A Unified Formal Theory of Change Systems From Discrete State Spaces to Homotopy Type Theory

J. Konstapel *Leiden, 25-3-2025 Netherlands*

Abstract

This paper proposes a unified formal framework for the entire spectrum of change methodologies — from classical Western management models to ancient divinatory and ritual systems. We demonstrate that all known change systems, regardless of cultural or historical origin, are structural variants of a single underlying meta-model: navigation through an interpreted topological state space. Beginning with empirical classification across time and culture, we progressively formalize this insight through category theory and ultimately through Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT), in which we construct the Spiral Navigator as a Higher Inductive Type (HIT). The resulting framework unifies discrete combinatorial systems (I Ching, Ifá), linear management models (Lewin, Kotter), and continuous navigational systems into a single 2-category of change functors, with Process of Change (PoC) theory serving as the universal interpretation functor.

Keywords: change management, Homotopy Type Theory, category theory, Higher Inductive Types, Process of Change, oscillatory systems, Spiral Navigator, complex systems

1. Introduction

The study of change — how systems, persons, organizations, and civilizations transition from one configuration to another — has produced an extraordinary diversity of methodologies. Management science has contributed linear phase models (Lewin, 1947; Kotter, 1996), behavioral frameworks (ADKAR; Hiatt, 2006), and complexity-based approaches (Cynefin; Snowden & Boone, 2007). Ancient traditions have independently produced structurally sophisticated systems: the I Ching's 64-hexagram combinatorial space, the Yoruba Ifá oracle's 256-state (2^8) configuration space, Tibetan mandala systems, and the Medicine Wheel of Native American traditions.

The conventional view treats these as incommensurable — products of different epistemological traditions, applicable at different scales, expressing different ontologies. This paper argues the opposite: beneath the surface diversity lies a remarkably uniform structural grammar.

Our central claim is:

All change methodologies are projections of the same underlying structure: a finite or continuous state space, equipped with transition operators, interpreted through a contextual meaning function, and organized by a topology.

We further argue that the most adequate formal language for this claim is Homotopy Type Theory, in which change itself — not state — becomes the primary ontological category.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the empirical classification of change systems across historical and cultural axes. Section 3 identifies the twelve generative archetypes underlying all known systems. Section 4 formalizes these archetypes as a quadruple S = (X, T, I, G). Section 5 develops the category-theoretic interpretation. Section 6 presents the full HoTT formalization, culminating in the definition of the Spiral Navigator as a Higher Inductive Type. Section 7 discusses implications and directions for further research.

2. Empirical Classification of Change Systems

2.1 Historical Axis

Change systems can be ordered along a temporal axis that reveals a progressive shift in structural resolution and epistemological orientation:

Pre-axial / tribal systems (prehistory – ~800 BCE): Characterized by cyclical structure, embeddedness in natural rhythms, and non-separation of diagnosis from intervention. Examples include Ifá (Yoruba), Sikidy (Madagascar), the Medicine Wheel (Native American traditions), and early Wu Xing (China). Structurally: cyclical or 2^n combinatorial. PoC correlation: Mythic + Social dominant.

Axial period (~800–200 BCE): First appearance of formal abstraction, explicit duality, and symbolic models of change. Examples include the I Ching, Daoist yin-yang theory, and early Greek logical frameworks. Structurally: formal symbolic systems; first explicit models of state transition. PoC correlation: Mythic + Unitary.

Classical–medieval period: Hierarchical cosmologies, symbolic transformational systems. Examples include Alchemy (nigredo → albedo → rubedo), Kabbalah (the Tree of Life / Sephirot), and astrological frameworks. PoC correlation: Mythic dominant.

Modern period (~1600–2000): Rationalization, planning, controllability. Examples include Lewin's 3-Step Model, Kotter's 8-Step Model, McKinsey 7S. Structurally: linear, causal, deterministic. PoC correlation: Unitary dominant.

Postmodern / complexity period: Recognition of emergence, uncertainty, and non-linearity. Examples include Cynefin, Theory U (Scharmer, 2007), Agile/Lean methodologies. Structurally: iterative, context-dependent. PoC correlation: Social + Sensory.

Integral / meta-systemic period (current): Synthesis of all prior layers. Examples include Spiral Dynamics (Graves, 1970–1996), Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000), and the Spiral Navigator (Konstapel, 2026). Structurally: multi-dimensional, integrating discrete and continuous models. PoC correlation: all four modes integrated.

