

# An inquiry into human nature and the cost of the wealth of nations reconsidered

Addressing global systems failure through an integral systems paradigm for sustainable  
development

With a 27-dimensional triangulation update

David E. Martin  
Marshall, VA  
davidmartin.world

Original: received 20 August 2012; accepted 8 February 2013; published online 16 July 2013,  
*AI & Society* (2013). DOI 10.1007/s00146-013-0471-1.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271431275\\_An\\_inquiry\\_into\\_human\\_nature\\_and\\_the\\_cost\\_of\\_the\\_wealth\\_of\\_nations\\_Addressing\\_global\\_systems\\_failure\\_through\\_an\\_integral\\_systems\\_paradigm\\_for\\_sustainable\\_development](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271431275_An_inquiry_into_human_nature_and_the_cost_of_the_wealth_of_nations_Addressing_global_systems_failure_through_an_integral_systems_paradigm_for_sustainable_development)  
27DT update drafted for circulation, 2026

## Abstract

Current economic ontology development has failed to confront two important errors associated with historicism. Embracing the linearity of economic value being directly attributed to the labor applied to natural resources taken together with efficiency arguments used to justify monetary policy on both the microlevel (transaction) and macrolevel (global trade), we know these legacies of the scientific method applied to economic systems have left the G-20 paralyzed to deal with structural failings evidenced from banking to business to economic policy. An exploration of the structural modalities that impair our current capacity for adaptation and alternative methods for accounting for value is the basis for this inquiry. Integral accounting is proposed as a more suitable method to transition from scarcity-based market models to abundance-based modes of sustainable engagement. A 2026 addendum leaves that argument intact and replaces the ornamental infinity in the wealth expression with the kernel of a monetary projection on the 27-dimensional triangulation manifold  $M_{27}$ .

**Keywords:** economic systems; international stability; integral accounting; 27-dimensional triangulation; retained optionality

## 1 Introduction

Setting into motion the moral apology for the subsequent two and one half-centuries of industrial hegemonic violence and ideological propaganda—animated by struggles for “resources” and “labor”—postmodernism has yet to challenge Adam Smith’s doctrine of dominion upon which his entire *Inquiry* is based. Erwin Schrödinger, a 1933 Nobel Laureate for his work in quantum mechanics, lamented, “There is a tendency to forget that all science is bound up with human culture in general, and scientific findings, even those which at the moment appear most advanced and esoteric and difficult to grasp, are meaningless outside their cultural context” (Schrödinger 1952). As culture

recontextualizes normative memes, it is errant to seek application of social, economic, or physical sciences from one period to constrain the innovation called for at times of transition.

Awash in the tsunami of systemic dislocation misnamed a “Global Financial Crisis,” it is reasonable to critique our structural assumptions and consider the adequacy of our current general theories and their corollaries. As we observe the carbon-loving algae and lichens currently thriving in the thawing tundra courtesy of the greenhouse gases humans emit, we can observe our climate calamities, like our financial ones, are only apocalyptic to our way of seeing the world—not the speciation terminus they are frequently portrayed to portend. Humanity’s affinity for self-destructive myths, neither new in our day nor readily disarmed, makes them no more empirically true today than they have been with each passing eclipse since the beginning of heliocentric myth millennia ago. Perturbations in the consensus performance of systems afford rare opportunities to consider whether our challenges are essential or merely evidence of the outdated social optics prepared for paradigm shifts (Kuhn 1970).

Our present economic and social dissociative disorders were in full virulence during the Reagan/Thatcher era of protectionism when nationalist procurements disguised as trade modernization under the WTO. On the one hand touting “free-market” supremacy all the while creating gross industry-specific intervention, the economic policies of the early 1980s built the myth from which modern systems seem helplessly bound. In a paper presented to the Oppenheimer Study Center on *Economics, Revelation, Reality, and Computers*, Maxwell Fellow, Dr. Herbert Striner detailed with remarkable precision the collapse of the US technical superiority now evidenced in the global market (Striner 1990). Arguing without fundamental redefinition of the integral role of government aligning itself with industrial intervention, “free-market” dynamics fail both in name and in practice. Without manipulation of government or social priority, what we think of as industrial capitalism has not evidenced its capacity to be sustained.

