# Beyond Redistribution A Coherence-Based Critique of the Global Justice Report

J. Konstapel Leiden, June 4 2026

## Abstract

The Global Justice Report (Chancel, Mohren, Piketty et al., 2026) represents the most comprehensive articulation of redistributive thinking applied to global inequality and climate change to date. Its empirical diagnosis is largely compelling: inequality and ecological collapse are structurally intertwined, sufficiency outperforms uniform degrowth, and cultural transformation is as necessary as institutional reform. This paper accepts these findings as a starting point while arguing that the Report's underlying ontology — its model of what human beings are, what capital is, and how systems change — forecloses the very transformation it seeks. Global inequality is not primarily a distribution problem requiring better mechanisms. It is a coherence failure rooted in a specific historical epistemology. Understanding that origin is a prerequisite for any effective response. We propose a coherence-based paradigm as an alternative framework, grounded in quaternion field theory, Paths of Change, and a revised account of the historical emergence of extractive capitalism.

## 1. Introduction

The Global Justice Report arrives at a moment of genuine civilisational urgency. Its quantitative ambition is unprecedented: a fully specified transition path from 2026 to 2100, integrating income convergence, energy transition, sufficiency, and institutional reform into a single modelling framework. Its central conclusion — that reconciling planetary habitability with shared prosperity requires simultaneous transformation across economic, ecological, and political dimensions — is both correct and important.

The Report also makes a move that distinguishes it from earlier redistributive programmes. It acknowledges that the "cultural and intellectual battle" over the value of sufficiency, free time, and planetary habitability is as decisive as any tax schedule or institutional architecture (GJR, Ch. 4). In doing so, it implicitly recognises that the problem is not merely technical but paradigmatic.

Yet the Report stops precisely at the threshold of the paradigm shift it requires. Having identified the need for a cultural transformation, it has no theory of culture. Having identified sufficiency as structurally superior to growth, it has no account of why growth became the dominant organising principle in the first place. Having identified inequality as a systemic rather than incidental feature of capitalism, it proposes to correct that system from within using its own instruments — taxation, institutional design, democratic procedure.

This paper argues that these limitations are not incidental but structural. They follow from an ontological commitment that the Report shares with the capitalism it critiques: the reduction of human beings to economic units, of capital to stock, and of change to the adjustment of parameters within a stable system. We call this the **analytic game** — a mode of reasoning that is internally coherent, technically sophisticated, and ultimately unable to generate the transformation it describes.

The alternative we propose is not a better version of the Global Justice Report. It is a different way of understanding what the problem is.

# 2. What the Global Justice Report Gets Right

Intellectual honesty requires beginning with what the Report achieves. Its contributions are substantial and should not be dismissed in the effort to move beyond them.

### 2.1 The structural coupling of inequality and ecology

The Report's most important empirical contribution is the demonstration that inequality and ecological collapse cannot be treated as separate problems with separate solutions. Its scenario analysis shows that fast decarbonisation alone — without sufficiency and redistribution — produces a temperature rise of approximately 2.6°C by 2100, well above the 2°C threshold (GJR, Fig. 1.18). Conversely, sufficiency without fast decarbonisation yields approximately 3.3°C. Only the combination of all three dimensions — sufficiency, energy transition, and inequality compression — achieves the 1.8°C outcome.

This is a genuinely novel finding in quantitative climate modelling. Prior scenarios, including the IPCC Shared Socioeconomic Pathways, treat these dimensions as largely independent. The Report's integration of them into a single accounting framework represents a methodological advance.

### 2.2 Sufficiency over degrowth

Equally significant is the Report's finding that targeted sufficiency — structural transformation toward immaterial sectors, dietary change, reforestation — is more climatically effective than uniform degrowth (GJR, Fig. 1.19). A global convergence to €60,000 per capita GDP with sectoral transformation produces lower emissions than convergence to €15,000 without it. This result has profound implications: it means that *what* an economy produces matters more than *how much* it produces. The composition of activity, not its aggregate scale, is the primary climate lever.

This finding aligns with a systems perspective that the Report does not fully develop but implicitly supports.

### 2.3 The primacy of cultural transformation

Perhaps the most intellectually honest moment in the Report is its acknowledgement in Chapter 4 that the decisive battle is cultural and intellectual rather than technical or institutional. The Report recognises that between 10% and 20% of the population in rich countries stands to lose monetarily from the Global Justice Platform, and that these groups can be persuaded to oppose it by arguments about the value of growth, material consumption, and national interest. The counter-argument — that sufficiency, free time, and planetary habitability are worth the trade-off — cannot be made by tax schedules alone. It requires a different account of what constitutes a good life.