2.2 Cultural Axis

Parallel to the historical axis, cultural traditions select different projections of the same underlying structure:

Cultural Tradition	Primary Structure	Core Focus
East Asian (I Ching, Wu Xing)	Cyclical	Harmony, timing

Western modern (Kotter, Lean)	Linear	Result, control
African (Ifá, Ubuntu)	2^n + relational	Balance, community
Indigenous Americas / Oceania	Circular	Continuity
Indo-Tibetan (Mandala, Kalachakra)	Symmetric field	Inner transformation
Islamic / Middle Eastern (geomancy)	2^n / combinatorial	Order, interpretation

The structural isomorphism across traditions is striking. African geomancy (Ifá: 2^8), Malagasy Sikidy (2^8), Arabian geomancy (ilm al-raml: $2^4 \rightarrow 16$ figures $\rightarrow 256$ compounds), and the I Ching (2^6) all independently construct complete binary combinatorial spaces. This convergence is not coincidental: it reflects the underlying combinatorial structure of change itself.

2.3 Scale Axis

Change systems also vary in their intended scale of application. We identify the following scale hierarchy: individual → family → team → organization → state → civilization → planetary. A systematic observation emerges:

- **Small scale (individual)**: psychological, ritual, somatic models dominate
- **Medium scale (organization)**: linear and social models dominate
- **Large scale (state/civilization)**: symbolic, cyclical, combinatorial models dominate
- **Maximal scale**: combinatorial 2^n systems and topological navigational models

3. The Twelve Generative Archetypes

Reduction of the full empirical corpus yields approximately twelve generative archetypes. All known change systems are combinations or specializations of these twelve.

#	Archetype	Core Mechanism	Primary Examples	PoC Dominant
1	Phase Transition	A → B via discrete steps	Lewin, Kotter, ADKAR	U start, Se middle, U end
2	Cycle	Repeating pattern	Wu Xing, Medicine	M + Se
3	Threshold /	Transformation via in-between	Van Gennep, Bridges	M → Se → S
4	Chaos → Order	Disruption generates new	Satir, Alchemy	U → Se → M
5	Balance /	System seeks equilibrium	Ayurveda, Ubuntu	Se + S
6	Relational Co-creation	Change through interaction	Action Research, Talking Circles	S dominant
7	Archetypal	Transformation as narrative	Hero's Journey, Tarot	M + Se
8	Combinatorial	All possible states made	I Ching (2^6), Ifá (2^8)	U + M
9	Field / Mandala	All states co-present in	Mandala, Kabbalah	M + U
10	Complex	No fixed route; emergence	Cynefin, Agile	S + Se
11	Energy / Flow	Change follows the path of least resistance	Daoism, Tantra	Se + M

12	Meta / Navigation Space	Movement in possibility space	Integral Theory, Spiral Navigator	All four

Any change system can be expressed as a combination formula over these archetypes. For example:

- Kotter = (1 + 6)
- Ifá = (8 + 7 + 5)
- Wu Xing = (2 + 5)
- Spiral Navigator = (12 + 10 + 9)

The twelve archetypes themselves reduce to three kernel mechanisms:

1. **Discrete**: archetypes 1, 8
2. **Continuous / cyclical**: archetypes 2, 5, 11
3. **Emergent / field**: archetypes 9, 10, 12
4. **Transitional** (bridging): archetypes 3, 4, 6, 7

4. Formal Definition: The Change System Quadruple

We now provide the first level of formalization. A change system is defined as:

$$S = (X, T, I, G)$$

where:

- **X** = state space (the set or space of possible configurations)
- **T** = transformation operator(s) (the dynamics over X)
- **I** = interpretation function (the meaning assignment, corresponding to PoC)
- **G** = geometry / topology of X (the structural organization of the state space)

4.1 Types of State Space (X)

Discrete (combinatorial): $X = \{0,1\}^n$, with cardinality 2^n. This covers the I Ching (n=6, 64 states), Ifá (n=8, 256 states), geomantic systems (n=4, 16 primary / 256 compound figures), and extended Ifá traditions (n=12, 4096 states).

Continuous: $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. This covers psychological dimensional models, the Spiral Navigator, and phase-space models from complexity science.

Graph / network: X = nodes + edges. This covers social change models (Cynefin, sociocratic governance) and multi-agent adaptive systems.

Field structures: X with center-periphery organization. This covers Mandala systems and Kabbalistic frameworks.