Assaults to the brewer’s yeast mathematical dogma are exposing the dry rot in the timbers upon which the scientific method is built. Linear regression, where neither independence nor homoscedasticity is measured or controlled, has served to indict its adherents as neither metric nor meaning is coherent with observed reality. A critique of Smith’s assumptions allows us to consider the suitability of new models which shift our linear hierarchical framework toward an essential model in which covalence (interdependence) and fusion (generative energetics) serve as structural guides. We present an argument for an infinitely orthogonal optionality model which reflects an organic homologue for rationalizing economic systems.

## 2 “Free” against “rents”

Adam Smith did not initiate the fallacy of “free.” In his monetary encyclical meant for the provisioning of the Fourth Crusade in 1199, Pope Innocent III cemented the inviolate principles of economic dominion in which humans (to be clear, Christian) were supreme over “creation” and value (rents) wrought from exploitation was central to the human experience (Smith 1776). The notion of “free” presumes that the creation or assembly of what is seen as an exploitable resource was without “cost.” This notion presumes the present condition in which a resource is observed is the only relevant time. Silver in the ground in fifteenth century Potosí is. The context of the debt owed by the crown of Spain to other European courts, a monetary and social obligation formed by a regional consensus, justifies its “free” extraction. The extraction of both the ore and the local labor subjected to genocide for the endeavor is “free” as they have no “rent” value in the moment of their extraction. From the actual enslavement in the mines to the modern entrepreneurial illusion which seduces celebrated innovators to create businesses, the majority of which fail to provide tax

losses for wealthy investors, “free” and “rent” dichotomies require contextual myopia.

## 2.1 Human currency

Our modern notions of currency, market exchange, and central banking are indistinguishable to the Judeo-Christian story of Joseph in the land of Egypt when, during a great famine, Joseph and Pharaoh created the first documented commodity exchange in which currencies, commodities, property rights, and future markets were created (The Bible: Genesis 47:13–26). While frequently overlooked, this financial innovation derived from desperation and famine serves as the archetypal inspiration for even the most sophisticated market transactions today. Managed scarcity, the basis for historical and modern economic models and practices, saw humans and land as commodities for exploitation by the few for the benefit of the few. While Niall Ferguson celebrates modern financial innovation alleging it to be a crowning achievement of the modern establishment (Ferguson 2008), a careful review of the Egyptian famine account contains every element of the risk-hedged arbitrage market behavior which was both celebrated and vilified in 1929 and 2007: Aetna at the turn of the twentieth century, AIG in the turn of the twenty-first century, and J.P. Morgan, Chase, Citibank, Bank of New York, etc., and their predecessors in both.

In the records of an Estates General gathering in 1484 in France, it was stated, “Money is in the body politic what blood is in the human body; it is then necessary to examine what bleedings and purgings France has undergone.” Hale and Mallett summarize, “The two major bleedings were papal taxation and the purchase of luxury goods from abroad. The effects of the first could be countered by political action, the second by ‘drawing gold and silver into the country’” (Hale and Mallett 2000).

The story of money as a reductionist expression of denominating value is inextricably a story of taxation, originally required to support religion and war. It may be worth noting little has changed in at least four millennia of human history as, to this day, our fear of considering alternative, more orthogonal, and humane value metrics may have, at its core, profound angst to question monetary and economic precepts is to menace a divine right (Malthus 1798). Five hundred years after Louis XI and Henry VII substituted luxury consumerism and terrestrial conquest for the hegemonic role of the Church’s control of wealth, set in full preeminence by Innocent III in 1199 in his financing encyclical for the Fourth Crusade, to suggest society can operate without a single, scarce artifact of monetary exchange managed by a sovereign is still heresy.

Therefore, as we consider a Commons “Currency,” we are invited to consider not only the laudatory energetics of a more human value exchange, but we, at the same time, bear an obligation to consider the transition between the incumbent now and the future to which we strive. This position is seldom taken when we speak in sweeping idealisms, however; one of the enemies’ transformations comes in the form of a failure to invite the current actors into the future.

It is informative to consider John Maynard Keynes’ *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (Keynes 1936) which highlights the catechism that has defined and enslaved modern economic thought. Tragically, Keynes himself concludes his posthumously misapplied (though frequently invoked) treatise stating that:

Our criticism of the accepted classical theory of economics has consisted not so much in finding logical flaws in its analysis as in pointing out that its tacit assumptions are seldom or never satisfied, with the result that it cannot solve the economic problems of the actual world (Keynes 1936).

