ordering asks:

How does an already consequential organization alter the way consequences can be borne?

Without Formation, there is no organization to re-order.

But once organization exists, further change does not return us to an original state of Formation.

The organization already has a history.

Its relations have already borne consequences.

Any subsequent organization therefore emerges from conditions that are no longer neutral.

Re-ordering and Redistribution

Re-ordering must likewise remain distinct from Redistribution.

The two concepts are closely connected, but they do not describe the same thing.

Re-ordering changes relational availability.

Redistribution realizes consequence through that altered availability.

A new pathway may become available without yet carrying a substantial consequence.

A previous pathway may become restricted while consequence continues temporarily through it.

An organization may therefore have begun to Re-order before the consequences borne through it have been substantially redistributed.

This distinction prevents Redistribution from becoming simply another word for structural change.

Re-ordering concerns the alteration of possible Bearing pathways.

Redistribution concerns what happens when consequence actually enters altered pathways.

But before Redistribution can be understood, another problem must be addressed.

Once Bearing pathways have become multiple, why should they be equally available?

Nothing established so far requires them to be.

Materials already enter relation with different histories and capacities.

Formation places them in different relational positions.

Bearing changes them further.

Re-ordering alters their availability.

Yet none of these concepts, by itself, explains why consequence may persistently encounter these differences directionally.

Why might some pathways repeatedly become more consequential than others?

Why might certain relations repeatedly bear consequences that other relations do not bear to the same degree?

Why might inequality of Bearing persist rather than appear only momentarily?

Re-ordering cannot answer this question by itself.

It produces the question:

What makes pathways of Bearing persistently and directionally unequal?

This is where Gravity becomes necessary.

Chapter Seven

GRAVITY

A Persistent Directional Condition

Gravity is a persistent directional condition.

This definition establishes the theoretical position of Gravity within Under Conditions of Load.

Gravity is not introduced simply to explain why things move downward.

Nor is it introduced in order to return the argument to a conventional model in which external forces act upon passive materials.

By the time Gravity appears, the relational field is already complex.

Materials carry histories.

Relations have formed organizations.

Consequences can persist.

Those consequences can be borne.

Bearing relations can change.

The organization of Bearing can be re-ordered.

Gravity enters this already formed relational field as a condition under which direction remains persistently consequential.

Its significance therefore lies not only in force, but in persistence.

An impact may occur and end.

An external intervention may enter a relation and later be withdrawn.

A temporary pressure may intensify and then disappear.

Gravity differs in an important respect.

As long as relations remain within its condition, direction continues to matter.

It continues to participate in how consequences can be borne.

Difference Is Not Yet Direction

Materials have already established that participants in relation are not equivalent.

They possess different histories.

They enter relations with different capacities.

But difference alone is not direction.

Two relations may differ greatly without that difference consistently favoring one pathway of Bearing over another.

Gravity does not need to create these differences.

Instead:

Gravity does not create relational difference; it gives persistent directional consequence to differences already present within relations.

This formulation requires care.

Gravity should not be treated as the origin of every directional inequality.

Relations may already be asymmetrical because of geometry, position, friction, boundary conditions, prior deformation, material history, or other constraints.

Gravity may encounter an organization that is already unequal.

Its role is therefore better understood in this way:

Gravity makes direction persistently consequential.

Under Gravity, differences in position, contact, density, capacity, and organization can acquire consequences that remain directionally active.

Directional Inequality

Direction here should not be understood merely as a geometric arrow.

A downward vector by itself does not yet explain structural consequence.

What matters is how direction enters the availability of Bearing.

Directional inequality means that consequences are not equally able to continue through all available relations.

Under Gravity, pathways of Bearing are not necessarily equally available.

Some relations may repeatedly become more consequential.

Some may repeatedly receive consequences generated elsewhere.

Some may be placed in conditions under which continued Bearing becomes increasingly demanding.

Others may remain comparatively less implicated.

Direction therefore becomes relationally significant when it produces persistent differences in how consequences can continue.

Load and Gravity

This also makes it possible to distinguish Load from Gravity more precisely.

Load is relational. Gravity is directional.

Load describes the condition under which consequences must be borne through relations.

Gravity describes a persistent directional condition under which that Bearing occurs.

Load is therefore not synonymous with weight.

A relation can be under Load whenever it must take up consequences generated elsewhere in an organization.

Gravity, meanwhile, is not simply another name for Load.

It gives directional persistence to the conditions under which Bearing takes place.

The distinction is essential.

Without it, Load would collapse into force, and Gravity would become redundant.

Direction Does Not Necessarily Produce Concentration

A further limitation is necessary.

It would be too strong to write:

Direction -> Concentration -> Limit -> Failure

as though each term necessarily produced the next.

Direction does not necessarily produce concentration.

An organization may contain multiple pathways capable of accommodating directional consequence over long periods.

Bearing may remain distributed.

Relations may repeatedly adjust.

Re-ordering may occur without a decisive concentration emerging.

Concentration becomes relevant only when consequences repeatedly enter a limited set of Bearing relations.

Even then, concentration should not be understood simply as "more force in one place."

Its structural importance lies elsewhere.

Repeated Bearing changes the relations that bear.

A relation repeatedly taking up consequence does not remain in its original condition.

Its future availability may change.

Thus concentration becomes structurally significant when repeated Bearing begins to alter the conditions under which that Bearing can continue.