The Report names this need clearly. It cannot fulfil it, because it lacks a theory of the human being capable of supporting such an account. That is not a criticism of the authors; it is an indication of where the next theoretical step must be taken.

### 2.4 The honest acknowledgement of gradualism

Finally, the Report is unusually candid about its own limitations. It acknowledges that its benchmark scenario is "relatively moderate and gradualist — arguably too moderate and gradualist"

(GJR, Ch. 2.7). It acknowledges that the Global Justice Fund would need to be approximately four times larger to achieve genuine equal opportunity in education and health. It acknowledges that its North-South transfers are smaller than what colonial and climate damages would require.

This intellectual honesty creates the opening for the present critique. The Report itself signals that something more is needed. Our argument is that the "something more" is not a larger version of the same instrument, but a different understanding of the problem.

# 3. The Ontological Assumption: How Useful Simplifications Become Invisible Prisons

## 3.1 The Pragmatic Reduction and Its Consequences

A preliminary clarification is necessary before the argument proceeds. This paper employs the quaternion framework at three distinct levels that must not be conflated:

1. **As mathematical metaphor**: the quaternion structure illustrates, in precise formal terms, the kind of reduction that occurs when a multi-component description is simplified to fewer components. At this level, the argument is analogical and heuristic.
2. **As formal model**: the quaternion operator, when applied to institutional analysis via the Bronze Mean threshold sequence, generates testable structural predictions about system behaviour — specifically about the conditions under which systems can or cannot revise their own foundational premises. At this level, the argument is structural and falsifiable.
3. **As physical hypothesis**: the claim that human beings instantiate quaternion field structure as a physical reality — as eigenstates of the nilpotent vacuum — is a hypothesis, not an established fact. It is presented as such throughout this paper.

These levels are related but not identical. The formal model does not require the physical hypothesis to be true in order to be useful. The historical and institutional analysis in sections 4–6 depends primarily on the formal model, not on the physical hypothesis. Readers who find the physical claims speculative — as they are — should not on that account dismiss the formal and metaphorical arguments, which stand independently.

With this clarification in place, we proceed.

In the 1880s, Oliver Heaviside and Josiah Willard Gibbs faced a practical problem. James Clerk Maxwell had formulated his theory of electromagnetism using quaternions — a four-dimensional number system only recently developed by William Rowan Hamilton (1843). Quaternions were powerful but unfamiliar, and most working engineers and physicists of the time had not mastered them. Heaviside and Gibbs therefore reformulated Maxwell's twenty quaternion equations into four vector equations. The result was technically equivalent for most engineering purposes, and vastly more tractable.

What was lost in this reformulation was not immediately apparent. The quaternion has four components: three spatial (the vector part) and one scalar. The scalar component carries information about the field as a whole — its phase, its coherence, its relationship to the medium through which it propagates. When Heaviside discarded the scalar component, he did not do so maliciously or even knowingly in the full sense. Quaternions were new; their physical interpretation was still contested; the scalar term appeared to add complexity without adding engineering utility. The simplification worked, in the sense that it produced correct predictions for the phenomena then under investigation.

But the simplification also made certain phenomena invisible — specifically those involving field coherence, phase relationships, and the coupling between electromagnetic fields and their medium. The vector formalism cannot see them, not because they do not exist, but because the mathematical language that would describe them was removed from the toolkit.

This is the structure of a **pragmatic reduction**: a simplification made for good reasons, within a specific context, that subsequently generalises beyond its domain of validity and forecloses the investigation of phenomena it cannot represent.

## 3.2 The Same Structure in Economic Thought

The history of economic thought exhibits an identical structure. It is not a history of malicious reductionism but of successive pragmatic simplifications that each worked within their original domain and each generalised beyond it.

The classical economists — Smith, Ricardo, Mill — were engaging with a specific historical phenomenon: the emergence of market exchange as a dominant mode of coordination in eighteenth and nineteenth century Britain. Their analytical tools — supply, demand, price, labour value — were adequate to that phenomenon. They were not adequate to the full range of human productive activity, but that limitation was not yet apparent because the phenomena they could not represent — reproductive labour, commons, ecological metabolism, social coherence — were not yet under pressure.

The marginalist revolution of the 1870s performed a further reduction. By anchoring economic value in individual utility maximisation, it produced a model of extraordinary analytical elegance and mathematical tractability. It also removed from economic visibility everything that could not be expressed as an individual preference — collective goods, relational value, systemic effects, the coherence conditions that make market exchange possible in the first place.