Keynes builds his entire thesis on the basis that “consumption—to repeat the obvious—is the sole end and object of all economic activity.” The “propensity to consume” together with the centrality

of malleable monetary friction are corollaries to every argument in his model. The natural sequelae of this foundational postulation include the following:

1. Labor (an euphemism for all those engaged in productive endeavors) is a commodity, and laborers are Pavlovian actors who are coerced and manipulated by fickle money-wages and interest (Keynes 1936, 91);
2. Natural resources supporting extraction (gold, silver, metals, oil, etc.) are free for the taking, exist for the purpose of consumption alone, and are essentially baseless in value at extraction, thereby rendering them “free” for exploitation (Keynes 1936, 130, 213); and
3. That entrepreneurial psychology will persist in seeking to maximize monetary profits as *sine qua non* giving no consideration for value metrics apart from those defined in monetary terms (Keynes 1936, 264, 290).

Human activity, both the rent utility whereby the industrialist can extract labor for the purpose of industry and the proxy through which social status can be achieved or maintained, is applied to “free” resources for their improvement into “goods.” The expenditure of energy (both human and mechanical), according to Smith and his progeny, renders “value” as evidenced by a monetary transaction confirms the *raison d’être* for enterprise. At no point in the supply chain are any essential artifacts valued beyond their utility to animate the final artifact. A copper coil is not seen, for example, as having essential elemental value. It anonymously receives current, animating a rotor that animates a compressor that then circulates gas to effectuate a pressure gradient elucidating a thermal condition in which a beverage is cooled. The “rent” object is a cold beverage for which an environment from which the copper was sourced had to be deforested and its pristine lakes and rivers toxified.

The plastic deformation properties, or structural failure susceptibility, of this unconsidered dichotomy is a function of the number of explicit factors contributing to a supply chain for which “free” is applied. Ignore the copper source and you get geopolitical unrest and social upheaval. Ignore the smelting energy requirements, and you get permanent resource depletion and environmental degradation. Ignore the grid required to distribute the animating electricity, and you remove utility bonds undergirding most fixed income pension schemes in the industrialized economies. And, ignore the chemical additive that makes your beverage zero calories, and you fail to account for your liver and kidney failure associated with the artificial sweetener.

### 3 Progressive linearity

Regression seeks to observe a series of independent variables across one axis and relate their association with variables on another axis. As complexity is accepted within a model, associations seek to minimize model error and control for variance. Implicit to all regression is a context in which variable, variance, and model exist. Scatter is a scalar function; duration is a temporal function; and so forth. Acknowledging the complete failure of statisticians fully circumscribes the limitations of assumption non-adherence, the scientific method requires serial, confirmatory processes by which it arrives at empirical truth.

Popper (1945) foreshadowed the self-congratulatory euphoria evidenced by Ferguson (2008) when he critiqued the common macro-parametric error of historicism in which selective narration creates the illusion of variable and variance quantification and modeling. Regression underpins the logical framework for moral rationalism in which the existence of “means” (the process by which a thing is manifest) can be viewed in light of the “ends” (final artifact or event of value or production).

Exploitation, as an animating impulse and unfettered in this context by its pejorative connotation, is a function of dimension constrained progressive linearity. When modeling social, economic, population, or production systems, the sine function demonstrated as an ascent (up the  $x$ -axis) and temporal perpetuation (out the  $y$ -axis) is a ubiquitous feature not by observed natural order but by progressive linearity model consensus. Many systems, however, explicitly defy this consensus yet are modeled into justifications thereof.

Take, for example, debt-supported sovereign currency or fractional reserve banking in which an underlying rent is required for the currency utility to exist. Assume the value of the Treasury includes a hypothecation of value derived from the cost of renting the economic power of others. The others, in our scenario, require a 2% annual rate over a period of 30 years. This imposition of a fixed, linear progressive rate on a system known to have periodicity uncorrelated both to the rate and to the duration is by definition unstable. Ironically, it led Keynes to foretell:

I see, therefore, the rentier aspect of capitalism as a transitional phase which will disappear when it has done its work. And with the disappearance of its rentier aspect much else in it besides will suffer a sea-change. It will be, moreover, a great advantage of the order of events which I am advocating, that the euthanasia of the rentier, of the functionless investor, will be nothing sudden, merely a gradual but prolonged continuance of what we have seen (Keynes 1936).

