Constitutional Capital: Separating Authority from Discretion in Long-Horizon Systems

Why Abuse of Trust Is an Architectural Failure, Not a Moral One

Roshan Ghadamian | Institute for Regenerative Systems Architecture

Abstract

Contemporary analyses of institutional abuse, capture, and dependency typically focus on actor intent, governance quality, or ethical norms. This paper advances a different claim: abuse of trust is not primarily a moral failure but an architectural one. Wherever capital renewal is discretionary, authority accumulates regardless of intention, enabling dependency, behavioural distortion, and soft coercion without requiring malice; where renewal is constitutional, this primary channel of leverage is removed.

We show that conventional approaches—oversight, transparency, ethical stewardship, or decentralisation—fail to resolve this problem because they leave discretionary renewal intact. In such systems, power concentrates at renewal points, converting capital scarcity into implicit authority even under benevolent administration.

The paper introduces **constitutional capital** as a distinct design category in which authority over capital is exercised once, ex ante, through rule-bound temporal structures rather than continuously by individuals or committees. In constitutional capital architectures, renewal cadence, access conditions, and recycling logic are embedded structurally, rendering capital continuity predictable, non-discretionary, and resistant to capture.

We argue that effective protection against abuse does not require separating capital from authority, but separating capital from people. Authority must be coupled to capital constitutionally—through enforceable cycle rules—while remaining uncoupled from personal discretion. This reframes trust as a non-load-bearing property of system design rather than a prerequisite for institutional safety.

Finally, we situate constitutional capital within Regenerative Cycle Architecture (RCA) and Perpetual Social Capital (PSC), showing how constitutional coupling resolves a long-standing paradox in regenerative finance: how to preserve authority without enabling control, and continuity without dependence. The paper concludes by outlining design principles for capital systems that maintain dignity, autonomy, and long-horizon capability independent of actor intent.

Section 1 — The Misdiagnosis of Abuse

1.1 The prevailing explanation: bad actors, weak governance, broken trust

Contemporary accounts of institutional abuse, capture, and dependency overwhelmingly frame the problem in moral or behavioural terms. Failures are attributed to bad actors, corrupt elites, weak governance, insufficient transparency, or breaches of trust. The implied solution space follows directly: improved oversight, ethical leadership, decentralisation, stakeholder participation, and norms-based accountability.

While these responses may mitigate symptoms, they consistently fail to address the underlying mechanism by which abuse emerges. Empirically, systems characterised by high ethical standards, strong intentions, and formal accountability nonetheless exhibit patterned dependency, agenda capture, and behavioural distortion. This recurrence suggests that abuse cannot be explained solely by actor intent or governance quality.

The persistence of failure across domains indicates a structural cause.

1.2 Abuse without malice: why intention is the wrong explanatory variable

A critical limitation of moralised explanations is their reliance on intent as the primary causal variable. Such accounts implicitly assume that if actors are benevolent, abuse will not occur; if abuse occurs, malign intent must be present. This assumption is contradicted by historical and institutional evidence.

Across philanthropic systems, development finance, global coordination bodies, and public–private partnerships, abuse-like outcomes frequently arise in the absence of corruption or overt coercion. Institutions become dependent, priorities drift, autonomy erodes, and behaviour adapts toward funder expectations—even when all parties act in good faith.

These outcomes do not require deception, conspiracy, or exploitation. They emerge deterministically from systems in which capital continuity depends on discretionary renewal.

1.3 Renewal discretion as the hidden control surface

The core structural feature shared by these systems is the presence of a renewal decision point governed by discretion. Capital is deployed for a finite period, depleted, and subsequently re-authorised through approval processes controlled by individuals or committees. This design creates a predictable dynamic:

1. Capital depletion produces institutional dependence
2. Dependence concentrates attention on renewal decision-makers
3. Behaviour adapts to maximise renewal probability
4. Authority accumulates at the renewal point

Crucially, this accumulation of authority does not depend on intent. Even benevolent stewards acquire leverage simply by occupying the renewal position. The power arises not from what they do, but from what they are able to withhold.

Renewal discretion therefore functions as a control surface: a structural location where scarcity is converted into authority.