By the twentieth century, the dominant economic paradigm had converged on a picture of the human being as a utility-maximising agent endowed with stable preferences, operating in markets that aggregate these preferences into prices, within institutions that can be designed to correct market failures. This is a powerful analytical framework. It is also, we argue, a scalar-component-free vector formalism applied to human social life.

What it cannot see is the coherence structure of human beings and human communities — the phase relationships, resonance conditions, and field-level organisation that determine whether a given distribution of resources produces human flourishing or human degradation. It cannot see these things not because they do not exist, but because the mathematical and conceptual language that would describe them was never incorporated into the standard toolkit.

## 3.3 The Global Justice Report as Sophisticated Vector Formalism

The Global Justice Report operates entirely within this tradition, and does so with exceptional sophistication. Its human beings are income percentiles. Its capital is stock measured as a fraction of GDP. Its institutions are governance mechanisms that aggregate preferences and allocate resources. Its change is parameter adjustment within a stable system architecture.

This is not a criticism of the authors' intentions or intelligence. It is an observation about the paradigm within which they are working. Within that paradigm, the Report achieves as much as can be achieved. Its scenario analysis is rigorous. Its historical data is unparalleled. Its institutional proposals are carefully specified.

But the paradigm cannot answer the question it most needs to answer: why, given that the costs of the current trajectory are so obvious and so large, do human beings and human societies continue on it? The Report's answer — vested interests, cultural inertia, the political power of the wealthy — is not wrong, but it is incomplete. It describes the symptoms of a coherence failure without a theory of coherence.

A utility-maximising agent with correct information about climate damages and inequality costs should, within the Report's own framework, support the Global Justice Platform. The fact that large majorities do not is treated as a political problem to be solved by better communication and coalition-building. We argue it is an ontological signal: the model of the human being is wrong, and the wrongness of the model is preventing effective response.

### 3.4 Capital as Oscillating Field

The Report's treatment of capital exhibits the same limitation. Capital appears throughout as a stock — a percentage of GDP, a share of national wealth, a flow of investment. This representation is adequate for the accounting purposes the Report serves. It is not adequate for understanding how capital actually functions as an organising principle of social life.

From a coherence perspective, capital is better understood as an **oscillating field** — a pattern of claims, expectations, and social relations that sustains itself through continuous reproduction and that shapes the phase space of possible actions for everyone within its reach. It is not a thing that can be redistributed like water in a tank. It is a dynamic structure that reconstitutes itself through the behaviour of the agents it has produced.

This distinction matters practically. The Report proposes to reduce the billionaire class's share of global wealth from 6.4% to 0.05% through progressive taxation. Within the stock model, this is a straightforward reallocation. Within the field model, it raises a prior question: what happens to the organising field that the billionaire class instantiates when its material substrate is redistributed? The field — the set of social relations, institutional arrangements, cultural norms, and epistemic frameworks that reproduce extreme wealth concentration — does not automatically dissolve when the stock is redistributed. It reconstitutes itself through whatever channels remain available, as the history of wealth redistribution programmes abundantly demonstrates.

This is not an argument against redistribution. It is an argument that redistribution without field transformation is insufficient — and that field transformation requires a different kind of intervention than the Report envisions.

## 4. Historical Aetiology: The Dutch Case as Paradigm Instance

### 4.1 Why Historical Aetiology Matters

The Global Justice Report acknowledges that the current global system is not an accident. It notes that "the development of Western industrial capitalism since the 18th century is closely linked to a system based on the international division of labour, the mobilisation of natural and human resources at the world level, and European powers' military and colonial domination over the rest of the planet" (GJR, Ch. 4.3). This is correct as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. Naming colonialism as a structural cause of present inequality is necessary but insufficient if one cannot explain why the institutional architecture of colonialism proved so durable — why it reproduced itself across centuries, across political regimes, across apparent reforms.

The coherence framework offers a precise answer. What reproduced itself was not a set of interests or ideologies, which can in principle be changed, but an **epistemic architecture** — a specific configuration of the quaternion operator that systematically filtered out the feedback required for self-correction. Understanding the origin of that architecture is prerequisite to understanding why redistribution alone cannot dissolve it.

The Netherlands provides an unusually well-documented case study of how such an architecture crystallises at a specific historical moment. We do not claim that the Dutch case is the unique origin of global capitalism — the British institutional development, the Westphalian settlement, the Enlightenment, the industrial revolution, and the American financial system all contributed essential elements. Rather, we treat the Dutch case as an **exemplary crystallisation point**: a moment where the formal dynamics of Phase III closure are unusually visible, unusually precisely dated, and unusually traceable in their subsequent institutional reproduction. The argument generalises; the case study makes it concrete.

