

here, the practice succeeds where it preserves the divergence among positions and fails where it merges them, so a more even presentation of two positions in one frame deepens the failure. The two rationales prescribe opposite remedies in the case just described, and the practice they assess is the same practice.

Section 16 supplies what the second rationale recommends in its place. Attribution, the recording of an evidential basis alongside a position, and the exhibition of the difference between the two bases are annotations, and they keep the asymmetry on the record without requiring the frame to carry it.

26 CIRCULATION

26.1 *The operation of circulation*

Circulation carries a published report onward through parties the report's author did not select. A report is summarised, quoted in part, restated, recirculated with commentary attached, and reduced to a fragment, by parties who are unknown at the time of writing and whose number is unbounded.

The operation differs at one decisive point from the transmission treated in the companion study of diplomacy. A party sending a message through chosen intermediaries selects the pathway and retains a measure of control over it. A party publishing a report selects nothing downstream, and Section 15 constructed the chain on that assumption.

26.2 *Failure at circulation*

The operation fails through iterated coercion. A claim asserted of some members of a neighbourhood is restated of the neighbourhood, then of a wider one, and then of a population, each step performing a quotient in the sense of Section 14. Proposition 15.2 establishes that the domain of assertion is non-decreasing along such a sequence and that the composition of the steps is itself a coercion, so a terminal claim reached through many unremarkable enlargements is indistinguishable from one fabricated at the outset.

The verification of Section 16 measured the magnitude. In the construction used there, a claim whose material reached two of thirty-two positions arrived at the end of six hops asserted over twenty-one, with the collapse detectable in no chain at all where no party recorded what it had received.

26.3 *Alteration of the rule of circulation*

The rule fixes which forms survive transmission. Alterations at this site are performed by the architecture through which material moves, since a channel that carries a headline and discards its qualifications has altered what a report can transmit, whatever the report contains. A reporting actor operates under whichever rule obtains and does not set it.

26.4 *Prior treatments of circulation*

Circulation has an established descriptive literature. Secord's programme treats knowledge as constituted in its movement and not merely conveyed by it [Secord (2004)], and

Raj develops the same for knowledge moving between regions under unequal conditions [Raj (2007)]. Research on diffusion and cascades supplies the quantitative treatment of onward transmission. Work on headlines establishes that a headline is read by many who read no further and that headline and body may diverge. The division of newsroom labour is documented: the sub-editing stage rewrites headlines and leads and unifies copy assembled from several sources [Vandendaele et al. (2015)], and digital-first reorganisation has redistributed that function without removing it [Robotham (2022)].

The descriptive literature establishes that claims are altered as they travel. What it does not supply is a condition binding the party at the head of the chain, and Section 26.3 supplies one by way of Proposition 15.2: the operation performed downstream is the same operation performed at the head, so a report's resistance to it is settled at the time of writing.

26.5 *Case material at circulation*

Case Study 23.1. (The composition of headlines within a newsroom). Documented, and presented as a common pattern with its variation noted. In the traditional newsroom division the writing of headlines belongs to the sub-editing or copy-editing function and lies outside the reporting function [Vandendaele et al. (2015)], so that the element of a published artefact most likely to be extracted and circulated on its own is composed by a party other than the one who gathered the material. Digital-first operations have altered the division in places, with some reporters supplying their own headlines and some functions consolidated [Robotham (2022)].

The structure Case Study 26.5 exhibits is the one Section 11 established, appearing now inside a single organisation. A condition binding the writer of a report does not bind the writer of its headline, and the headline is the portion of the artefact that circulation is most likely to carry. The residue is a matter of organisational design and belongs with the material Part IX refers onward.

27 RECEPTION

27.1 *The operation of reception*

Reception is the arrival of a report at an addressee holding a particular repertoire. The operation is distinguished from construal because the addressee of a published report is a multitude, unknown individually at the time of writing, and heterogeneous in the categories and background its members hold.

The operation is the site at which the paper's criterion becomes relative to a party. Section 40 states the criterion and establishes what follows from its relativity.

27.2 *Failure at reception*

The operation fails where the report is unreconstructable by the addressee it was written for. A sentence framed in the vocabulary of a specialised field arrives at a general read-

ership as an event from which little can be generated, and the failure is a property of the pairing and of neither party alone.

A second failure runs in the other direction and is the more common. A report simplified for accessibility may remove the relational structure a reader requires, so that a formulation stating that inflation harms everyone arrives with nothing from which the differences among positions could be reconstructed. Accessibility purchased by removing differentiation is the coarsening operation of Proposition 6.2 performed for a benign reason.

27.3 *Alteration of the rule of reception*

The rule is the repertoire an addressee holds, and repeated reception alters it. A readership addressed for a long period in terms that carry no differentiation among positions loses the categories in which differentiation would be received, which is the alteration Section 24.3 identified at the level of an individual reader and which appears here at the level of an audience.

27.4 *Prior treatments of reception*

The condition of the addressee has been treated most fully in the study of public understanding of science, where the deficit model holds that public difficulty arises from a shortfall of knowledge to be remedied by better transmission. The critique of that model establishes that lay parties bring competences and situated knowledge of their own, and that their difficulty frequently concerns the institution making the claim and not its content [Wynne (1992), Jasanoff (2005)]. Readability and plain-language research supplies the practical apparatus for adjusting a text to a readership, and the critique of simplification establishes that adjustment may remove the distinctions that made the claim informative.