He goes on to see the day above as the day when the volume of capital increases so as to eliminate scarcity and that the executive skill of the entrepreneur will “be harnessed to the service of the community on reasonable terms of reward” (Keynes 1936, 377).

The monetary utility of our current economic paradigms defies regression. It meets none of the scedasticity, linearity, variance, or duration requirements of an independent variable. Yet, despite its explicit failure to meet a single condition of a discrete variable, it has maintained its unassailed preeminence as the arbiter of wealth and the metric of successful enterprise.

Model instability, then, is a function of disequilibrium created by the imposition of linearity on systems that are amorphous or multidimensional in their complexity. Note that when the United States sought to foster greater wealth creation with the legalization of usurious private equity after the Second World War, greed alone was insufficient to animate the desired capital flows. Explicit intervention in the form of: (a) preferential, high-profit margin government contracting to private equity funded enterprises (Small Business Administration of 1953); (b) liberalization of pension fiduciary obligations to flow capital into the private equity markets (Pension Act of 1974); and (c) tax incentives to allow investors to recognize losses from their enterprise investments (Small Business Investment Act of 1958; LLC formation of 1982) all were precedent to the “Silicon Valley” miracle. Each of these ecosystem incentives mandatory for the desired capital flows and each directly redistributed monetary wealth from the broader ecosystem to the selected beneficiaries.

## 4 Essential integral accounting

Smith’s (1776) *Inquiry* together with his idealized contemporaneous colonial experiment celebrated by Keynes 150 years later laid a foundation now collapsing under the weight of its unconsidered assumptions. In Joseph Schumpeter’s criticism of John Maynard Keynes and David Ricardo, he correctly indicted the fallacy of over-reliance on variable reduction from which explanations could be readily deduced, but through which policy application failed given the ignored abstract complexity of reality. Beyond his observations of business cyclicity, Schumpeter offered an insight into humanity which profoundly challenges classic industrial economics and illuminates a central deficiency in

Taylor’s human productivity essential tenet. He suggests that the catalyst for meaningful systemic economic change may emerge from “intellectuals” which he described as those persons suitably versed and positioned to offer critiques on social systems and advocate for interests of social strata to which they do not belong and for which they have no explicit incentive save a broader moral imperative (Schumpeter 1942). In other words, he introduces the notion that the commodity-industry (energy + labor)-consumer good linearity in which efficiency and exploitative ignorance are essential will ultimately unravel in favor of a more dimensional appreciation of values.

Articulating a more suitable model to both understand enterprise economics at the micro- or the macrolevel invites a multidisciplinary exposure to principles beyond linear regression and variable constrained modeling. While daunting, the task of highlighting the incapacity of current models may be more suitably done using a simple metaphor.

Consider a wooden playground for children. We can agree through application of design (knowledge and technology), and we can assemble a safe (well-being) structure on which children can play. To do so, we apply a saw (technology predicated on steel comprised of metallurgical coal [unaccounted], iron ore [unaccounted], internal combustion using petrol [unaccounted]) to a tree [unaccounted composite of soil, water, and sunlight], which we cut into boards. These boards are shaped and bolted (see metal above) into a configuration with crossbeams and supporting limbs. To these structures, we affix nylon (technology predicated on oil [unaccounted] and industrial chemicals [unaccounted]) to attach swings and ladders. So far, our industrial paradigm has explicitly ignored: (a) production and replenishment realities for everything consumed as commodities; (b) presumption of property rights associated with their extraction and exploitation and the enforcement thereof; (c) orthogonal uses for each commodity in other applications in vivo and in situ, e.g., the tree also served as shade (well-being) and habitat; it manufactured oxygen and starches while holding soil and water (technology); it held currency value as a unit of carbon credit or as the production agent for harvestable crops (money); it recorded information regarding climate, rainfall, temperature, and sunlight (knowledge); it served as an aesthetic element in the landscape (custom and culture), e.g., the metallurgical coal served as an aquifer filter for cleaning subterranean water sources (technology), recorded biodiversity and physical history (knowledge), had thermal options for cooking, heating, etc. (other commodity value);

- a) social consensus on a priori selection of industrial priorities;
- b) tacit recognition of the equivalent option extermination value explicit to each industrial production imperative.