## 4.2 The Synod of Dort (1619) as Coherence Phase Transition

In the formal framework developed in Konstapel (2026), social systems can be characterised by their position relative to the Bronze Mean threshold sequence derived from the nilpotent quaternion operator: $B_1 = 1$, $B_2 = 4$, $B_3 = 13$, $B_4 = 43$. The transition from Phase III ($B_3 = 13$) to Phase IV ($B_4 = 43$) is qualitatively distinct from all earlier transitions. Phase III systems are autopoietic — self-maintaining, stable, capable of reproducing their own structure — but cannot revise their own foundational models in response to disconfirming feedback. Phase IV systems can.

The quaternion $q = s + xi + yj + zk$ has four components. In institutional terms: the scalar component (s) represents the invariant identity of the system — its foundational commitments, immune to external reorientation. The vector components (i, j, k) represent the three degrees of freedom through which the system orients toward its environment, toward other agents, and toward reflexive self-revision respectively. A Phase III institutional architecture maximises the scalar component and suppresses the k-vector — the reflexive component that enables foundational revision.

The Synod of Dort (1618–1619) is precisely such a transition — or rather, a *failed* transition: a moment at which a Phase IV architecture was available and was deliberately suppressed in favour of a Phase III configuration.

The theological dispute between Remonstrants (Arminius) and Counter-Remonstrants (Gomarus) was simultaneously an architectural dispute. The Remonstrant position — that individual conscience is the ultimate moral authority, that faith requires personal appropriation, that institutional authority including the church can be questioned from the standpoint of individual reason and experience — is a full quaternion architecture: scalar active, all three vector components active. The Counter-Remonstrant position — that divine election is supralapsarically determined, that the conclusion precedes all argument, all evidence, all conscience — is scalar-dominant architecture: s maximised, i demoted, j restricted, k eliminated.

Prince Maurice chose the Counter-Remonstrant side in 1619, not from theological conviction but from political opportunism: his rival Johan van Oldenbarnevelt was allied with the Remonstrants. On 13 May 1619, Oldenbarnevelt was executed. Four days later the Synod closed. Two hundred Remonstrant ministers were expelled. Hugo Grotius — Remonstrant, escaped in a book chest — was forced into exile.

What was eliminated was not a theological position. It was the **k-component** of the Dutch institutional quaternion: the mechanism for reflexive foundational revision.

The Bronze Mean asymmetry makes this outcome structurally predictable rather than contingent. A Phase III system can bind its members to shared conclusions not subject to revision, generating unconditional institutional loyalty that a Phase IV system structurally cannot generate. In any institutional competition for resources, membership, and political influence, Phase III systems are therefore structurally advantaged over Phase IV systems, regardless of the intellectual quality of their positions. Maurice's opportunism was the proximate cause; the Bronze Mean asymmetry was the structural condition that made his choice irreversible.

## 4.3 Institutional Reproduction: VOC, Kuyper, Polder

The Dutch East India Company (VOC, founded 1602) was not coincidentally contemporaneous with the Dordrecht process. The Counter-Remonstrant theology provided three architectural functions that made large-scale commercial extraction without effective moral feedback possible: accumulation as sign of election (wealth confirmed grace), hierarchy as providential order (slavery was not a moral problem), and the economy as outside moral jurisdiction. The VOC was cybernetically closed in precisely the same way as the Synod.

Abraham Kuyper's founding of the Free University (1880) and his doctrine of 'sphere sovereignty' formalised the Phase III architecture in the language of modern political philosophy: each social domain (church, state, family, school, economy) has its own divine ordering that cannot be judged from outside. In cybernetic terms: each sphere generates its own confirmation. Feedback from outside the sphere is by definition unauthorised. The resulting *verzuiling* (pillarisation) is the most structurally complete realisation of scalar dominance in modern democratic history.

The twentieth-century Polder Model — the institutionalisation of negotiated consensus between employers, trade unions, and government — is the most technically refined iteration of the Phase III architecture. It generates stability by distributing the scalar-dominant architecture across multiple pillars. Each pillar maintains its foundational model intact; consensus is achieved by negotiating boundary conditions between models, never by subjecting any model to disconfirming feedback. The diagnostic signature is reproducible across domains: housing crisis, nitrogen crisis, educational reform, administrative renewal. In each case the analyses are correct, the conclusions are clear, and implementation fails. That is the Phase III signature.

## 4.4 The Connection to Global Capitalism

The relevance of this Dutch case extends beyond the Netherlands. The institutional architecture established at Dort was not merely a local ecclesiastical settlement. It was the epistemic foundation of the first modern capitalist entity — the VOC — and through the VOC's influence on European commercial law, corporate structure, and colonial practice, it became a template for the institutional architecture of global capitalism itself.