Concentration Does Not Necessarily Produce a Limit

Even this does not make Failure inevitable.

A relation may sustain highly unequal Bearing for a long time.

An organization may repeatedly Re-order while continuing to accommodate concentrated consequences.

New pathways may become available.

Existing pathways may alter their capacities.

What appears to be an extreme condition may remain viable.

Therefore concentration cannot itself define a limit.

The relevant question is not:

How much has accumulated?

It is:

Has the mode through which consequence has been borne remained viable under the relations as they have become?

This shift is decisive.

It moves the argument away from a fixed threshold model.

There is no universal quantity at which a Bearing relation must fail.

Viability is relational.

The same apparent degree of concentration may remain possible under one organization and become impossible under another.

Gravity Does Not Necessarily Produce Failure

This leads to the most important limitation of the chapter:

Gravity does not necessarily lead to Failure.

Persistent directional inequality may exist without making a mode of continuation unavailable.

Relations may continue to bear under unequal conditions.

They may adjust.

They may Re-order.

Their capacities may change while continuation remains viable.

Nor is Gravity a universal prerequisite for Failure.

Other conditions may make Bearing pathways unequal.

Geometry may do so.

Friction may do so.

Boundary conditions may do so.

Chemical change may do so.

A sudden external event may do so.

Failure can therefore occur without Gravity being its determining condition.

Why, then, retain Gravity as a distinct concept?

Because it introduces something the preceding concepts do not:

persistent directional condition.

Gravity names a condition in which direction continues to participate in relation without needing to be reintroduced at every event.

Its importance is not that it explains every structural change.

Its importance is that it prevents relation from being treated as directionally neutral.

Yet Gravity itself cannot tell us when a mode of continuation has ceased to be viable.

Persistent inequality may continue indefinitely.

Change may continue.

Re-ordering may continue.

Concentration may increase or decrease.

None of these facts alone establishes Failure.

The question must therefore become more precise:

When persistent unequal Bearing has altered the conditions under which a relation can continue to bear consequences, in what sense can we say that a previously viable mode of continuation is no longer viable?

Gravity cannot answer that question.

A new distinction becomes necessary.

That distinction is Failure.

Chapter Eight

FAILURE

When a Mode of Continuation Loses Its Viability

Failure does not simply indicate that relations have changed. It indicates that a previously viable mode of relation has lost its viability as a mode of continuation.

This distinction is essential.

Relations change continuously. Bearing changes relations. Re-ordering changes the organization through which consequences can be borne. Gravity may make inequalities within those relations persistently consequential.

None of these changes, by itself, constitutes Failure.

Failure names a more specific condition.

A mode of Bearing that had previously allowed Continuity to proceed is no longer available under the relations as they have become.

Failure Is Not an Event

Failure is often identified with an event.

Something fractures. Something detaches. Something collapses. Something shifts. Something disappears.

The event becomes visible, and visibility is taken as evidence that Failure has occurred.

But this inference is unreliable.

Failure is not an event.

Fracture, detachment, collapse, displacement, and removal may accompany Failure. They may make Failure legible. They may also participate in the conditions through which Failure develops.

But none of them is identical with Failure.

A fracture may occur while the previous mode of Bearing remains viable.

A displacement may alter position without substantially altering how consequences continue.

A detachment may remove one relation while another relation immediately takes up its consequences without the previous mode of continuation becoming unavailable in the relevant sense.

Conversely, Failure may occur without a dramatic visible event.

A relation may remain present.

Its position may remain recognizable.

Its surface may remain continuous.

Yet the way in which it had previously borne consequence may no longer be viable.

The distinction can therefore be stated clearly:

Fracture is not Failure.

A fracture must be interpreted through relational availability.

The relevant question is not simply:

What broke?

It is:

What mode of continuation is no longer available because relations have become what they now are?

Failure as Loss of Availability

Failure can therefore be defined more strictly:

Failure occurs when a mode of Bearing through which Continuity has been sustained is no longer available under the relations as they have become.

The decisive term is availability.

Failure does not necessarily mean destruction.

It does not necessarily mean disappearance.

It does not necessarily mean that a material, object, or structure has ceased to exist.

It means that a particular way of continuing can no longer continue under present relational conditions.

This changes the subject of Failure.

Rather than saying "the material fails" or "the structure fails," it is often more precise to say:

a mode of Bearing becomes unavailable.

The distinction matters because the material may remain.

The structure may remain recognizable.

Many of its relations may continue.

What has ceased to be viable is not necessarily the entire organization, but one mode through which that organization had sustained Continuity.

Failure Is Relationally Produced

Failure should therefore not be reduced to a fixed mechanical threshold.

There is no universal point at which a relation simply reaches "too much" and fails independently of its conditions.

A mode of Bearing may remain viable under one organization and become unavailable under another.

The same apparent amount of pressure, displacement, concentration, or deformation may have different structural consequences depending on the relations through which it is borne.

Failure is therefore relationally produced.

This is one reason why Failure cannot be inferred from magnitude alone.

A dramatic event may leave the organization capable of continuing through the same basic mode.

A comparatively slight change may make a crucial relation unavailable.

The importance of a change is determined not by its visible scale but by what it does to the conditions of continuation.

Failure and Re-ordering

Failure must also be distinguished from Re-ordering.

Re-ordering means that the organization of Bearing changes.

Failure means that a previously available mode of continuation becomes unavailable.

Re-ordering may occur without Failure.