Socioeconomic theorists protest the unmodelable complexity of this exercise. This same objection is the progenitor of our catastrophic view of asymmetric system failures (e.g., climate change; peak oil; resource depletion; geopolitical resource-activated conflict; etc.) which evoke a hand-wringing impotence by those who advocate model simplicity. However, the daunting nature of the model complexity is an essential corollary to the industrial economic model of managed scarcity. From “raw materials” to “labor,” we find our systems valuing only those things that can be constrained in scarcity for the control of the capitalist and industrialist. It has been a relatively recent phenomenon for the public sector to comment on (though still largely ignore) the cost-associated “Commons” such as seaborne or airborne commerce (Brimley and Flournoy 2009).

To fully engage in integral accounting, we begin with an audit of that which we access—both in abundance and with perceived scarcity (Martin 2007). In our classification of our ecosystem, we seek to see each artifact not as the object to which effort can render value, but rather as energy containing intrinsic value: a helpful exercise to reconsider our metaphor of a tree. Where an industrialist sees

a tree as metric units of timber, volume of pulp or BTUs of caloric heat, integral accounting sees the commodity dimension thusly but also sees the tree as:

- the customary gathering place for human interactions or the aesthetic of sanctuary (custom and culture);
- the keeper of climatological records and knowledge of rain, wind, moss growth, and seasonal dynamics (knowledge);
- the unit of stored value in the protection of the forest (money);
- the technology of photosynthesis or biosynergistic production of saps, fruit, or medicines (technology); and
- the essence of tree which provides shade for the heated, roof for the exposed, or limbs for the playing child (well-being).

By viewing tree as essence rather than as named commodity, we realize countless value (including commerce) is possible without altering the state of the tree. In other words, by applying no phase (temporal or classification permanent alteration) nor state (observable condition affording maximum optionality) alterations, we could rent value from the tree while preserving its essential nature in all other spaces. In so doing, we diminish or eliminate our utility imperative for tools and power.

And thus accounted, the human actor is invited to consider whether the cutting of a tree to make a playground for children is a genuine efficiency or whether an advantaged interaction is to allow the child to learn to play on the tree. By liberating our optics that under the Adam Smith cosmology rendered value in alterations of phases and states through the surrogate of stored value animated by money, we may find ourselves engaging more and manipulating less.

In the integral accounting framework, having completed the audit, we step into the playful duality we call polarization. This step relies on the dual meaning ascribed to this term. First, we apply the notion of positive and negative, not in some empirical dogmatic frameworks, but rather in simply a sense of things. Ascribing positive and negative classification to the things in our sphere of consequence gives us a mirror by which we see ourselves in our surroundings. But having quickly “polarized” our audit by our sense of affinity or repulsion, our sense of “good” or “bad,” we then assess the resilience of this classification by forcing each audit artifact into each dimension of value. In other words, we ask the unasked question—Is a thing good because it is essentially good or do we see it as “good” because we have classified it a certain way? Returning to our tree for a moment: Is the well-being attribute of “shade” “good” when you see it as the thing that blocks passive solar heating of your house in the winter? You see, by auditing—not in the two dimensions of a balance sheet but rather in the six dimensions of an Archimedean solid—we recognize our “values” are often derived from our optics, not the other way around.

With an audit that actively measures six classes of value—both for storage and for exchange—phase and state efficiency can be measured empirically. Back to our tree; if I cut a tree for lumber to make a children’s playground, I must add technology (saws, logistics, etc.) and potentially pay money for services or delivery of the artifacts derived from the tree rather than using the tree as a play environment and preserving all optionality in the tree. Wealth can be measured, in this scenario by the function of:

$$\text{wealth} = \text{utility} \times \text{retained optionality}^{\infty} \quad (1)$$

where  $\infty = d(r) \int$  of all users  $\times$  all value dimensions.

## 5 Addendum: from ornamental infinity to 27-dimensional triangulation

The infinity in (1) is not a magnitude. It is the statement that optionality is lost under projection. A scalar price is a boundary operator. It takes a multi-axial state and returns one coordinate, then treats the coordinate as the state. Debt service, GDP, and the rentier rate are all of that kind: a fixed progressive line laid on a system whose relevant variation is not on that line. GDP, financial metrics, and corporate valuation ignore intangible assets except as residual “goodwill.” The same reduction is what the copper-coil paragraph recorded as geopolitical unrest, toxified water, pension bonds, and organ failure—axes present in the supply chain and absent from the rent object.