1.4 Why oversight and transparency are insufficient

Conventional remedies—audits, reporting requirements, ethical codes, transparency regimes—operate downstream of the renewal mechanism. They assume that discretionary renewal is unavoidable and seek to constrain its misuse. However, as long as renewal remains discretionary, these measures cannot eliminate leverage; they merely regulate its exercise.

Oversight can detect abuse after the fact but cannot prevent behavioural distortion ex ante. Transparency can illuminate decision-making but cannot neutralise the dependency created by capital depletion. Ethical norms may moderate conduct but cannot eliminate the structural incentives embedded in renewal control.

As a result, systems relying on trust-based stewardship remain vulnerable regardless of governance sophistication.

1.5 Reframing the problem: abuse as an architectural failure

This paper advances a different diagnosis: abuse of trust is an architectural failure arising wherever capital renewal is discretionary rather than rule-bound. The decisive variable is not who holds authority, but whether authority is wieldable at renewal points.

When renewal is discretionary, authority inevitably accumulates. When authority accumulates, behaviour adapts. When behaviour adapts, dependency emerges. These dynamics follow regardless of moral intent.

Preventing abuse therefore requires redesigning the capital architecture itself—not improving the character of actors, but eliminating the structural conditions under which leverage can form.

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 formalises discretionary renewal as a structural control surface. Section 3 demonstrates the persistence of renewal-based power across historical contexts. Section 4 defines constitutional capital as an alternative authority architecture. Sections 5 and 6 situate constitutional capital within Regenerative Cycle Architecture and examine its failure modes. Section 7 outlines implications, limits, and scope.

Section 2 — The Renewal Choke Point: Capital, Scarcity, and the Accumulation of Authority

2.1 Capital as a temporal system

Capital is commonly treated as a quantity—an amount allocated, spent, or transferred. This framing obscures its more important property: **capital is a temporal system**. What matters is not only how much capital exists, but how it behaves across time—when it arrives, how long it persists, and under what conditions it renews.

In most institutional settings, capital is single-cycle. It is deployed for a fixed interval, depleted through use, and extinguished at the end of the cycle. Continuity therefore requires a new decision: a fresh allocation, a renewed grant, a replenishment round, or a budgetary approval.

This design choice has a predictable consequence. Once capital depletes, time—not money—becomes the binding constraint. Institutions do not merely need resources; they need permission to continue.

2.2 Scarcity is not accidental — it is architected

Scarcity in these systems is often treated as exogenous: the result of limited resources, fiscal prudence, or unavoidable trade-offs. In reality, scarcity is frequently **architected through temporal design**.

Single-cycle capital guarantees periodic scarcity regardless of aggregate wealth. Even in capital-abundant environments, institutions are repeatedly returned to a state of dependence at the end of each cycle. The scarcity that follows is not a market failure; it is a structural feature of capital extinction.

This manufactured scarcity is not neutral. It produces a moment of vulnerability in which survival depends on renewal.

2.3 The renewal choke point

The moment at which depleted capital must be renewed constitutes what this paper terms the **renewal choke point**.

At this point:

- capital continuity is uncertain,
- institutional survival is at stake,
- and authority is implicitly concentrated.

Crucially, this authority does not require enforcement. No explicit threat is necessary. The mere capacity to approve or withhold renewal is sufficient to shape behaviour upstream. Institutions anticipate renewal conditions and adapt in advance, aligning priorities, narratives, and actions with perceived renewal criteria.

The choke point therefore exerts influence backward in time, reshaping institutional conduct long before any decision is made.

2.4 Authority accumulation without coercion

Because renewal authority operates through anticipation rather than force, it accumulates invisibly. There is no command issued, no order given, no sanction imposed. Yet behaviour changes nonetheless.

This dynamic explains why:

- dependency can exist without domination,
- compliance can emerge without instruction,
- and capture can occur without conspiracy.

Authority accrues simply because renewal is discretionary. The system does not require bad actors; it requires only that someone occupy the renewal position.

2.5 Why benevolence does not neutralise the choke point

It is tempting to assume that benevolent intentions negate this dynamic. They do not. Benevolence may soften its expression, but it cannot eliminate its effect.

As long as renewal depends on approval:

- institutions must remain legible to approvers,
- risk-taking is suppressed,
- long-horizon investments are deferred,
- and mission integrity is subordinated to renewal probability.