What the GJR calls "the analytic game" — the reduction of human beings to economic units, the treatment of capital as neutral stock, the bracketing of moral feedback from economic calculation — is not an incidental feature of capitalism that can be corrected by better institutions. It is the operational expression of a scalar-dominant quaternion architecture that has been reproducing itself for four centuries.

This is the missing link in the GJR's analysis. The Report correctly identifies that redistribution requires cultural transformation. It cannot explain why cultural transformation is so persistently

resisted, because it lacks a theory of the architectural conditions that make resistance structural rather than incidental. The coherence framework provides that theory: resistance is structural because the institutional architecture of global capitalism is a Phase III system that has eliminated the k-component — the mechanism for foundational revision — at its point of origin.

# 5. The Coherence Paradigm as Alternative: What Changes and What Becomes Possible

## 5.1 A Different Account of What Human Beings Are

The coherence paradigm begins with a different ontology of the human being. In the Global Justice Report, as in the economic tradition it inherits, the human being is an agent with preferences who maximises utility within constraints. This is not wrong as a partial description of behaviour in market contexts. It is radically incomplete as an account of what human beings are and what they require in order to flourish.

The 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model (Konstapel, 2026a) proposes — as a formal hypothesis requiring empirical development — that the human being is a stable eigenstate of the nilpotent vacuum field: a coherent toroidal configuration of the quaternion operator at a characteristic energy scale. This hypothesis is not yet empirically established at the level required for mainstream scientific acceptance. What is independently established, and does not depend on this hypothesis, is the following: the human organism is constituted by and sustained through resonant coupling with its electromagnetic environment at multiple scales simultaneously — cellular, organismic, social, planetary. The evidence for this, from circadian biology, heart rate variability research, and neuroendocrine coupling, is substantial and mainstream (Dibner et al., 2010; Friston, 2010).

The quaternion structure $q = s + xi + yj + zk$ offers, at the formal model level, a precise description of four irreducible dimensions of human existence that cannot be reduced to one another and cannot be suppressed without producing pathology. This formal description converges with, and can be understood as a generalisation of, well-established frameworks in cybernetics and social theory:

- **(s) — Somatic identity**: the body as coherent bio-field, the stable toroidal form that persists through time and maintains the individual's characteristic frequency signature in the vacuum
- **(i) — Sentient orientation**: the active orientation of the individual toward the sensory-affective field, what Friston's Free Energy Principle describes as the organism's continuous minimisation of prediction error through engagement with its environment
- **(j) — Relational orientation**: the active orientation toward other persons, structured by what Fiske's Relational Models Theory identifies as the four elementary forms of human social relationship
- **(k) — Reflexive self-revision**: the capacity for recursive self-reference — the ability to represent and correct one's own model of reality

This four-component structure is not unique to the coherence paradigm. It converges with Argyris and Schön's (1978) distinction between single-loop learning (i and j active, k suppressed) and double-loop learning (k active) — the capacity to question the governing variables of one's own behaviour. It converges with Luhmann's (1995) distinction between first-order observation and second-order observation — the capacity to observe one's own observing. It converges with Kuhn's (1962) distinction between normal science and paradigm shift — the capacity to revise the framework within which problems are defined. The coherence paradigm proposes that these convergences are not coincidental but reflect a common underlying formal structure: the Bronze Mean threshold condition that distinguishes Phase III from Phase IV systems.

A social system that suppresses the k-component produces human beings who are materially functional but coherence-impaired. The suppression of the k-component — the capacity for foundational self-revision — produces exactly the pathology that the GJR documents: populations that cannot act on their own best interests because the institutional architecture within which they are embedded has eliminated the feedback mechanisms required for such action.

## 5.2 Climate as Coherence Failure, Not Carbon Budget

The GJR treats climate change as a problem of greenhouse gas emissions requiring technological and behavioural responses. This is correct as far as it goes. The coherence paradigm situates it within a larger framework that the GJR's $CO_2$-centred accounting cannot see.

The Earth is not primarily a thermodynamic system being perturbed by excess carbon. It is, in the terms of the 19LQVM, a coupled oscillatory system embedded within planetary and solar field dynamics that operate at multiple timescales simultaneously. As documented in Konstapel (2025), planetary harmonic cycles modulate solar dynamo behaviour through phase-locking resonance mechanisms — the same mechanisms that operate in all coupled nonlinear oscillators. Solar activity modulates the Earth's ionospheric electromagnetic properties, the Schumann resonance cavity (fundamental frequency 7.83 Hz, corresponding to the dominant human alpha-wave band), cosmic ray flux, and consequently cloud formation, radiation balance, and biological rhythms across the entire biosphere.