An organization may alter its Bearing pathways while all major modes of continuation remain viable.

Consequences may begin to move through different relations without any previous mode becoming unavailable.

Failure may also emerge through Re-ordering.

As Bearing relations change, a mode that had previously been viable may gradually lose its availability.

In such cases, Failure may become legible only through Re-ordering.

But this does not justify a universal formula:

Re-ordering -> Failure.

A sudden alteration in conditions may make a Bearing mode unavailable without an extended process of Re-ordering.

Conversely, Re-ordering may continue indefinitely without producing Failure.

Failure therefore cannot be defined as the result of Re-ordering.

It identifies a different theoretical condition.

Failure Is Not Necessarily Permanent

The loss of viability must also be stated carefully.

To say that a mode of Bearing is no longer available does not necessarily mean that no comparable mode could ever appear again.

Conditions may change.

Relations may be altered.

New capacities may emerge.

A configuration resembling an earlier mode may later become possible.

But if it does, it does not occur under the conditions of its previous occurrence.

The later mode inherits a different relational history.

Failure therefore refers first to:

present unavailability under altered conditions.

This distinction anticipates the later problem of Return.

A mode may return in appearance.

A position may return.

A relation may again become possible.

But what returns does not thereby erase the Failure through which the conditions of its return were altered.

Failure and Continuity

The most important consequence of this definition is that Failure and Continuity are not opposites.

A mode of Bearing can fail while Continuity continues.

This gives us a central proposition:

Failure marks the limit of a mode of Continuity, not necessarily the limit of Continuity itself.

This is a decisive distinction.

If Failure were identical with the end of Continuity, nothing further could be said structurally after Failure except that the process had ended.

But a local or particular mode of Bearing may become unavailable while consequences continue to enter other relations.

The end of one mode may therefore become part of the conditions under which another mode becomes necessary.

This does not mean that Failure is productive by definition.

Failure must not be romanticized.

It does not automatically generate renewal.

It does not automatically create a stronger organization.

It does not necessarily improve anything.

And it does not guarantee that Continuity will continue.

Continuity May End

This limit is crucial.

If a mode of Bearing becomes unavailable and the consequences previously carried through it cease to enter subsequent relations, then Continuity may end.

There is no theoretical requirement that another relation must take them up.

There is no guarantee that organization must find another pathway.

There is no law according to which Failure produces recovery.

Continuity is possible, not guaranteed.

Failure therefore opens more than one possibility.

A Bearing mode may fail and Continuity may terminate.

A larger relational organization may cease.

Or consequences may remain active and begin to enter other relations.

Only the last of these possibilities requires the next concept.

This is why Failure must not be written as though it automatically produces Redistribution.

The relation is conditional.

Failure does not necessarily produce Redistribution.

The question is instead:

If a previously viable mode of Bearing has become unavailable, and yet its consequences remain active within subsequent relations, how can Continuity proceed?

At that point, the consequences that can no longer continue through one mode of Bearing must be taken up through other available relations.

Only then does Redistribution become necessary.

Chapter Nine

REDISTRIBUTION

How Consequences Continue through Other Relations

Failure does not necessarily produce Redistribution. Redistribution becomes necessary only where Continuity persists after a prior mode of Bearing has become unavailable.

This proposition must stand at the beginning of the chapter because it prevents Continuity from being assumed as the inevitable outcome of Failure.

Failure may terminate a mode of Bearing.

Continuity may also terminate with it.

Nothing in Under Conditions of Load requires every consequence to find another pathway.

Redistribution becomes theoretically necessary only under a particular condition:

A prior mode of Bearing is no longer viable, but the consequences previously borne through it remain active.

Those consequences must then enter other relations if Continuity is to persist.

Redistribution can therefore be defined as follows:

Redistribution occurs when consequences that can no longer continue through a prior mode of Bearing are taken up through other available relations.

Redistribution Is Not the Movement of an Object

Redistribution is easily misunderstood as spatial transfer.

Something was in A. It leaves A. It moves into B and C.

This image is insufficient.

What is redistributed is not necessarily a material quantity that remains identical as it changes location.

The theoretical object of Redistribution is consequence.

A consequence that can no longer continue through one Bearing relation becomes consequential through other relations.

This may involve physical displacement, but physical displacement alone does not define Redistribution.

A material can move without a significant redistribution of structural consequence.

Conversely, structural consequence can be redistributed while very little visibly moves.

What matters is which relations now have to bear what was previously borne elsewhere.

Consequence Does Not Remain Unchanged

Redistribution cannot be understood as the transfer of an unchanged consequence from one relation to another.

The receiving relations are not neutral containers.

They have histories. They have capacities. They occupy positions. They already exist within constraints. They may already bear other consequences.

When a consequence enters them, it enters under these conditions.

Therefore:

A consequence cannot be redistributed without being transformed by the relations through which it continues.

This follows directly from the definition of Bearing.

To bear is already to change.

The relation changes because of what it bears.

The consequence changes in how it can continue because of the relation through which it is borne.

Redistribution is therefore not simply relocation.

Redistribution changes how consequences continue by changing the relations through which they are borne.

Redistribution and Re-ordering

Re-ordering changes the organization of possible Bearing.

Redistribution concerns the actual continuation of consequence through that altered organization.

Thus:

Re-ordering changes relational availability.

Redistribution realizes consequence through altered relational availability.

A new pathway may become available before substantial consequence enters it.