In such systems, even the most well-intentioned stewards become de facto governors of behaviour—not because they choose to govern, but because the architecture assigns them that role.

2.6 Scaling of the renewal mechanism

The renewal choke point scales cleanly across levels:

- In philanthropy, it appears as grant renewal.
- In public systems, as annual or electoral budgeting.
- In global coordination, as replenishment rounds and voluntary contributions.
- In finance, as refinancing, rollover, or liquidity access.

Across these domains, the same structure recurs: capital extinction followed by discretionary renewal. The scale changes, but the mechanism does not.

This recurrence indicates that renewal discretion is not a domain-specific flaw but a general architectural pattern.

2.7 The architectural implication

If authority accumulation arises at renewal points, then preventing abuse does not require eliminating authority. It requires **eliminating discretionary renewal**.

So long as capital systems are designed to terminate and be reauthorised by people, leverage will concentrate at those termination points. No amount of transparency, ethics, or decentralisation can remove this effect while the choke point remains intact.

The only stable alternative is to relocate authority away from renewal decisions and into **rule-bound temporal structures** that govern capital continuity automatically.

2.8 A worked example: Grant renewal as a control surface

Consider a standard three-year philanthropic grant. Capital is allocated for a fixed term, expended through operations, and extinguished at the end of the cycle. Continuity requires renewal approval, typically justified through reporting, evaluation, and demonstrated alignment with funder priorities.

No coercion is required for influence to emerge. As the end of the grant approaches, the funded institution anticipates renewal criteria and adapts behaviour accordingly: priorities narrow, risk-taking declines, narratives are shaped toward legibility, and long-horizon investments are deferred. These adaptations occur regardless of funder intent. Authority accumulates simply because renewal is discretionary.

A constitutional capital version of the same mission would differ structurally rather than morally. Capital continuity would be governed by predefined cadence and recycling rules established ex ante. Eligibility, drawdown rates, and regeneration thresholds would be encoded structurally rather than renegotiated periodically. Renewal would occur automatically unless explicit rule-based conditions fail.

Under this architecture, several distortions disappear. Survival no longer depends on approval; behavioural alignment toward renewal criteria is unnecessary; and institutional planning horizons extend beyond grant cycles. What remains are design-time choices—mission scope, access rules, capacity limits—but these operate once, not repeatedly. The locus of power shifts from renewal discretion to constitutional design.

Section 3 — Renewal Control as a Persistent Pattern of Power

3.1 Power that governs time rather than territory

Conventional accounts of power emphasise control over territory, law, or force. These accounts explain domination through command: who can compel whom, and by what means. Yet many of the most durable forms of power in history have operated without continuous coercion. Instead, they have governed **time**—specifically, the ability of systems to regenerate their own capital across cycles.

Wherever an authority controls renewal rather than production, influence can be exercised without direct intervention. Institutions may continue to function, populations may remain productive, and formal autonomy may even exist. What is constrained is not action in the present, but continuity into the future.

This form of power is quieter, more stable, and less visible than overt domination.

3.2 Extraction without regeneration

A recurring historical pattern is the separation of productive capacity from regenerative control. In such systems, local actors retain responsibility for labour, output, and risk, while an external authority governs the conditions under which surplus may be retained, reinvested, or renewed.

The defining feature of these arrangements is not extraction alone, but **the prevention of regeneration**. Capital exits the system or is neutralised before it can compound locally. Replacement, reinvestment, or recovery requires permission rather than arising endogenously.

This structure explains why productive systems can decline even while activity continues. Output does not guarantee continuity if renewal is externally governed.

3.3 Formal autonomy, structural dependence

In many historical cases, control over renewal persisted even after formal authority weakened or withdrew. Political sovereignty could change while economic dependence remained intact. Institutions appeared independent yet operated within inherited capital architectures that constrained long-horizon development.

This persistence demonstrates an important point: **renewal control outlives rule**. Once capital cycles are externally structured, authority can be exercised indirectly through trade norms, financial arrangements, or institutional dependencies without the need for direct governance.

The durability of these arrangements reflects the fact that renewal control does not rely on enforcement; it relies on necessity.