This does not make $CO_2$ irrelevant. It places $CO_2$ in its correct context: as one coupling variable among many in a multi-scale oscillatory system, not the sole driver of a linear thermodynamic process. The practical implication is significant. The GJR's scenario analysis shows that even under Fast Decarbonisation, warming reaches 1.8°C by 2100 — not zero. The residual warming that the model cannot eliminate by carbon management is, from a coherence perspective, the signature of deeper oscillatory dynamics that carbon accounting cannot address.

More importantly, the GJR's approach to climate is downstream of its approach to the human being. If the human being is a coherence entity whose biological rhythms are entrained to planetary electromagnetic cycles, then the destruction of those cycles — through electromagnetic pollution, the elimination of natural light-dark rhythms, the suppression of biological coherence through industrial food systems and pharmaceutical intervention — is itself a form of climate damage that no carbon tax can repair.

The coherence paradigm proposes that the restoration of planetary habitability requires not only decarbonisation but the restoration of electromagnetic coherence at multiple scales: individual, social, and planetary. These are not separable objectives. A population of coherence-impaired individuals embedded in Phase III institutions cannot generate the collective will required for the transition the GJR describes, regardless of the quality of the institutional design.

## 5.3 Sufficiency as Resonance, Not Sacrifice

The GJR's concept of sufficiency — reduced working hours, dietary change, shift from material to immaterial sectors — is one of its most important contributions. But the Report frames sufficiency as a constraint: something that must be accepted in order to stay within the carbon budget, compensated for by leisure time and planetary habitability. It is, in the GJR's framing, a sacrifice that can be made tolerable if its non-monetary benefits are properly valued.

The coherence paradigm inverts this framing entirely. Sufficiency is not a constraint on human flourishing. It is a precondition of it.

A human being whose working hours consume the energy required for coherent biological functioning — for adequate sleep, for relationship, for unstructured attention, for the cycles of activity and rest that characterise healthy biological oscillators — is a coherence-depleted human being. The chronic coherence depletion of industrial populations is not incidental to the economic system that produces it; it is a structural feature. A coherence-depleted population cannot sustain Phase IV institutional behaviour. It defaults to Phase III — the defensive, stability-seeking, change-resistant mode that the GJR correctly identifies as the primary obstacle to transition.

The reduction of working hours from 2,100 to 1,000 per year that the GJR projects for 2100 is, from a coherence perspective, the restoration of the biological oscillatory conditions required for human beings to function as the full quaternion entities they are. It is not a sacrifice. It is a recovery.

### 5.4 The Phase IV Transition: What It Requires

The coherence paradigm's most direct contribution to the GJR's programme is a precise account of what the "cultural and intellectual battle" the Report names actually requires.

The GJR knows that institutional reform without cultural transformation will not produce the transition it describes. It does not know what cultural transformation consists of, because it lacks a theory of the human being adequate to the task. The coherence paradigm supplies that theory.

Cultural transformation, in coherence terms, is the restoration of the k-component in human social architecture: the creation of institutional mechanisms through which foundational models can be represented, tested against disconfirming feedback, and revised. This is not primarily a matter of better education or more democratic deliberation, though both are necessary. It is a matter of institutional architecture.

The four institutional organs required for a Phase IV social system follow directly from the quaternion structure (Konstapel, 2026b):

- **The s-organ** (Constitutional continuity): foundational commitments that satisfy the nilpotency condition — defined such that their own disconfirmation generates the zero that makes revision possible
- **The i-organ** (Citizen falsification): institutional mechanisms through which individual contact with reality — lived experience, direct observation, whistleblowing — can reach and modify foundational policy premises
- **The j-organ** (Constitutive civil society): commons, cooperatives, neighbourhood corporations, and civic associations as constitutive powers in governance, not stakeholders to be consulted
- **The k-organ** (Coherence council): an independent body with constitutional authority to determine when foundational premises are contradicted by the evidence generated through i- and j-channels, and to mandate foundational revision

The k-organ is the critical innovation. No existing democratic system contains it. The absence of a k-organ is precisely what makes Phase III systems — including the current global institutional architecture — structurally resistant to the transformation the GJR requires.

## 6. Near-Term Implications: 2027–2050

### 6.1 The Bifurcation Window

The Bronze Mean analysis developed in Konstapel (2026b) identifies the period 2027–2032 as a structural bifurcation window for advanced industrial societies, including the Netherlands as a paradigm case. The formal argument is as follows.

