

PHREVO Framework Paper — SSRN Working Paper 6614438

WORKING PAPER

SSRN Abstract ID: 6614438

PHREVO: A Post-Capitalist Economic Architecture for the Global South

Framework, Methodology, and Evaluation System — Version 1.0

Author

Andrés Jimenez

PHREVO — Independent Research Initiative

Contact

hello@phrevo.org

phrevo.org

Date

April 2026

License

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Keywords

post-capitalist economics, impact measurement, Global South, economic alternatives, dignity economy, regenerative economics, PHREVO-Score, community governance, planetary health, post-GDP metrics

Abstract

PHREVO — Planetary Human Revolution for Economic Value and Organization — is a post-capitalist economic framework designed as a structural replacement for capitalism rather than a reform of it. Built from the intellectual and experiential tradition of the Global South, PHREVO argues that the failure of existing alternative frameworks — from Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) standards to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to impact investing — lies not in their values but in their refusal to propose a complete alternative architecture capable of operating independently of capitalist logic.

This paper presents the PHREVO framework in full: its philosophical foundations, rooted in the ethics of care and the concept of dignity as economy; its structural architecture, the 4-16-64 matrix of four pillars, sixteen domains, and sixty-four operational instruments; its measurement system, the PHREVO-Score, a six-dimension impact metric designed as an operational alternative to GDP-centric evaluation; its ten policy families covering every domain of economic governance from fiscal redistribution to cultural sovereignty; and three working artificial-intelligence-powered evaluation applications that demonstrate the framework reasoning in real time across civil society, governance, and corporate domains.

PHREVO draws critically on Marx's structural diagnosis of capitalism while correcting its most consequential failures: the Eurocentrism that positioned Northern industrial experience as universal, the ecological blindspot that treated nature as resource rather than rights-holder, the state-capture theory of change that reproduced power in new forms, and the subordination of individual dignity to historical forces.

PHREVO is currently in early operational deployment through the Dignity Toolkit, a coordination infrastructure for immigrant communities in New York City. This paper invites peer engagement, methodological critique, and collaborative research development from scholars in heterodox economics, political economy, ecological economics, decolonial theory, and governance design.

Contents

- 1. Introduction: The Problem of Incomplete Alternatives**
- 2. Theoretical Foundations: Diagnosis, Inheritance, and Departure**
 - 2.1 What PHREVO Inherits from Marx
 - 2.2 Where PHREVO Departs
 - 2.3 Positioning Among Contemporary Alternatives
- 3. The PHREVO Framework: Core Architecture**
 - 3.1 Philosophical Layer: The "Why" of the System
 - 3.2 Four Pillars
 - 3.3 The 4-16-64 Matrix
- 4. The PHREVO-Score: Measurement Methodology**
 - 4.1 Six Dimensions of Value
 - 4.2 Formula and Dynamic Weighting
 - 4.3 Applications Across Actors
- 5. Ten Policy Families: Governance Architecture**
- 6. Operational Layer: Technology and Evaluation Systems**
 - 6.1 Three Evaluation Applications
 - 6.2 The Dignity Toolkit: First Operational Proof
- 7. Theory of Change: Construction Over Rupture**
- 8. Governance Design: Anti-Capture Architecture**
- 9. Research Agenda and Limitations**
10. Conclusion
- References

1. Introduction: The Problem of Incomplete Alternatives

The twenty-first century has produced an extraordinary abundance of critiques of capitalism. From degrowth economics to Doughnut Economics, from platform cooperativism to post-development theory, the intellectual case against the dominant economic system has never been more rigorous, more diverse, or more widely disseminated. And yet capitalism continues to organize the lives of virtually every human being on the planet — not because the critiques are wrong, but because the alternatives remain incomplete.

This incompleteness takes a specific form. Most alternative frameworks are either diagnostic — explaining what is wrong with the current system with great precision — or aspirational — describing what a better system would feel like in terms of values. Very few attempt what capitalism itself required over centuries to become dominant: a complete operational architecture. Rules. Metrics. Institutions. Incentive structures. Governance mechanisms. A system detailed enough that someone could actually implement it.

PHREVO — Planetary Human Revolution for Economic Value and Organization — is an attempt to fill that gap. It is not a critique of capitalism, though it contains one. It is not a manifesto, though it has the political force of one. It is a designed system: a complete post-capitalist economic architecture built from the epistemological and experiential tradition of the Global South, detailed enough to be implemented in a municipality, a cooperative network, a national policy framework, or a territorial governance system.

This paper presents that architecture in full. Section 2 situates PHREVO in relation to its primary intellectual inheritance — Marxist political economy — and to contemporary alternative frameworks including the SDGs, ESG, Doughnut Economics, and degrowth theory. Section 3 describes the core philosophical and structural architecture. Section 4 presents the PHREVO-Score methodology in technical detail. Section 5 describes the ten policy families that constitute PHREVO's governance architecture. Section 6 describes the operational layer including three working evaluation applications and the Dignity Toolkit as first operational proof. Section 7 addresses theory of change. Section 8 addresses governance design and anti-capture mechanisms. Section 9 presents the research agenda and limitations. Section 10 concludes.