3.4 The invisibility of renewal power

Unlike overt coercion, renewal control is difficult to observe and harder to contest. There is no singular moment of domination, no explicit command, and no easily identifiable abuse. The system simply fails to regenerate.

Actors within such systems often attribute stagnation to mismanagement, inefficiency, or cultural factors, masking the underlying architectural constraint. Responsibility is internalised by those denied renewal rather than attributed to the structure that governs it.

This invisibility contributes to the longevity of renewal-based power. It rarely provokes resistance because it rarely appears as power.

3.5 Continuity as the real stake

Across historical contexts, the decisive struggle has not been over who governs day-to-day operations, but over who determines whether systems persist across cycles. Control of continuity determines whether institutions can invest in maintenance, capability formation, and intergenerational planning.

Where renewal is discretionary, continuity is conditional. Where continuity is conditional, autonomy is partial at best.

This insight reframes historical power not as domination of space, but as governance of time.

3.6 From historical pattern to contemporary architecture

The persistence of renewal-based power across eras suggests that the problem is not historical contingency but architectural recurrence. Modern systems reproduce the same pattern whenever capital is extinguished and reauthorised through discretionary processes.

What changes is the language—aid, coordination, stewardship, investment—but not the structure. Renewal remains the choke point through which authority flows.

Recognising this continuity allows contemporary systems to be analysed without moralising historical cases. The question is not who intended harm, but whether regeneration was structurally permitted.

3.7 Implication for institutional design

If renewal control has historically functioned as a stable, non-coercive mechanism of power, then any contemporary architecture that leaves renewal discretionary will reproduce similar dynamics regardless of intent.

This leads to a decisive conclusion: preventing abuse at scale requires **structural guarantees of regeneration**. Without such guarantees, dependency will emerge even in systems explicitly designed to empower.

Section 4 — Constitutional Capital: Authority Without Control

4.1 The false choice between authority and abuse

Conventional responses to renewal-based power tend to oscillate between two flawed positions. The first seeks to eliminate authority altogether through decentralisation, voluntary coordination, or market discipline. The second accepts authority but attempts to constrain it through oversight, transparency, or ethical norms.

Both approaches misunderstand the problem. Abuse does not arise because authority exists, nor because it is insufficiently supervised. It arises because authority is **personally exercisable at renewal points**.

The relevant design question is therefore not whether authority should exist, but **how and when it is exercised**.

4.2 Defining constitutional capital

This paper introduces **constitutional capital** as a distinct design category for long-horizon systems.

Constitutional capital is defined by three properties:

1. **Authority is exercised ex ante**, at design time, through rule-setting rather than through ongoing discretionary decisions.
2. **Capital continuity is governed by rule-bound temporal structures**, not by periodic approval.
3. **No actor possesses unilateral control over renewal**, even if they hold formal governance roles.

Constitutional capital is not synonymous with algorithmic or blockchain-based governance; while rule enforcement may be implemented through code, law, or institutional process, the defining property is architectural—the non-repeatability of renewal authority—not the mechanism of execution.

In constitutional capital architectures, authority exists—but it is embedded in structure rather than wielded by people.

4.3 Authority relocated from renewal to design

The central architectural move of constitutional capital is the relocation of authority away from renewal moments and into initial system design. Decisions about cadence, eligibility, recycling logic, and continuation thresholds are made once and encoded structurally.

After deployment:

- renewal occurs automatically,
- capital persists unless structural conditions fail,
- and no actor can selectively interrupt continuity.

Authority is thus front-loaded and exhausted. It cannot accumulate over time.

4.4 Why constitutional authority cannot be abused

Because authority in constitutional capital is not exercised repeatedly, it cannot be used as leverage. There is no ongoing decision to approve, withhold, or condition survival. Actors may still evaluate performance, gather information, and adjust strategy, but they cannot threaten continuity as a means of influence.

This distinguishes constitutional authority from both discretionary authority and delegated authority. In all cases where authority is repeatedly exercisable, power accumulates. In constitutional capital, authority is **non-repeatable**.

Abuse becomes structurally impossible not because actors are virtuous, but because the system provides no mechanism through which leverage can form.

4.5 Capital continuity without permission

A defining feature of constitutional capital is that capital continuity does not require permission. Institutions do not need to justify their existence at regular intervals, nor align behaviour to secure approval.