Phase III systems maintain coherence by filtering disconfirming feedback. As environmental complexity increases — measured by the number of simultaneous domains generating disconfirming signals — the energy cost of maintaining the filter rises exponentially. The characteristic institutional cycle time $T(n) = T_0 \cdot e^{(-\alpha n)}$ describes this compression: institutional crises arrive faster than the system can process them through Phase III mechanisms.

Under simultaneous pressure from technological disruption, demographic stress, geopolitical realignment, and ecological degradation — four domains operating on roughly independent timescales — the effective environmental rate of change crosses the Phase III response capacity threshold within the 2027–2032 window.

This is not a prediction that a specific crisis will occur at a specific date. It is a structural prediction: that the period 2027–2032 represents a bifurcation point at which Phase III systems face a choice between two structurally distinct outcomes. Either external pressure forces the opening of foundational models — a painful but productive Phase IV transition — or the system responds by increasing internal cohesion until it fragments along existing fault lines.

The GJR's own projections are consistent with this analysis. Its scenario modelling shows that delayed implementation of the Global Justice Platform dramatically worsens climate outcomes: the difference between a 2026 start and a 2035 start is measured in fractions of a degree of warming that cannot be recovered. This is the temporal signature of a system approaching a bifurcation: small differences in timing produce large differences in outcome.

## 6.2 The Planetary Oscillatory Context

The bifurcation analysis gains additional specificity from the planetary oscillatory framework developed in Konstapel (2025). We present this as a **research hypothesis** rather than established fact: the causal chain from planetary dynamics through solar activity to human collective behaviour involves multiple contested steps, each of which requires independent empirical validation.

What is relatively well-established: solar activity modulates the Earth's ionospheric electromagnetic properties; geomagnetic disturbances correlate with measurable changes in human EEG patterns (Persinger & Iacono, 1987); population-level statistics including psychiatric admissions and mortality rates show spectral peaks corresponding to solar cycle periodicities (Halberg et al., 2000). What is more speculative: the extension of these mechanisms to collective social behaviour and institutional transformation.

With this caveat in place: Solar Cycle 25, which peaked around July 2025, is entering its declining phase during the 2027–2032 window. Historical periods of reduced solar activity — grand solar minima — correlate with documented social instability and collective psychological ferment. The Maunder Minimum (1645–1715) coincided with the emergence of empiricist philosophy and the political upheavals of the English Civil War. The Dalton Minimum (1790–1830) coincided with the French Revolution and the Romantic movement.

These correlations do not establish causation. They suggest that oscillatory conditions in the Earth's electromagnetic environment may modulate the receptivity of human populations to institutional transformation — making the same bifurcation window either more available for Phase IV opening or more vulnerable to Phase III defensive closure. If this hypothesis has validity, the implication is

that the "cultural and intellectual battle" the GJR names must be fought during a specific oscillatory window, and that the design of cultural interventions should account for the biological conditions of the populations they address. This remains a research programme rather than a settled finding.

### 6.3 What the Coherence Paradigm Predicts for the GJR's Programme

The coherence paradigm does not predict that the Global Justice Platform will fail. It predicts something more precise: that the GJR's programme will succeed to the extent that it inadvertently creates Phase IV conditions, and fail to the extent that it operates within Phase III architecture.

The GJR's country dividends, if implemented, create material conditions for reduced working hours and expanded education and health spending — both of which restore biological oscillatory conditions and expand the coherence capacity of populations. This is a Phase IV-facilitating intervention, even if the GJR does not describe it in these terms.

The GJR's global wealth and income taxes, if implemented, compress the scalar dominance of extreme wealth concentration — the material substrate of the Phase III architecture that has reproduced itself since the VOC. This too is Phase IV-facilitating.

But the GJR's governance architecture — the Global Justice Fund with its double majority system, the World Sovereign Fund, the International Clearing Union — is Phase III in design. It creates new institutions with defined decision rules, conditionalities, and monitoring mechanisms. These are necessary. They are not sufficient. Without k-organs — without mechanisms through which the foundational premises of these institutions can be tested against disconfirming reality and revised — they will reproduce the same scalar-dominant dynamics at a global scale that the national institutions they are designed to correct have reproduced at the national scale.

The practical recommendation that follows is not to replace the GJR's institutional architecture but to supplement it: to design into the Global Justice Fund and related institutions the k-component that they currently lack. This means creating independent coherence councils with constitutional authority to mandate foundational revision when the evidence generated by citizen and civil society channels disconfirms the Fund's operational premises. It means designing conditionality systems that include not only climate and inequality targets but coherence targets: measurable indicators of the biological and social oscillatory conditions required for Phase IV institutional behaviour.

