

CARE vs TA-14 Comparison v1.0

Public comparison surface | Date: 2026-04-28 | Public reference: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19852764>

Important limitation

This document is based only on the claims asserted in the LinkedIn thread screenshots. It does not independently verify any TA-14 patent filing, publication, legal status, or complete technical specification.

Neutral comparison

Aspect	CARE	TA-14 claims as asserted in thread
Core focus	Execution-bound consequence	Full execution integrity architecture
Primary claim	Where consequence becomes system reality	How consequence is structured end-to-end
Boundary	Bind decides whether consequence may become real	Structured chain defines validity before and through execution
Dependency	Substrate-independent: proof substrate may fail but must not produce consequence	Architecture-defined: validity depends on chain structure and continuity
Failure test	Can effect occur without bind?	Is the chain valid, continuous, and admissible?
Authority location	Only at execution-time bind	Across the claimed chain plus commit enforcement
Primitive overlap	Admissibility, non-bypassability, fail-closed semantics, commit-time evaluation	May include overlapping primitives as asserted in thread
CARE non-claim	Does not claim the universal principle	Does not evaluate TA-14 ownership claims

Clean separation

CARE does not need to claim that upstream chains, formalization systems, or evidence architectures are irrelevant. They matter. CARE asks whether they carry direct authority over consequence.

If upstream can produce consequence without bind, governance fails. If upstream cannot produce consequence without bind, it is input, not authority.

Thread-safe close

Primitive overlap is not architectural identity. The decisive question is where authority exists.

Public response line

CARE does not claim the chain. CARE claims the condition under which the chain has authority: no valid execution-time bind, no consequence.