The literature establishes that a text meets a repertoire it does not supply, and it frames the problem as one of better transmission or of better mutual engagement. This account holds that no transmission occurs at all, so the question at Section 27.2 becomes which collapses a reader of the declared description can detect, and Section 40 states the condition that follows.

27.5 *Case material at reception*

Case Study 24.1. (Two formulations of one distributional claim). Constructed. A report may state that inflation harms everyone, or may state that consumers face higher prices while some producers face higher costs, with the two effects falling on different parties. The second is no harder to read than the first and carries a distinction the first removes.

Case Study 27.5 shows that accessibility and differentiation are independent, and the independence is what the second failure of Section 27.2 obscures. A report may be simple and differentiated, and the operation that removes differentiation is chosen and is not forced by the requirement of being read.

PART VI

THE ALLOCATION OF INTERPRETIVE LABOUR

28 INTERPRETIVE ABSTENTION AND THE TRANSFER OF THE INTERPRETIVE BURDEN

The role of this section is to examine the professional doctrine under which a reporter supplies occurrences and leaves their significance to others. Its objective is to show that the doctrine performs an allocation, to identify the feature of its formulation that conceals the allocation, to record the unequal incidence of what it allocates, and to state what the journalistic case adds to a result the corpus already holds. The method is to take the doctrine at its own valuation and then to ask what follows for the party on whom the labour lands.

28.1 *The doctrine of interpretive abstention*

A reporter is to establish what occurred and to leave to the reader what it means. The doctrine has an obvious appeal, since it appears to withhold from the reporter a power the reporter has no title to, and it appears to leave the reader's judgement intact. It is stated in professional codes, it is taught, and it is defended by practitioners as the ground of the trust a publication holds.

The doctrine is stated in a negative form, and the form is the object of this section. A reporter following it refrains: from characterising, from concluding, from evaluating. What the doctrine describes is an omission, and an omission appears to impose nothing on anyone.

28.2 *The transfer the doctrine performs*

Interpretation of an episode is work, and the work has to be done somewhere for the episode to be understood by anyone. A doctrine under which a reporter declines it therefore locates it elsewhere, and the elsewhere is the reader. A reader receiving occurrences without their relations supplies the relations, and a reader supplying them draws on whatever background, time and access it holds.

The doctrine is accordingly not the absence of an allocation, and it is a particular allocation stated in the grammar of a refusal. Whether the allocation is defensible is a further question and one this section leaves open; that it is an allocation is settled by the observation that the labour does not cease to exist when a reporter declines it.

28.3 *The concealment of the transfer*

The companion paper on the distribution of the translation burden establishes the general result, and the result is imported here without re-derivation. A default that imposes a burden conceals the imposition where the default takes the grammatical form of a refusal to act, since a party asked to justify an imposition can point out that it did nothing.

Journalism supplies the general result with an unusually clean instance. The doctrine of abstention is written down, it is taught as a positive professional virtue, and its formulation is explicitly negative. A practitioner defending it may accurately state that no interpretation was imposed on any reader, and the accuracy of that statement is precisely what makes the allocation difficult to see.

28.4 *The incidence of what is transferred*

Interpretation transferred to readers lands on readers unequally, and the inequality follows the distribution of what interpretation requires. Background knowledge of a policy area, time to consult further sources, access to several accounts of the same episode and familiarity with the conventions of the genre are unevenly held.

A consequence follows for the doctrine's appeal. The doctrine is defended as leaving the reader's judgement intact, and it leaves intact the judgement of a reader equipped to exercise it. For a reader lacking what the exercise requires, the doctrine supplies material from which a reading will be generated by whatever repertoire is available, which Section 24 treated at the site of construal.

28.5 *The contribution of the journalistic case*

The general result was established in a setting without institutions dedicated to the operation. Journalism supplies three features that setting lacked: a doctrine of abstention codified in professional codes, a documented history of its adoption, and a documented history of its partial abandonment as publications introduced analysis, explanatory sections and context alongside reporting. Section 31 takes up the second and third.

29 CONSTRAINT DISTINGUISHED FROM DETERMINATION

The role of this section is to examine a third position between supplying an interpretation and withholding one. Its objective is to state that position, to distinguish the two operations it rests on, to raise the objection that the distinction runs opposite to the way it is ordinarily taken, and to state the condition under which the position is defensible. The method is to grant the position its strongest formulation and then to test it against the treatment of degradation in two levels.

29.1 *The position on constraint under examination*

A reporter may decline to supply a reading of an episode while shaping the conditions under which a reader generates one. Verified occurrences, the relations among them, the positions from which each account came, the boundaries of what the material reached and the points at which evidence stops are all available to be recorded, and recording them narrows the readings a reader can reach without selecting among those that remain.

The position is attractive and it answers the objection of Section 28 directly. A reporter adopting it neither abandons the reader nor replaces the reader's judgement, and it supplies the labour that the doctrine of abstention transfers.