This does not imply the absence of standards or accountability. Rather, standards are enforced structurally—through eligibility rules, performance thresholds, and recycling constraints—rather than through discretionary judgment.

Continuity is earned through compliance with rules, not through persuasion.

4.6 Separating capital from people, not from authority

A common misunderstanding is that preventing abuse requires separating capital from authority entirely. Constitutional capital demonstrates that the opposite is true. Capital must be coupled to authority in order to behave predictably across time.

What must be avoided is coupling capital to **people**.

By embedding authority constitutionally:

- capital remains governed,
- renewal remains disciplined,
- but no individual or committee can convert scarcity into control.

This distinction resolves the long-standing paradox between governance and autonomy.

4.7 Constitutional capital as a general design category

Constitutional capital is not limited to any single domain. It can govern:

- public-good infrastructure,
- scientific capability,
- climate adaptation assets,
- civic institutions,
- and any system whose mission horizon exceeds political or financial cycles.

Its defining feature is not the source of funds, but the **elimination of discretionary renewal** as a control surface.

Section 5 — Constitutional Capital within Regenerative Cycle Architecture

5.1 Renewal control as a cycle-coupling failure

Regenerative Cycle Architecture (RCA) formalises institutional failure as a consequence of **cycle coupling**: capital cycles inheriting the volatility, periodicity, and discretion of fragility cycles rather than aligning with mission cycles. Sections 1–4 identified discretionary renewal as the specific mechanism through which this coupling occurs.

From an RCA perspective, discretionary renewal binds capital to short, volatile cycles—grant periods, budget rounds, replenishment windows, or refinancing events. These cycles function as fragility cycles because fluctuations in approval probability directly reduce institutional capability.

In formal terms, renewal discretion creates a non-zero dependency of capital availability on exogenous cycles. Capital is therefore not autonomous; it is temporally subordinated.

5.2 Constitutional capital as cycle decoupling (Δ)

Constitutional capital operationalises **cycle decoupling (Δ)** by removing the dependence of capital continuity on discretionary events. By encoding renewal rules ex ante, constitutional capital renders capital availability independent of political, financial, or civic volatility.

Decoupling is achieved not by insulating actors from external conditions, but by ensuring that those conditions cannot interrupt continuity unless predefined structural thresholds are breached. Capital persists across cycles unless the architecture itself determines otherwise.

This satisfies the necessary condition for regeneration: capital behaviour no longer inherits fragility-cycle dynamics.

5.3 Constitutional capital as cycle alignment (Λ)

Decoupling alone is insufficient. Capital must also be aligned to the intrinsic mission cycles of the system it supports. Constitutional capital achieves **cycle alignment (Λ)** by synchronising renewal cadence with asset lifetimes, capability formation timelines, or intergenerational horizons.

Because renewal is rule-bound, alignment is stable rather than contingent. Capital renews when mission demands renewal, not when discretionary approval is granted. This prevents both premature withdrawal and politically motivated deferral.

Alignment thus becomes a property of structure rather than intention.

5.4 Perpetual Social Capital as constitutional capital

Perpetual Social Capital (PSC) constitutes the first realised instantiation of constitutional capital within RCA. PSC's defining invariants—non-liability, non-extractiveness, multi-cycle regeneration, rule-based cadence, and decentralised agency—collectively eliminate discretionary renewal.

In PSC systems:

- capital does not extinguish after use,
- renewal does not require approval,
- and authority over continuation is exhausted at design time.

This places PSC squarely within the constitutional capital category. It is not merely a new financial instrument, but a different **authority architecture** at the capital layer.

5.5 Why PSC avoids trust as a load-bearing element

Traditional capital systems rely on trust to moderate the exercise of discretionary power. PSC does not. Trust may exist, but it is not structurally required.

Because renewal is automatic and rule-governed:

- no actor can threaten survival,
- no institution must perform for permission,
- and no steward can accumulate leverage through scarcity.

Trust becomes a social benefit rather than a systemic vulnerability.

5.6 Resolving the authority–autonomy paradox

RCA has long identified a paradox in long-horizon systems: removing authority leads to fragility, while concentrating authority leads to capture. Constitutional capital resolves this paradox by distinguishing **authority over design** from **authority over continuation**.