At that moment, Re-ordering may already have occurred.

But Redistribution may not yet have fully taken place.

Likewise, a former pathway may remain materially present while becoming increasingly unavailable. Consequence may gradually enter other relations.

Re-ordering and Redistribution may therefore overlap temporally, but they remain conceptually distinct.

One concerns the organization of possibility.

The other concerns the continuation of consequence through that changed organization.

Redistribution Is Not Restoration

Redistribution must also be separated from restoration.

When consequences enter other relations, the organization does not thereby return to an earlier equilibrium.

There is no neutral original distribution waiting to be recovered.

The relations that now bear consequence have already been altered by everything that preceded them.

Their capacities are different.

Their dependencies are different.

Their histories are different.

Redistribution therefore produces conditions that did not exist before.

The resulting organization may become more stable.

It may become less stable.

Consequence may become more dispersed.

It may become more concentrated.

A new Bearing pathway may become dominant.

Another may become increasingly marginal.

Nothing in Redistribution guarantees equilibrium.

Therefore:

Redistribution does not solve Failure. It creates new conditions of Bearing.

This proposition is fundamental.

If Redistribution were understood as a solution to Failure, the theory would quietly return to a model of disruption followed by recovery.

Failure would become a temporary disturbance.

Redistribution would restore order.

Continuity would mean eventual stabilization.

But this is not the argument.

Redistribution does not restore the conditions that existed before Failure.

It establishes conditions under which consequence can continue differently.

Redistribution Produces Altered Conditions

Once other relations begin to bear consequences, those relations change.

Their future availability changes.

The organization of Bearing changes further.

The conditions under which subsequent events occur are therefore no longer the conditions that existed before Redistribution.

We can express this as:

Failure -> possible Redistribution -> altered conditions of Bearing

The word possible is essential.

Failure does not guarantee Redistribution.

But where Redistribution does occur, it changes the conditions of what follows.

The consequence of Failure is therefore not exhausted by the event through which Failure became visible.

Its consequences may continue through relations that did not previously bear them.

Those relations then carry this history forward.

Redistribution is thus a bridge between Failure and History.

It explains how the loss of one mode of continuation can become consequential within later relational conditions without assuming that the original mode has been restored.

The Past Enters the Present as Condition

The consequence of a prior relation does not remain in the past simply because the event that produced it has ended.

If that consequence has been redistributed, it now participates in present Bearing.

The past has entered the present not by remaining present as an event, but by altering the conditions under which present relations occur.

This allows a proposition that will become central in the next chapter:

The past persists not merely as what happened, but as a condition of what can happen now.

This is not yet a theory of memory.

Nor does it mean that every past event remains active indefinitely.

Many events cease to be consequential.

But where consequences remain active through Redistribution, the present is already historically conditioned.

The present organization carries relations that have been altered by what they previously bore.

Its current availability is inseparable from those prior consequences.

This creates a new problem.

Suppose an event occurs again. Suppose a relation returns to a previous position. Suppose a configuration resembles an earlier configuration. Suppose an event of the same apparent kind recurs.

Can it be said to be the same event again?

If the conditions under which it now occurs already carry the consequences of its previous occurrence, then recurrence cannot simply mean repetition.

The event may return.

But the conditions of its return have changed.

The next question must therefore be:

What does it mean for something to occur again when the conditions of its occurrence have already been altered by what occurred before?

This is the problem of Return under Altered Conditions.

Chapter Ten

RETURN UNDER ALTERED CONDITIONS

When Recurrence Is Not Repetition

Events may recur. Conditions do not repeat.

This proposition requires immediate qualification.

It does not mean that no physical, spatial, or formal condition can ever recur in any sense. A position may be recovered. A configuration may resemble an earlier configuration. A relation may again become available. An event of the same apparent kind may occur more than once.

The claim is more precise:

Where prior consequences remain active, recurrence cannot occur under relationally identical conditions.

This follows from everything established so far.

An event occurs.

It produces consequences.

Those consequences enter subsequent relations.

They alter Bearing.

They may participate in Re-ordering, Failure, or Redistribution.

If those consequences remain active, the relational field in which a later event occurs already differs from the field in which the earlier event occurred.

Therefore:

What returns does not return under the conditions of its previous occurrence.

Recurrence Is Not Repetition

Two events may appear similar.

Two fractures may occur in approximately the same place.

Two displacements may follow comparable paths.

A relation may return to a position it previously occupied.

A configuration may again resemble an earlier configuration.

None of these similarities is sufficient to establish relational identity.

Phenomenal similarity does not establish relational identity.

An event must be understood through the conditions under which it occurs.

If those conditions have been altered by prior consequences, the structural significance of the later event cannot simply be inferred from its resemblance to the earlier one.

This is why recurrence cannot be reduced to repetition.

Repetition would require more than the reappearance of a recognizable event.

It would require the relevant relational conditions to remain identical.

But where prior consequences remain active, those conditions have already been altered.

Return of Position Is Not Return of Condition

A relation may return to a previous position.

But:

Return of position is not return of condition.

Position is only one component of a relational condition.

A relation occupying the same position may now bear different consequences.

Its neighboring relations may have changed.

Its capacities may have changed.

The pathways through which consequence reaches it may have changed.

Its dependencies may have changed.

The organization in which the position acquires significance may no longer be the same.

Spatial return therefore cannot establish structural restoration.

The same applies to form.