### 5.1 The 27-cell

The minimum space that keeps the loss visible is the 27-cell fixed by triangulated observation, not by numerology:

$$27 = 3_{\text{domains}} \times 3_{\text{principles}} \times 3_{\text{stations}}. \quad (2)$$

Write the manifold as the product

$$M_{27} = \prod_{d=1}^3 \prod_{s=1}^3 \prod_{o=1}^3 D_d S_s O_o. \quad (3)$$

The three stations  $O_o$  are the ones the playground example kept sliding between without naming: emergent context, observed phenomenon, and observer delimitation. The three source principles  $S_s$  are the three the 2013 text was reaching for with covalence and fusion:

---

|       |                        |
|-------|------------------------|
| $S_1$ | Persistence            |
| $S_2$ | Generativity           |
| $S_3$ | Infinite Orthogonality |

---

The domains  $D_d$  bundle the 2013 audit classes rather than replace them:

---

|                    |                                          |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Material–energetic | commodity, field, time                   |
| Social–relational  | custom and culture, property, technology |
| Knowledge–intent   | ontology, language, governance           |

---

Money is not a domain. It is the consensus surrogate already defined in the 2013 audit: a representational unit of exchange devoid of the value it represents. Well-being is not a seventh commodity. It is the Persistence reading of the same artifact from the observer station. Technology remains what the 2013 account said it was—the recipe and the execution, not the artifact—and sits in the social–relational domain because it is an assembly of the other classes, activated only in practice.

This counting is motivated by the irreducible structure of triangulated observation. A formal proof that  $k < 27$  produces coherence loss is open. The addendum does not treat that proof as given.

### 5.2 The six classes as faces, not a new chart of accounts

The six 2013 classes—commodity, custom and culture, knowledge, money, technology, well-being—are the readable faces of  $M_{27}$ , not a competing ontology. Forcing each audit artifact into each dimension

of value, which the polarization step already required, is the economic form of the triangulation: context, observed, observer, read under Persistence, Generativity, and Infinite Orthogonality.

A tree then occupies the cell rather than a stumpage line.

| Station              | Reading                                                                                               |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Commodity, observed  | board-feet, pulp, caloric BTU                                                                         |
| Custom, context      | gathering place, aesthetic of sanctuary                                                               |
| Knowledge, context   | climate record in the rings                                                                           |
| Money, observed      | carbon unit, crop lien, forest as stored value                                                        |
| Technology, observed | photosynthesis and biosynergistic production, not the saw                                             |
| Well-being, observer | shade, roof, limbs; the same shade read from the house in January<br>is negative at that station only |

Cutting the tree is a phase change that zeroes the unchosen stations. The industrial account records the one station that survived and calls the zeroed stations free. That is the “free” against “rents” fallacy, now stated as a projection rather than as a moral epithet alone.

Orthogonality is the empirical content of the claim, and it is already illustrated by cases that do not commute:

- material prosperity does not commute with financial wealth (high literacy against low GDP);
- social capital does not commute with property accumulation (indigenous commons against enclosure);
- knowledge vitality does not commute with patent count (open source against proprietary).

These are the same non-commutations the copper coil recorded. They are descriptive. They are not a booking rule.

### 5.3 Wealth as the kernel of the price map

Replace the ornamental infinity with the dimension of what the price map discards. Let

$$B: M_{27} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \quad (4)$$

be the monetary projection. Let  $U$  be utility at the chosen station and  $\Omega$  retained optionality on the unchosen stations. Then

$$\text{wealth} = U \cdot \Omega^\kappa, \quad \kappa = \dim(\ker B). \quad (5)$$

Under a pure price account,  $\kappa = 0$  and wealth collapses to utility: equation (1) with the exponent switched off. Under an audit that refuses the collapse,  $\kappa$  is the number of axes still open. The 2013 infinity is the limit case  $\kappa \rightarrow 27$ , which is not an operating target. It is the statement that full extraction and full accounting cannot be the same map.

Phase and state, as defined in the 2013 audit, now have coordinates. A phase change is a temporal or classification-permanent alteration that moves an artifact off a station. A state is the observable condition affording maximum optionality, which is to say maximum  $\kappa$  short of liquidation. Renting the tree preserves  $\kappa$ . Liquidating it spends it.