Authority is necessary to define cycles, thresholds, and alignment logic. But once defined, that authority must be rendered inert. PSC demonstrates how authority can exist without being exercisable as control.

This resolution clarifies why attempts to decentralise authority without redesigning capital architecture repeatedly fail.

5.7 Generalisation beyond PSC

While PSC is the first realised example, constitutional capital is a general category. Any capital system that:

- embeds renewal logic structurally,
- removes discretionary continuation,
- and aligns cadence to mission cycles,

can satisfy RCA's regenerative criteria.

This opens a broader design space for regenerative institutions without requiring new forms of moral governance or political legitimacy.

Section 6 — Constitutional Fragility, Reversion, and the Conditions of Failure

6.1 Why constitutional capital can still fail

Constitutional capital eliminates discretionary renewal as a control surface, but it does not render systems immune to failure. What it eliminates is a *class* of failure—abuse through renewal leverage—not all forms of institutional breakdown. Understanding this distinction is essential.

Failures of constitutional capital do not arise primarily from malice or capture. They arise from **reversion**: the gradual reintroduction of discretionary authority under conditions of pressure, urgency, or moral justification. These reversions are predictable, patterned, and architectural in nature.

The central risk is not that authority is exercised poorly, but that it becomes exercisable again.

6.2 Constitutional reversion as the dominant failure mode

The most common failure mode of constitutional systems is **constitutional reversion**: the migration of authority from structure back to people.

Reversion typically occurs when:

- predefined rules are treated as provisional,
- exceptional circumstances justify ad hoc intervention,
- or continuity is reframed as contingent on judgment rather than compliance.

Once reversion begins, renewal discretion reappears, and with it the renewal choke point. The system does not fail abruptly; it slowly reacquires the same dependency dynamics constitutional capital was designed to eliminate.

Importantly, reversion is often motivated by good intentions.

6.3 Emergency as the re-entry vector for discretion

Emergencies represent the most dangerous moment for constitutional capital. Crises create intense pressure to act quickly, visibly, and decisively. In such moments, rule-bound processes are frequently perceived as obstacles rather than safeguards.

Emergency exceptions, however, are not neutral. Once discretion is exercised in the name of urgency, a precedent is established: authority has demonstrated its ability to override structure. Even if framed as temporary, this override reopens the renewal choke point.

Historically, exceptional powers introduced during crises tend to persist. In capital architectures, emergency discretion reintroduces conditional continuity, undermining constitutional guarantees precisely when systems are most vulnerable.

6.4 Moral override and the re-personalisation of authority

A subtler but equally corrosive failure mode is **moral override**. When constitutional capital is justified primarily in ethical terms—fairness, justice, compassion—it becomes vulnerable to moral exceptionalism.

Moral override occurs when:

- actors invoke virtue to justify exceptions,
- outcomes are prioritised over process,
- or fairness is redefined situationally rather than temporally.

This shift is dangerous because it re-legitimises personal judgment as a basis for renewal. Authority is no longer structural; it is moralised and re-personalised. The system begins to depend once again on who is trusted rather than what is encoded.

Constitutional capital must therefore resist ethical substitution. Its legitimacy rests on fairness across time, not moral responsiveness in the moment.

6.5 Evolution versus mutation

Constitutional capital must be capable of evolution, but incapable of mutation.

Evolution refers to rare, procedural, and collectively constrained modification of constitutional rules. Mutation refers to informal, discretionary alteration under operational pressure. The two are often conflated, but they have opposite effects.

If constitutional change is too easy, authority is never truly exhausted.
If constitutional change is impossible, systems ossify and invite override.

The design requirement is **asymmetric change**:

- operational flexibility must be high,
- constitutional flexibility must be low,
- and the cost of reopening authority must exceed the cost of operating within constraints.

6.6 Internal capture without renewal discretion

Even in the absence of discretionary renewal, internal capture can occur through interpretation rather than continuation. Risks include:

- concentration of interpretive authority,
- opaque eligibility determinations,
- or informal prioritisation mechanisms.

These forms of capture do not reinstate renewal discretion directly, but they can distort access and function as proxy control surfaces.