Return of form is not return of relation.

A recognizable configuration may reappear while the relations through which that configuration exists have been fundamentally altered.

Form can recur without conditions recurring.

Return Is Not Restoration

Return is recurrence under altered conditions.

Restoration would require the recovery of prior conditions.

These are not the same.

Something may return without restoring what preceded it.

Indeed, what returns may be possible only because the organization has already changed.

A prior Failure may have altered Bearing.

Redistribution may have created new pathways.

Relations may have acquired different capacities.

The later recurrence may therefore depend precisely on the changes that make restoration impossible.

This gives us another central proposition:

Return does not restore what preceded it; it inherits its consequences.

Inheritance again does not mean replication.

What is inherited is not an unchanged past.

It is the continuing consequence of what occurred before.

History as Present Condition

History is often understood as an accumulation of past events.

But an event does not become structurally relevant merely because it occurred in the past.

Many events cease to affect what follows.

Others remain consequential.

Within Under Conditions of Load, therefore:

History is the persistence of prior consequences as present conditions.

This definition is deliberately limited.

It does not claim to exhaust every meaning of history.

Nor does it deny memory, representation, narrative, archive, or recollection.

It identifies the particular sense in which history matters to the relational structure being developed here.

The past remains structurally active when its consequences continue to alter the conditions under which present relations occur.

Thus:

The past persists not as memory alone, but as condition.

This sentence should not be read as a rejection of memory.

The distinction is methodological.

Under Conditions of Load asks not whether the past can be remembered, represented, or narrated, but whether what has occurred continues to participate in present relational availability.

The past is structurally active when it changes what can happen now.

The Past Does Not Continue Because It Is Past

The past does not persist merely by virtue of having happened.

Pastness does not guarantee consequence.

An event may occur and become irrelevant to subsequent relations.

Another event may continue to condition relations long after the event itself has ended.

Therefore:

The past does not continue because it is past. It continues insofar as its consequences remain active in the conditions of the present.

This distinction prevents History from becoming simple accumulation.

A structure does not necessarily become more historical merely because more events have happened to it.

History, in the sense developed here, depends upon consequential persistence.

Time Is Not Homogeneous

It would be insufficient to say merely that structural change "takes time."

Almost every process takes time in some sense.

The more important proposition is:

Consequences do not become conditions all at once.

A consequence may immediately alter another relation.

Another may become significant only after further Re-ordering.

Another may remain latent until a Bearing pathway changes.

Another may pass through several Redistributions before becoming decisive within a later condition.

Consequences therefore enter the present at different rates and remain active for different durations.

The present cannot be treated as temporally homogeneous.

The present is temporally uneven.

Different histories may remain active simultaneously.

A present relation may bear a consequence produced recently together with consequences that have persisted through multiple earlier reorganizations.

These histories do not merely accumulate side by side.

They may modify one another.

A later consequence may intensify an earlier one.

It may reduce it.

It may redirect it.

It may make a previously minor consequence structurally decisive.

Present conditions therefore contain temporal differences internal to themselves.

Irreversibility

A strong claim that "nothing can ever return" would be unnecessary and indefensible.

Positions can return.

Forms can return.

Relations can sometimes be re-established.

Comparable material configurations may recur.

The irreversibility relevant here is more specific.

A consequential history cannot be made not to have occurred.

Once an event has produced consequences that have entered subsequent relations, those consequences may later be altered, displaced, absorbed, redistributed, or cease to remain active.

But the fact that they entered the relational history cannot retroactively be made never to have happened.

A later configuration may resemble an earlier one.

It may even recover many of its relations.

Yet it reaches that configuration through a history that the earlier configuration did not possess.

This is the structural significance of irreversibility.

It does not mean that every state is physically unrecoverable.

It means that recovery cannot erase the consequential history through which the later condition became possible.

Return and Continuity

Return therefore reveals something fundamental about Continuity.

Continuity does not preserve the conditions through which it continues.

It changes them.

When something recurs, it encounters conditions that have already been altered by previous Continuity.

The later event inherits those alterations.

Continuity therefore does more than carry consequences forward.

It continually changes the conditions of its own continuation.

Continuity continually alters the conditions of its own continuation.

This is why A -> A' -> A'' -> A''' cannot be reduced to a sequence of states.

Each term marks a condition in which previous consequences have entered what is now possible.

What appears again does not begin again from zero.

It begins within conditions already carrying history.

But this creates one final theoretical problem.

What happens when what recurs is not simply an event, a position, or a form, but Re-ordering itself?

Suppose an organization undergoes Re-ordering.

That Re-ordering changes relational availability.

Its consequences enter later conditions.

Then the organization Re-orders again.

The second Re-ordering cannot be identical to the first, because the first has already altered the conditions under which the second occurs.

The organization is now responding not merely to a new event, but to conditions partly produced by its own prior organization.

At this point, repeated Re-ordering is no longer an adequate description.

A final distinction becomes necessary:

Re-reordering.

Chapter Eleven

RE-REORDERING

When Organization Bears the History of Its Own Re-ordering

Re-reordering is not repeated Re-ordering.

If Re-reordering meant only that Re-ordering happens more than once, the concept would be unnecessary.

"Repeated Re-ordering" or "iteration" would already be sufficient.

Re-reordering becomes necessary only under a more specific condition:

Re-reordering begins when the consequences of prior Re-ordering become conditions of subsequent Re-ordering.