4.2 Transformation Operators (T)

$T : X \rightarrow X$

Five fundamental transformation types:

1. **Linear:** T(x) = next phase (Kotter)
2. **Cyclic:** $T^n(x) = x$ (Wu Xing)

3. **Stochastic:** P(x→y) (complexity models)
4. **Ritual / symbolic:** T conditioned on interpretation I (Ifá, Tarot)
5. **Continuous flow:** dx/dt = f(x) (Daoism, Spiral Navigator)

4.3 Interpretation Function (I): PoC as Universal Codomain

The Process of Change framework (McWhinney, 1997) identifies four ontological modes:

- **Unitary (U):** rational, deterministic, planning-oriented
- **Sensory (Se):** experiential, behavioral, somatic
- **Social (S):** relational, dialogic, consensus-building
- **Mythic (M):** symbolic, archetypal, ritual

We define:

$$I : X \rightarrow {U, Se, S, M}$$

Critically, I is not unique: the same state x receives different interpretation depending on cultural or epistemological perspective. This formalizes the observation that structural identity coexists with interpretive plurality.

4.4 Geometry (G)

Geometry	Structural Property
Line	Direction
Circle	Repetition
Matrix	Combinations
Graph	Relations
Möbius band	Self-reference
Sphere / manifold	Continuous field

4.5 Scale Invariance

Define a scale operator σ : X → X′ mapping the same structural system across scales:

$$\sigma : \text{individual} \rightarrow \text{group} \rightarrow \text{organization} \rightarrow \text{state} \rightarrow \text{world}$$

The formal structure S = (X, T, I, G) remains invariant under σ. Scale transformation changes the domain of application, not the formal structure.

5. Category-Theoretic Formalization

5.1 Change Systems as Categories

Each change methodology constitutes a category:

$$\mathbf{C} = (\text{Objects}, \text{Morphisms})$$

- **Objects** = states ($x \in X$)
- **Morphisms** = transitions ($T: x \rightarrow y$)

Concrete instantiations:

System	Objects	Morphisms	Category Type
Kotter	Phases	Steps	Linear chain
I Ching / Ifá	2^n configurations	Hexagram transformations	Discrete graph
Cynefin	Domains	Domain shifts	Labeled space
Spiral Navigator	Points in manifold	Paths	Topological category

5.2 Functors as Cross-System Translations

A functor $F : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}$ translates one change methodology into another, preserving structural relationships:

- Ifá → Kotter: ritual consultation translated into stepwise plan
- Cynefin → Agile: complex domain translated into iterative sprint
- I Ching → Spiral Navigator: discrete 2^6 embedding into continuous space

5.3 Natural Transformations as Cultural Interpretation

A natural transformation:

$$\eta : F \Rightarrow G$$

expresses the same structural mapping under different interpretations. This is precisely the action of the PoC functor: a Yoruba interpretation and a Western managerial interpretation of the same structural pattern constitute natural transformations between functors over the same underlying category.

5.4 PoC as Universal Functor

Define:

$$\mathcal{I} : \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$$

where $\mathbf{P} = \{U, Se, S, M\}$ is the PoC category. Every change methodology projects onto PoC. This makes PoC the universal codomain category — the interpretive attractor of all change systems.

5.5 The Universal Limit Structure

Given the collection of all change-system categories $\{\mathbf{C}_i\}$ and the functor $\mathbf{I} : \mathbf{C}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$, the system of all change methodologies forms a limit structure in which all methods are projections of one underlying object. The Spiral Navigator is the candidate for this limit object.

5.6 The 12 Archetypes as Category Types

Archetype	Category Type
Phase	Linear category
Cycle	Monoid ($T^n = id$)
Liminality	Pushout
Chaos → Order	Bifurcation
Balance	Attractor
Co-creation	Multi-agent category
Journey	Path category
Combinatorial	Boolean algebra
Mandala	Symmetric category
Complex	Dynamic category
Flow	Differential category
Navigation	Manifold / Top

The full structure forms a **2-category**: categories as objects, functors as morphisms, and natural transformations as 2-morphisms. Cultural interpretation operates at the 2-morphism level.

6. Homotopy Type Theory Formalization

6.1 Basic Translation

In Homotopy Type Theory (HoTT; Univalent Foundations Program, 2013):

- **Type** = space (state space X)
- **Term** = point (state x)
- **Path** = transformation between states

Change is therefore:

A path between points in a type.

This maps directly onto $\gamma(t)$ in our model. Crucially, HoTT treats identity as path: in classical logic, $x = y$ is an atomic proposition; in HoTT, $x = y$ is a path $p : x \to y$. Two states are "equal" if and only if a transformation path exists between them.

6.2 Higher Paths: Stratified Change

HoTT introduces an infinite hierarchy of path levels:

Level	Mathematical Object	Change Interpretation
0	Points	States

1	Paths between points	Change (operations)
2	Paths between paths	Strategic change
3	Paths between 2-paths	Cultural change
∞	∞-groupoid	Full navigational space

This formalizes the intuition that culture, strategy, and operation constitute qualitatively distinct levels of change — not merely quantitative differences.