To prevent this, constitutional capital requires:

- explicit separation between rule authorship and rule interpretation,
- auditable cycle-level accounting rather than outcome-level reporting,
- and strict limits on discretionary exception-making at access points.

Crucially, these safeguards regulate **how rules are applied**, not whether continuity is granted.

Constitutional capital does not abolish power. It constrains a specific modality of power: discretionary leverage over continuity. Residual loci of power remain at design time (agenda

setting, rule authorship, initial allocation), in rule interpretation, and in data definition. These forms of authority are qualitatively different from renewal-based leverage: they do not operate through induced dependency over time, and they cannot be repeatedly exercised to condition survival. The claim of constitutional capital is therefore not the elimination of power, but the elimination of renewal-mediated control.

6.7 Scarcity discipline and the danger of discretionary relief

Constitutional capital does not abolish scarcity. It disciplines it.

Scarcity must arise from:

- predefined capacity limits,
- physical constraints,
- or mission-aligned thresholds.

When scarcity is relieved through discretion—temporary allocations, special cases, or prioritised access—the renewal choke point re-emerges in another form. Relief becomes leverage.

This is why constitutional capital must treat discretionary relief as structurally equivalent to discretionary renewal. Both convert scarcity into authority.

6.8 Indicators of constitutional degradation

Constitutional degradation is observable before failure occurs. Early indicators include:

- increasing frequency of “temporary” exceptions,
- narrative justification replacing rule reference,
- appeals to trust or intent rather than structure,
- and acceleration of constitutional change procedures.

These signals indicate that authority is migrating back toward people. Once this migration begins, dependency dynamics follow predictably.

6.9 Design implication: authority must be difficult to reach

The central design implication of this section is straightforward:

> Authority must exist, but it must be difficult to access.

Constitutional capital succeeds when authority is:

- exercised once,
- encoded structurally,
- and shielded from routine operational pressures.

Any design that allows authority to be conveniently reactivated will eventually reproduce the renewal choke point, regardless of intent.

6.10 Summary

Constitutional capital eliminates abuse not by trusting actors, but by constraining architecture. Its failure modes are therefore architectural, not moral. The dominant risk is not capture, but reversion: the gradual reintroduction of discretionary authority under pressure.

Preventing this requires treating emergencies, moral override, and discretionary relief as first-class architectural threats. Only by maintaining the inaccessibility of authority can constitutional capital preserve continuity without dependence.

Section 7 — Implications, Scope, and Architectural Closure

7.1 What this paper does — and does not — claim

This paper does not claim that abuse, capture, or dependency arise from malicious actors, elite conspiracy, or ethical failure. Nor does it claim that transparency, accountability, or moral governance are unimportant. Instead, it advances a narrower but more foundational claim: **abuse of trust emerges predictably wherever capital continuity depends on discretionary renewal**.

The argument is architectural rather than normative. It concerns the placement of authority within capital systems, not the intentions of those who operate them. Where renewal is discretionary, authority accumulates. Where authority accumulates, behaviour adapts. These dynamics do not require coercion, deception, or corruption; they follow from structure alone.

Accordingly, this paper does not propose better stewards, stronger oversight, or improved norms as primary solutions. It proposes a different category of capital architecture in which such measures are no longer load-bearing.

7.2 Reframing power as a function of time, not control

A central implication of this analysis is a reframing of power. Power in long-horizon systems is not exercised primarily through command, ownership, or enforcement. It is exercised through **control of continuity**.

Actors who control renewal govern behaviour upstream, even when they issue no directives. Conversely, systems that guarantee continuity through rule-bound structures remove the primary channel through which soft power accumulates.

This reframing shifts attention away from visible governance institutions and toward the temporal properties of capital systems. The decisive question becomes not who governs, but **whether continuation requires permission**.

7.3 Why coordination alone is insufficient

Many modern institutions were designed to solve coordination problems: aligning actors across jurisdictions, sectors, or scales. These designs succeeded in creating forums, norms, and legitimacy. They did not, however, solve the problem of **regeneration**.

Where coordination is layered atop discretionary capital renewal, dependency persists. Institutions may coordinate effectively while remaining structurally unable to sustain capability across cycles. As a result, authority concentrates despite the absence of formal control.