This definition gives the concept its theoretical necessity.

The second Re-ordering does not merely occur later than the first.

It occurs under conditions that the first Re-ordering has already altered.

Re-ordering Changes the Conditions of Further Re-ordering

The relation can be expressed schematically:

C1 -> R1 -> C2

followed by:

C2 -> R2 -> C3

where C designates relational conditions and R designates Re-ordering.

C2 is not an independent new beginning.

It contains consequences produced through R1.

R2 therefore does not respond to C1 again.

It responds to conditions that already carry the history of R1.

The distinction is decisive.

Without it, R1 and R2 would merely be two instances of the same operation.

With it, the second Re-ordering is historically conditioned by the first.

Consequences of Re-ordering, Not the Past Event Itself

It is not literally the previous event of Re-ordering that remains present.

What persists are its consequences.

This is consistent with the definition of History established in the previous chapter.

Past events do not remain structurally active simply because they once occurred.

They remain active when their consequences enter present conditions.

Therefore:

The consequences of prior Re-ordering become conditions of subsequent Re-ordering.

This formulation prevents Re-reordering from becoming mystical repetition.

The past does not return as an unchanged past.

It operates through altered present conditions.

Organization Acquires History

A major consequence follows.

Materials carry histories because their present relational capacities cannot be separated from the processes through which those capacities became available.

But organization also acquires history.

The present organization of relations carries the consequences of its prior Re-orderings.

This does not mean that Material history and organizational history are identical.

They operate at different conceptual levels.

Material history concerns how participants acquired the capacities with which they enter relation.

Organizational history concerns how prior changes in relational organization condition the ways later organization can occur.

Thus the argument that began with:

Materials carry histories

now reaches a second proposition:

Organization carries histories of consequence.

The structure of the theory has therefore returned to History, but at another level.

History is no longer only what participants bring into relation.

It is also what relations produce through their own transformations.

Re-reordering and Return

Re-reordering is closely connected to Return under Altered Conditions, but the two concepts must remain distinct.

Return concerns recurrence generally.

An event, position, relation, or form may recur under conditions altered by prior consequences.

Re-reordering concerns a more specific case:

organization itself is reorganized under conditions already altered by its prior reorganization.

In Return:

history conditions recurrence.

In Re-reordering:

the history of organization conditions further organization.

This is why Re-reordering deserves a separate chapter.

It names a recursive historical condition that Return alone does not specify.

Re-reordering Is Not Correction

The second Re-ordering does not necessarily occur because the first was inadequate.

There is no ideal organization toward which successive Re-orderings must converge.

The first Re-ordering may have been entirely viable under its conditions.

But by occurring, it altered those conditions.

Later relations therefore confront a different problem.

This leads to one of the strongest formulations of the chapter:

Each Re-ordering changes the problem to which the next Re-ordering responds.

The importance of this proposition lies in its rejection of repetition.

The organization does not repeatedly solve the same problem.

Its previous way of responding has already become part of the conditions of the next problem.

The problem itself has changed.

Re-reordering Is Not Iteration

Iteration tells us that an operation occurs again.

Re-reordering tells us something more:

the prior operation has altered the conditions of the next operation.

The distinction is therefore not numerical.

It does not depend upon whether Re-ordering has happened twice, three times, or many times.

Even a second Re-ordering is already Re-reordering if the consequences of the first have become conditions of the second.

Conversely, multiple similar operations would not require the concept if each occurred under relationally independent conditions.

Re-reordering names consequential recurrence, not repetition as such.

Re-reordering Is Not Merely Feedback

The concept also differs from a simple model of feedback.

Feedback can often be represented as an output returning to a system as a new input.

But such a model may leave the system itself conceptually unchanged.

Re-reordering requires a stronger claim.

R1 changes C1 into C2.

R2 therefore does not act upon the same organization under the same conditions.

The system of relations has itself been altered.

Thus:

Re-reordering is not the return of an output into an unchanged system; it is further organization within conditions already altered by prior organization.

This distinction is important because it places history inside the organization rather than outside it.

Re-reordering Does Not Require Constant Visible Change

None of this means that organization must remain visibly unstable.

Relations may remain relatively stable for extended periods.

A particular mode of Bearing may continue to be viable.

No substantial Re-ordering may be necessary.

Re-reordering does not mean that every moment contains visible reorganization.

It means that when later Re-ordering occurs, it does not occur on neutral ground.

It occurs within conditions already altered by previous organization.

Stability Does Not Erase History

Stability does not mean that change has ceased forever.

Nor does it mean that history has disappeared.

A relatively stable organization may simply be one in which current modes of Bearing remain sufficiently viable for Continuity to proceed without substantial Re-ordering.

Therefore:

Stability does not erase the history of Re-ordering through which current relations became available.

A stable condition can be deeply historical.

Indeed, what appears stable may be possible only because multiple prior Re-orderings have altered the organization through which current Bearing occurs.

Stability is therefore not the opposite of history.

It can be one of history's temporary relational conditions.

Historical Complexity

Not all complexity must be historical.

But Under Conditions of Load is concerned with a specific form of complexity:

historical complexity produced when consequences from different relational phases remain simultaneously active within present conditions.

Prior Bearings may remain consequential.

Prior Re-orderings may remain consequential.

Failures may have altered availability.

Redistributions may have established new pathways.

Returns may have occurred under altered conditions.

These histories do not simply stack one on top of another.

They interact.