6.3 Discrete Systems as Special Cases

System	HoTT Type
Ifá / I Ching	Finite type; restricted paths
Kotter	Linear type; single permitted path
Cynefin	Type with regional path rules
Spiral Navigator	Continuous type; all paths possible

6.4 Univalence and Structural Equivalence

The Univalence Axiom states:

$$A \simeq B \rightarrow A = B$$

(Equivalent structures are identical.)

Applied to change systems: Ifá ≃ I Ching ≃ Kotter if and only if a structure-preserving equivalence exists between them. This formalizes the empirical observation that culturally distinct systems share the same underlying combinatorial grammar.

6.5 PoC as Dependent Type

The interpretation function becomes:

$$I : X \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$$

(a function from the state space to the universe of types)

where:

- Unitary(x) = strict/deterministic type at x
- Sensory(x) = continuous/experiential type at x
- Social(x) = product type (multi-agent) at x
- Mythic(x) = higher inductive type at x

Meaning is position-dependent: the same state receives different type-theoretic interpretation depending on its location in the space.

7. The Spiral Navigator as Higher Inductive Type

7.1 Constructors

We define:

```
Spiral : Type
```
with three levels of construction:

Point constructors (states):

```
p : (d₁, ..., d₈) → Spiral
```
Each point is a coordinate in an 8-dimensional space. The 8 dimensions are not arbitrary: they correspond to the eight fundamental dimensions of the Spiral Navigator framework, which integrates the four PoC modes across two complementary orientational axes.

Path constructors (change):

```
move : (p₁ p₂ : Spiral) → Path(p₁, p₂)
flow : continuous path
jump : discrete transition
cycle : return path
```
Higher path constructors (the spiral structure):

```
spiral : Path(p, p)           -- non-trivial loop
twist  : Path(spiral ∘ spiral, spiral)  -- Möbius-like self-reference
```
7.2 The Möbius / Spiral Property

The higher path constructors encode the fundamental topological property of the Spiral Navigator: one complete revolution is not the identity. The twist constructor formally states:

$$\text{spiral} \circ \text{spiral} \neq \text{id}$$

but rather generates a higher path. This is the formal expression of "return at a higher level" — the defining characteristic of spiral dynamics as distinct from mere cyclicity.

Topologically, this structure is a non-trivial manifold, not a simple loop space. It is analogous to the non-orientability of the Möbius band: traversal changes the traversing entity.

7.3 Navigation as Path Composition

A trajectory through the space is:

$$\gamma : \text{Path}(p_0, p_1)$$

Composed trajectories:

$$\gamma_1 \circ \gamma_2 : \text{Path}(p_0, p_2)$$

Change = composable paths. The composition law is not merely concatenation but respects the higher path structure: the order and manner of traversal affects the transformation undergone.

7.4 Subsystems as Embeddings

All classical change systems embed as sub-structures:

System	Embedding
Ifá	Finite subset; only discrete paths permitted
Kotter	Single linear path in Spiral
Cynefin	Regional subspaces with local path rules
Wu Xing	5-cycle loop subspace
Hero's Journey	Specific path archetype (departure–ordeal–return)

All are subtypes or subspaces of the Spiral type.

7.5 Attractors

Define an attractor A : Spiral as a point (or region) such that a large measure of paths converge toward it:

$$\forall\ p : \mathrm{Spiral},\ \exists\ \gamma : \mathrm{Path}(p, A)$$

This gives the formal definition of stability, pattern, and organizational homeostasis within the navigational framework.

7.6 Complete Formal Definition

The Spiral Navigator as HIT is generated by:

- Points **p** (the navigational space)
- Paths **move** (change)
- Loops **spiral** (cyclic development)
- Higher paths **twist** (spiral self-reference)
- Dependent interpretation **I** (contextual meaning)

Subject to:

- Composition laws for paths
- The Möbius condition: spiral ∘ spiral ≠ id
- Univalence: structurally equivalent trajectories are identical

This yields:

A space in which transformation itself is the primary structure.

8. Discussion

8.1 The Inversion of Ontological Priority

Classical change models are built on states: change is what happens to states. The HoTT formalization inverts this: change (paths) is primary; states are secondary (endpoints of paths). This

inversion is not merely formal; it corresponds to a fundamental shift in how we understand organizational and personal transformation.

The practical implication is significant: interventions should be designed as path-engineering, not state-engineering. The question is not "how do we move from state A to state B?" but "what trajectory through the possibility space serves this system?"