## 5.4 Fusion as a station-change

The closing move of the 2013 paper—fusion economy, named for the Coulomb effect as a figure of persistent unconstrained energetics—can stay, with the physics metaphor retired as physics. Fusion here is a change of station that leaves Persistence intact: one axis reverses classification (shade against winter gain; lumber against habitat) and the reversal does work without requiring the other axes to be spent. That is the difference between renting the tree and liquidating it.

The rentier Keynes wanted euthanized is the agent whose return exists only on  $\ker B$ , the axes the price system has already discarded. Euthanasia, in this addendum, is not a policy prescription. It is the observation that a return which requires  $\kappa = 0$  cannot be the measure of an enterprise whose wealth is defined by  $\kappa > 0$ .

## 5.5 What the addendum does not do

$M_{27}$  with a pseudo-Riemannian metric, a coherence field equation, Innovation Alpha residuals, and physiological boundary measurements are claims of the 2026 triangulation note. They are not entailed by the playground, and they are not imported here as evidence. The addendum also does not supply the treasury booking rule for  $\kappa$ . What it supplies is the replacement of an ornamental infinity by the kernel of the price map, and the reading of the six classes as stations on a triangulation rather than as a new chart of accounts.

In our final step, we enter the enterprise of what we call fusion economy. We use this term in honor of the Coulomb effect variously posited as the quantum explanation for a perpetual, persistent, unconstrained, and infinite source of energy (Coulomb 1785). A fusion reaction, grossly simplified for those non-physicists, is catalyzed by a magnetically charged environment into which one particle elects to, or is induced to, change its charge—positive to negative or negative to positive. This unleashes a persistent, perpetual, energy-creating dynamic analogous to our sun. When we understand the principle of a thriving economy or thriving enterprise, we look for that transformation which will unleash persistent, perpetual dynamism.

## References

- [1] Brimley S, Flournoy M (2009) The contested commons. *Proceedings Magazine*, July, vol. 135(7):1,277. U.S. Naval Institute.
- [2] Coulomb C (1785) Premier mémoire sur l'électricité et le magnétisme. *Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Sciences* 569–577.
- [3] Ferguson N (2008) *The ascent of money: a financial history of the world*. The Penguin Press, Harmondsworth.
- [4] Hale J, Mallett M (2000) *Renaissance Europe 1480–1520*. Blackwell, London, pp. 115–117.
- [5] Keynes J (1936) *The general theory of employment, interest, and money*. Macmillan / Cambridge University Press, London.
- [6] Kuhn T (1970) The structure of scientific revolutions. *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science* 2(2).
- [7] Malthus T (1798) *An essay on the principle of population*. J. Johnson, London.

- [8] Martin D (2007) Accounting for a change. [http://www.globalinnovationcommons.org/sites/globalinnovationcommons.org/files/integral\\_accounting\\_overview.pdf](http://www.globalinnovationcommons.org/sites/globalinnovationcommons.org/files/integral_accounting_overview.pdf).
- [9] Martin DE (2013) An inquiry into human nature and the cost of the wealth of nations: addressing global systems failure through an integral systems paradigm for sustainable development. *AI & Society*. Received 20 August 2012; accepted 8 February 2013; published online 16 July 2013. DOI 10.1007/s00146-013-0471-1. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271431275\\_An\\_inquiry\\_into\\_human\\_nature\\_and\\_the\\_cost\\_of\\_the\\_wealth\\_of\\_nations\\_Addressing\\_global\\_systems\\_failure\\_through\\_an\\_integral\\_systems\\_paradigm\\_for\\_sustainable\\_development](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271431275_An_inquiry_into_human_nature_and_the_cost_of_the_wealth_of_nations_Addressing_global_systems_failure_through_an_integral_systems_paradigm_for_sustainable_development).
- [10] Martin D (2026) 27-dimensional triangulation: a coherence-preserving framework for intent-based communication analysis. Fully Live Academy and RASA Institute.
- [11] Popper K (1945) *The open society and its enemies*. Routledge, London.
- [12] Schrödinger E (1952) Are there quantum jumps? *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 3:109–110.
- [13] Schumpeter J (1942) *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy*. George Allen & Unwin, London and New York.
- [14] Smith A (1776) *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. W. Strahan and T. Cadell, London.
- [15] Striner H (1990) Economics, revelation, reality, and computers. In: *Proceedings of the conference on frontiers of supercomputing II*, Los Alamos National Laboratory, pp. 436–447.