A consequence from one phase may alter how a consequence from another phase remains active.

The present organization therefore contains not merely many relations, but relations carrying different consequential histories.

Structural complexity can thus be historical before it becomes formally complex.

A -> A' -> A'' -> A'''

The sequence can now be read in its fullest sense:

A -> A' -> A'' -> A'''

This is not an object moving through a succession of states.

Each term marks a relational condition whose availability has been altered by the consequences of what preceded it.

A' carries consequences of A.

A" occurs under conditions altered through A'.

A"' occurs under conditions that already contain the consequential histories of earlier transformations.

The prime therefore does not mean "later version."

It means:

the conditions of continuation have changed.

At this point, Re-reordering becomes indispensable.

It names the condition under which organization no longer merely changes, but must change within conditions produced partly by the consequences of its own prior changes.

Organization has acquired history.

And that history has become structurally active.

The question with which Under Conditions of Load began can now be answered more precisely.

Relations continue not because the conditions of their continuation remain unchanged.

They continue, where Continuity remains possible, because consequences can enter subsequent relations, be borne through them, alter their organization, and thereby become conditions of what follows.

Continuity therefore does not stand outside change.

It is constituted through the consequential history of change itself.

Conclusion

CONTINUITY UNDER ALTERED CONDITIONS

Under Conditions of Load began with a question:

How can relations continue when the conditions of their continuation are themselves being altered by what has already occurred?

After the preceding chapters, this question can no longer be answered through preservation.

Continuity does not mean that form remains intact.

It does not mean that every relation persists.

It does not mean that an organization successfully resists change.

Nor does it mean that one event simply follows another in time.

Continuity requires something more exact:

what has already occurred must remain capable of altering how subsequent relations can occur.

This is consequential inheritance.

And consequential inheritance does not preserve what it inherits unchanged.

It changes the conditions through which consequence continues.

From Ground to Consequence

Ground established the first condition.

Before any particular relation can occur, relation itself must be available.

Ground therefore does not designate a fixed foundation beneath relations. It names the condition under which relation becomes possible.

But possibility alone cannot explain the differences that enter relation.

Materials enter with histories.

Materials are not merely attributes. Materials carry histories.

Their present relational capacities cannot be separated from the processes through which those capacities became available.

History is therefore already present before organization fully emerges - not as narrative or memory, but as capacity.

Formation begins when these relations cease to remain merely adjacent.

One relation begins to alter the conditions under which another relation can occur or continue.

Relations become mutually consequential.

Organization appears.

But organization does not end Formation.

It becomes a condition of further Formation.

Thus:

Relation -> Organization -> Altered Conditions -> Further Relation

At this point, the problem of Continuity becomes unavoidable.

If organization changes, how can what has already occurred remain active without requiring the organization to remain the same?

The answer is consequence.

Continuity is the capacity of consequences to enter subsequent relations.

This separates Continuity from succession.

One event following another is not enough.

The earlier event must have altered the conditions under which the later relation occurs.

Therefore:

Continuity requires consequential inheritance, not merely temporal succession.

Bearing

But consequences do not continue abstractly.

They must be taken up by relations.

This is Bearing.

Continuity names the persistence of consequence. Bearing names the relational taking-up of consequence.

Bearing gives Continuity a concrete relational mechanism.

A relation begins to carry consequences that do not originate entirely within itself.

This is the condition of Load.

Load is therefore not simply weight.

It is the condition under which consequences must be borne through relations.

And because a bearing relation already possesses history, capacity, position, and prior dependencies, it cannot take up consequence without itself being altered.

Hence:

To bear is already to change.

This leads to one of the central propositions of the entire argument:

The same relation that sustains a structure also transforms it.

The relation through which Continuity proceeds is not protected from the consequences it carries.

It is changed by sustaining them.

Therefore:

Bearing sustains Continuity through changes in organization.

Re-ordering

Yet not every change in Bearing constitutes Re-ordering.

A bearing relation may change while the basic organization through which consequences are carried remains viable.

Re-ordering becomes necessary only when the organization of Bearing itself changes.

Re-ordering occurs when a change in relations alters the way consequences can be borne through those relations.

This distinction prevents structural change from being identified with visible events.

Fracture is an event.

Removal is an event.

Displacement is an event.

Covering is an event.

Their structural significance depends on whether they alter relational availability.

The event is therefore not the theoretical unit.

The change in relation is.

This also explains why Re-ordering cannot be reduced to Formation.

Formation concerns the emergence of mutually consequential relations.

Re-ordering concerns the alteration of an organization in which relations are already consequential.

The organization does not begin again.

It changes from within conditions already formed.

Gravity

Once Bearing pathways can change, another question arises.

Why should those pathways be equally available?

They need not be.

Gravity introduces a specific condition under which difference acquires persistent directional consequence.

Gravity is a persistent directional condition.

Gravity does not create all relational difference.

Materials already differ.

Positions already differ.

Histories already differ.

Capacities already differ.

Gravity makes such differences persistently consequential in relation to direction.

Under Gravity, pathways of Bearing are not necessarily equally available.

But Gravity does not therefore guarantee concentration.

Concentration does not guarantee a limit.

And Gravity does not necessarily produce Failure.

This limitation is essential.

The concepts in Under Conditions of Load do not form a deterministic chain.

One does not mechanically cause the next.

Instead, each concept identifies a problem that the preceding concept cannot adequately describe.