This explains why systems that appear participatory, decentralised, or benevolent can nonetheless reproduce dependency dynamics. Coordination without constitutional capital leaves the renewal choke point intact.

7.4 Constitutional capital as a missing architectural layer

Constitutional capital addresses this gap by relocating authority away from renewal decisions and into structural design. By embedding renewal cadence, access conditions, and recycling logic ex ante, constitutional capital ensures that continuity does not depend on ongoing approval.

This does not eliminate governance; it repositions it. Authority is exercised once, at the level of architecture, rather than repeatedly at moments of dependence. In doing so, constitutional capital resolves the long-standing tension between authority and autonomy in long-horizon systems.

The result is not the absence of power, but the absence of leverage.

7.5 Perpetual Social Capital as proof of feasibility

Perpetual Social Capital (PSC) demonstrates that constitutional capital is not merely conceptual. PSC operationalises constitutional authority at the capital layer through non-liability, non-extractive, multi-cycle structures that eliminate discretionary renewal.

PSC's significance lies not in novelty of funding source or moral orientation, but in its temporal behaviour. Capital persists across cycles without requiring permission, enabling institutions to plan, maintain, and invest without adapting behaviour to secure continuation.

In this sense, PSC serves as proof of feasibility rather than a comprehensive solution. It shows that constitutional capital can exist in practice, not merely in theory.

7.6 Architectural limits and trade-offs

Constitutional capital is not universally appropriate. Systems that require rapid reprioritisation, adversarial competition, or short-horizon optimisation may be poorly served by rule-bound continuity. Constitutionalising renewal reduces discretionary responsiveness and increases the cost of mid-cycle reallocation.

These trade-offs are intentional rather than accidental. Constitutional capital privileges long-horizon capability, maintenance, and autonomy over short-term adaptability. It shifts burden from ongoing judgment to upfront design, increasing the importance—and consequence—of initial framing and rule selection.

Where missions are stable but cycles are volatile, this trade-off is beneficial. Where missions themselves must change rapidly, constitutional capital may introduce rigidity. Recognising this boundary is essential: constitutional capital is a targeted architectural response to renewal-driven dependency, not a general substitute for political or managerial discretion.

7.7 The deeper design principle

The central design principle established by this paper can be stated succinctly:

> **Power accumulates where renewal is discretionary.**
>
> **The primary channel through which abuse arises—renewal-based leverage—disappears where renewal is constitutional.**

This principle generalises across scales and contexts because it describes a structural invariant rather than a contingent outcome. It explains why benevolent systems reproduce dependency and why trust-based governance repeatedly fails to prevent capture.

7.8 Closing statement

Preventing abuse at scale does not require better intentions, stronger norms, or more vigilant oversight. It requires architectures in which authority cannot accumulate through scarcity, leverage cannot form at renewal points, and continuity does not depend on permission.

Constitutional capital provides such an architecture by separating capital from people while preserving authority in structure. In doing so, it offers a path toward institutions that maintain dignity, autonomy, and long-horizon capability independent of actor intent.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.

Buchanan, J. M. (1965). An economic theory of clubs. *Economica, 32*(125), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.2307/2552442

Buchanan, J. M., & Tullock, G. (1962). *The calculus of consent: Logical foundations of constitutional democracy*. University of Michigan Press.

Coase, R. H. (1937). The nature of the firm. *Economica, 4*(16), 386–405. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0335.1937.tb00002.x

Forrester, J. W. (1961). *Industrial dynamics*. MIT Press.

Gerschenkron, A. (1962). *Economic backwardness in historical perspective*. Harvard University Press.

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4*, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The general theory of employment, interest, and money*. Macmillan.

Laibson, D. (1997). Golden eggs and hyperbolic discounting. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 112*(2), 443–478. https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555253

Mazzucato, M. (2018). *The value of everything: Making and taking in the global economy*. Allen Lane.

Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in systems: A primer*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, K. (1944). *The great transformation: The political and economic origins of our time*. Beacon Press.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Harper & Brothers.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Strotz, R. H. (1955). Myopia and inconsistency in dynamic utility maximization. *Review of Economic Studies, 23*(3), 165–180. https://doi.org/10.2307/2295722

Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The economic institutions of capitalism*. Free Press.

Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or control and communication in the animal and the machine*. MIT Press.