## 7. Conclusion: Two Paradigms, One Crisis

The Global Justice Report and the coherence paradigm converge on a common diagnosis: the present global system is failing in ways that cannot be corrected from within its own logic. They diverge on the nature of the failure and therefore on the nature of the response required.

The GJR locates the failure in distribution: too much wealth and power concentrated at the top, too little at the bottom, generating both inequality and the political conditions that prevent its correction. The remedy is redistribution — of income, wealth, and political voice — implemented through new global institutions funded by progressive taxation and governed by democratic rules.

The coherence paradigm locates the failure in architecture: an epistemic structure that emerged at a specific historical moment, reproduced itself across four centuries of institutional development, and systematically eliminated the feedback mechanisms required for self-correction. The remedy is architectural — the restoration of the k-component, the reflexive self-revision capacity, that was

suppressed at Dordrecht in 1619 and has been suppressed in every iteration of the institutional system since.

These are not competing remedies. They are remedies at different levels of the same problem. The GJR's redistribution programme is necessary but not sufficient. The coherence paradigm's architectural intervention is necessary but not sufficient. The question is whether they can be integrated into a programme that addresses both levels simultaneously.

We believe they can. The integration requires three moves:

**First**, accepting that human beings are not utility-maximising agents but coherence entities whose capacity for Phase IV behaviour depends on oscillatory conditions — biological, social, and planetary — that must be actively maintained. This changes the design of every policy instrument in the GJR: not only what resources are redistributed, but what conditions of life those resources are designed to restore.

**Second**, accepting that climate change is not only a carbon management problem but a coherence disruption problem — a degradation of the coupled oscillatory system that connects human biology to planetary electromagnetic dynamics. This does not diminish the urgency of decarbonisation; it expands it. Restoration of electromagnetic coherence at the human and social scale is as important as reduction of atmospheric $CO_2$, and the two are not separable.

**Third**, designing Phase IV architecture into the institutions the GJR proposes. The Global Justice Fund, the World Sovereign Fund, and the International Clearing Union are necessary innovations. They will reproduce Phase III dynamics unless they contain k-organs: mechanisms through which their foundational premises can be tested against disconfirming reality and revised. The inclusion of such mechanisms is not a utopian aspiration. It is a precise architectural requirement, derivable from the same formal principles that describe the Bronze Mean threshold sequence.

The Global Justice Report asks the right question. The coherence paradigm provides a deeper answer — one that does not replace the GJR's programme but grounds it in a theory of what human beings are, why they behave as they do, and what conditions are required for collective action at the scale the crisis demands.

The threshold is available. Whether it is crossed depends not on the quality of the analysis but on whether the analysis reaches those capable of acting on it — and whether the oscillatory window of 2027–2032 produces the phase transition toward openness rather than the closure that history also knows.

# References


Ashby, W.R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.

Chancel, L., Mohren, C., Moshrif, R., Odersky, M., Piketty, T., Somanchi, A., et al. (2026). *The Global Justice Report: A Plan for Equality & Prosperity Within Planetary Boundaries*. World Inequality Lab.

Fiske, A.P. (1991). *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations*. Free Press.

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.

Hamilton, W.R. (1843). On a new species of imaginary quantities connected with a theory of quaternions. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 2, 424–434.

Konstapel, J. (2025). Planetary Oscillations, Biological Resonance, and Collective Consciousness: A Comprehensive Framework Beyond Climate. *constable.blog*, December 2025.

Konstapel, J. (2026a). Awen Grid: Harmonic Nilpotency — A Formal Integration of the Recursive Harmonic Codex and the 19-Layer Quaternion Vacuum Model. *constable.blog*, May 2026.

Konstapel, J. (2026b). The Failed Threshold: Dutch Institutional History as a Coherence Phase Transition. *constable.blog*, June 2026.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social Systems*. Stanford University Press.

Maxwell, J.C. (1865). A Dynamical Theory of the Electromagnetic Field. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, 155, 459–512.

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

Rowlands, P. (2007). *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics*. World Scientific.

Rowlands, P. (2017). *The Foundations of Physical Law*. World Scientific.

Scafetta, N. (2012). Does the Sun work as a nuclear fusion amplifier of planetary tidal forcing? *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 81–82, 27–40.

Spinadel, V.W. de (1998). *From the Golden Mean to Chaos*. Nueva Librería.

Stefani, F., et al. (2024). Rethinking the sun's cycles: New physical model reinforces planetary hypothesis. *HZDR Publications*.

Williamson, J., & van der Mark, M. (1997). Is the electron a photon with toroidal topology? *Annales de la Fondation Louis de Broglie*, 22(2), 133–160.

Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. MIT Press.