Gravity can explain persistent directional inequality.

It cannot determine, by itself, when a previously viable mode of continuation has ceased to be viable.

That requires Failure.

Failure

Failure is therefore not simply change.

Nor is it identical with fracture, collapse, detachment, or disappearance.

Failure occurs when a mode of Bearing through which Continuity has been sustained is no longer available under the relations as they have become.

Failure concerns viability.

A relation may remain present while its previous mode of Bearing becomes unavailable.

A structure may remain recognizable while one mode of Continuity has reached its limit.

Thus:

Failure marks the limit of a mode of Continuity, not necessarily the limit of Continuity itself.

This distinction prevents Failure from being treated as an absolute ending.

But it also prevents Failure from being romanticized as automatic renewal.

Failure guarantees nothing.

Continuity may end.

The organization may terminate.

Consequences may cease to enter subsequent relations.

Only if consequence remains active after a prior mode of Bearing has become unavailable does another concept become necessary.

Redistribution

That concept is Redistribution.

Failure does not necessarily produce Redistribution. Redistribution becomes necessary only where Continuity persists after a prior mode of Bearing has become unavailable.

Redistribution is not the movement of an unchanged quantity from one place to another.

It is the continuation of consequence through other available relations.

Those relations are changed by what they bear.

And the consequence is changed in how it can continue through them.

Therefore:

Redistribution does not merely relocate consequences. It changes how consequences continue by changing the relations through which they are borne.

Redistribution is also not restoration.

It does not return the organization to a prior equilibrium.

It produces altered conditions.

Hence:

Redistribution does not solve Failure. It creates new conditions of Bearing.

Those new conditions become the conditions of what can occur next.

At this point, the theory becomes explicitly historical.

Return

If prior consequences remain active within present conditions, then recurrence can no longer be understood as simple repetition.

Events may recur. Conditions do not repeat.

More precisely:

Where prior consequences remain active, recurrence cannot occur under relationally identical conditions.

Thus:

What returns does not return under the conditions of its previous occurrence.

A position may return without its conditions returning.

A form may return without its relations returning.

A comparable event may recur without possessing the same structural significance.

Return is therefore not Restoration.

Return is recurrence under altered conditions.

This gives History a precise structural meaning.

History is not merely the accumulation of what has happened.

History is the persistence of prior consequences as present conditions.

The past remains structurally active insofar as it changes what can happen now.

The present is therefore not temporally neutral.

Different consequences enter it from different histories.

Some are recent.

Some have persisted through multiple Re-orderings.

Some have been transformed through Redistribution.

Some may become consequential only after other relations change.

Thus:

The present is temporally uneven.

Re-reordering

The final step occurs when organization itself enters this historical condition.

Re-ordering happens.

Its consequences alter relational conditions.

Later Re-ordering occurs within those altered conditions.

This is not simply Re-ordering repeated.

It is Re-reordering.

Re-reordering begins when the consequences of prior Re-ordering become conditions of subsequent Re-ordering.

At this point, organization itself carries history.

The argument that began with material history reaches organizational history.

Materials carry histories.

And now:

Organization carries histories of consequence.

Each Re-ordering changes the conditions under which the next Re-ordering can occur.

Therefore:

Each Re-ordering changes the problem to which the next Re-ordering responds.

Organization does not repeatedly return to the same problem.

Its own previous responses have already altered the problem.

This is why:

A -> A' -> A'' -> A'''

is not a sequence of object states.

Each term marks a relational condition whose availability has been altered by the consequences of what preceded it.

The prime does not simply mean "later."

It means:

the conditions of continuation have changed.

Continuity

The argument can now return to its beginning.

Continuity does not require the preservation of form.

Continuity does not require every relation to survive.

It does not require an organization to remain identical to itself.

And it does not guarantee that Continuity will always continue.

What it requires, where it occurs, is that consequences remain capable of entering subsequent relations.

Those relations bear them.

In bearing them, they change.

Their organization may Re-order.

Persistent directional conditions may make some pathways unequally available.

A mode of Bearing may lose its viability.

If Continuity persists, consequences may be redistributed.

Redistribution creates altered conditions.

Under those conditions, events may recur without repeating.

And when organization changes again, it changes within a history partly produced by its own prior changes.

Continuity therefore cannot be located in an unchanged thing moving through time.

It lies in the consequential relation between what has occurred and what can occur next.

This is why the same relation that sustains a structure can also transform it.

This is why Failure can mark the end of one mode without necessarily marking the end of Continuity.

This is why Return cannot erase History.

And this is why organization never simply begins again from the same conditions.

The entire argument can finally be condensed into a small number of propositions:

Continuity does not require the preservation of form.

Continuity requires consequential inheritance, not merely temporal succession.

Bearing sustains Continuity through changes in organization.

The same relation that sustains a structure also transforms it.

Failure marks the limit of a mode of Continuity, not necessarily the limit of Continuity itself.

Redistribution does not solve Failure; it creates new conditions of Bearing.

What returns does not return under the conditions of its previous occurrence.

The present organization of relations carries the consequences of its prior Re-orderings.

And finally:

Continuity does not preserve the conditions through which it continues. It changes them.

A relation continues not by remaining what it was, but by entering conditions already altered by what has occurred.

What has occurred continues not because the past remains intact, but because its consequences have become conditions of the present.

And the present continues not by escaping those conditions, but by changing them again.

Continuity continues through altered conditions.