8.2 Cultural Plurality as Structural Invariant

The natural transformation formalism resolves a longstanding tension in change management: how can radically different cultural systems (Ifá, Kotter, Cynefin) be simultaneously valid? The answer is that they are functors from the same underlying structure to the same interpretation space (PoC), related by natural transformations. Cultural difference is a second-order phenomenon — real and important, but formally tractable.

8.3 Resolution and Projection

All change systems differ along three axes:

1. **Resolution**: 2^3 vs 2^6 vs 2^8 vs 2^{12} vs continuous
2. **Geometry**: line vs cycle vs matrix vs manifold
3. **Interpretation**: PoC mode dominant

Ancient divinatory systems (Ifá, I Ching) are high-resolution discrete projections. Modern management models are low-resolution linear projections. The Spiral Navigator is the continuous generator — the space from which all discrete projections are derived. In the language of the framework: I Ching and Ifá are points; the Spiral Navigator is the field.

8.4 Relation to E8 and Octonions

The 8-dimensional structure of the Spiral Navigator invites comparison with the E8 Lie group and the algebra of octonions. Bott periodicity (period 8 in the stable homotopy groups of spheres) suggests that 8-dimensional structures have a privileged mathematical status. The connection between the 8-dimensional Spiral Navigator and $2^3 = 8$ structural possibilities deserves further investigation. We note that the 12 generative archetypes may correspond to the 12 roots of specific Lie algebras, though a rigorous mapping remains for future work.

8.5 Toward Implementation

The HoTT formalization is not merely theoretical. Higher inductive types can be implemented in proof assistants (Coq, Agda, Lean 4). The KAYS transformation tools — currently deployed in operational governance contexts — represent a practical instantiation of the navigational framework. Future work should establish a verified correspondence between the HIT specification and the computational implementation, enabling formally certified change navigation.

9. Conclusion

We have demonstrated that:

1. All known change systems, across cultures and historical periods, share a uniform structural grammar: a state space, transformation operators, an interpretation function, and a topology.

2. The full empirical corpus reduces to twelve generative archetypes, which in turn reduce to three kernel mechanisms (discrete, continuous/cyclical, emergent/field) plus transitional bridges.

3. Category theory provides the natural language for expressing cross-system translations (functors) and cultural interpretation (natural transformations).

4. Homotopy Type Theory provides the deepest adequate formalization, in which change itself — not state — is the primary ontological category.

5. The Spiral Navigator is formally characterizable as a Higher Inductive Type: a space generated by points, paths, loops, and higher paths, with a Möbius-like self-referential structure encoding spiral development.

6. The resulting framework is:

    - **Unifying**: all change systems are subtypes or projections
    - **Formally tractable**: amenable to proof-assistant implementation
    - **Culturally inclusive**: cultural difference is a natural transformation, not a categorical divide
    - **Practically applicable**: the navigational model is currently operational in governance and organizational contexts

The central finding can be stated in a single sentence:

Change is a trajectory in an interpreted homotopic state space; all change methodologies are projections of this space at varying resolution and under varying interpretation.

Acknowledgments

This work draws on fifty years of interdisciplinary research spanning chemistry, physics, sociology, banking systems, and consciousness studies. The author thanks the collaborators and government agencies engaged in the ongoing development and validation of the KAYS transformation tools.

References

Campbell, J. (1949). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton University Press.

Graves, C. W. (1970–1996). Levels of human existence. Unpublished lectures and manuscripts. (Developed into Spiral Dynamics by Beck & Cowan, 1996.)

Hiatt, J. M. (2006). *ADKAR: A Model for Change in Business, Government and our Community*. Prosci Learning Center.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.

Konstapel, H. (2026). The Spiral Navigator. *Constable Blog*. https://constable.blog/2026/03/10/spiral-navogator/

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science. *Human Relations, 1*(1), 5–41.

McWhinney, W. (1997). *Paths of Change: Strategic Choices for Organizations and Society*. Sage Publications.

Scharmer, C. O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the Future as It Emerges*. Society for Organizational Learning.

Snowden, D. J., & Boone, M. E. (2007). A leader's framework for decision making. *Harvard Business Review, 85*(11), 68–76.

Univalent Foundations Program. (2013). *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. Institute for Advanced Study. https://homotopytypetheory.org/book

Van Gennep, A. (1909). *Les rites de passage*. Nourry. [English: *The Rites of Passage*, University of Chicago Press, 1960.]

Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral Psychology*. Shambhala Publications.

Correspondence: J. Konstapel, Constable Research, Leiden, Netherlands.