A note on positionality: this framework was developed from and for the Global South. It treats the knowledge, experience, and institutional creativity of the Global South not as a deficit to be remedied by Northern frameworks, but as the primary epistemological foundation from which a genuinely alternative economic system can be built. This is not a rhetorical gesture. It is the core methodological claim of the framework: that the communities most damaged by capitalism are also the communities most equipped to design its replacement, precisely because they have had to develop resilience, community governance, and alternative value systems in the absence of the protections that capitalism provided to its beneficiaries.

2. Theoretical Foundations: Diagnosis, Inheritance, and Departure

2.1 What PHREVO Inherits from Marx

Karl Marx's analysis of capitalism in *Das Kapital* (1867) remains the most rigorous structural account of how the system actually functions: how it extracts surplus value from labor, how it concentrates capital through accumulation, how it externalizes costs onto nature and community, and how it generates crises through its own internal contradictions. PHREVO does not contest this diagnosis. On the contrary, the PHREVO framework treats Marx's analytical machinery as foundational.

Three specific inheritances are worth naming precisely. First, the concept of structural causation: PHREVO follows Marx in treating poverty, inequality, and ecological destruction not as accidents or moral failures but as structural products of a system designed to generate them. The founding principle — "the Global South did not fail the economy; the economy failed the Global South" — is a direct application of structural causation to the colonial dimension that Marx identified but did not center.

Second, the critique of commodification: Marx's concept of commodity fetishism — the process by which social relations become encoded in the exchange value of things — directly informs PHREVO's insistence that dignity, care, ecological health, and community cohesion cannot be adequately captured by monetary metrics. The PHREVO-Score is, in part, an attempt to create measurement instruments for precisely those dimensions of value that commodification renders invisible.

Third, the concept of totality: Marx understood that capitalism is not merely an economic system but a total social form — organizing not just production and exchange but subjectivity, temporality, desire, and imagination. PHREVO takes this insight seriously by proposing a replacement that is equally total: not just different markets but different governance, different metrics, different property relations, different relationships with territory and ecology.

2.2 Where PHREVO Departs

PHREVO departs from Marx at four critical points, each of which proved consequential in the historical attempts to implement Marxist frameworks. First, on historical inevitability. Marx's thesis that capitalism would collapse under its own contradictions and be replaced by communism through revolutionary class struggle has not been borne out. Capitalism has demonstrated remarkable adaptive capacity, absorbing labor movements, welfare states, and environmental regulation without structural transformation. PHREVO does not wait for collapse. It builds the replacement while the existing system still operates, on the grounds that systems are not replaced by their own contradictions but by the superior legitimacy and functionality of alternatives that grow within and alongside them.

Second, on the state as instrument. The Marxist theory of change — seizing state power as the primary path to transformation — produced in practice a series of concentrated power structures that reproduced many of the oppressions they claimed to eliminate. PHREVO does not seek to capture the state. It seeks to make the state progressively less necessary by building community governance infrastructure that is more legitimate, more responsive, and more effective than centralized state power, while simultaneously proposing specific policy frameworks through which states can adopt PHREVO principles without requiring capture.

Third, on ecology. Marx's framework treated nature primarily as a resource to be collectively owned and productively deployed. The ecological crisis of the twenty-first century makes this insufficient. PHREVO treats nature as a rights-holder, an active participant in economic governance, and a limit-setter for all productive activity. The PHREVO-Score's Sustainable Depth dimension, the ecological regeneration pillar, and the concept of "derecho líquido" (liquid rights) that extends legal standing to natural systems are direct responses to Marx's ecological blindspot.

Fourth, on the Global South. Marx wrote primarily from and about the European industrial working class. The colonial dimensions of capitalism — the extraction from what would become the Global South that financed European industrial development — were peripheral to rather than constitutive of his analysis. PHREVO reverses this: the Global South is not the periphery of the system but the epistemological center of its replacement. The communities that have survived capitalism's most extractive face have developed knowledge, governance practices, and value systems that are not merely compatible with a post-capitalist system — they are its primary intellectual resource.

2.3 Positioning Among Contemporary Alternatives

PHREVO exists in a rich field of contemporary alternative economic frameworks. Understanding where it sits relative to the most prominent of these is necessary for intellectual precision.

Doughnut Economics (Raworth, 2017) provides the most influential recent reframing of economic goals, proposing that human flourishing requires meeting social foundations while remaining within planetary boundaries. PHREVO is broadly sympathetic to this framing but goes further in two respects: it proposes specific institutional mechanisms rather than a conceptual reframing, and it centers the Global South's existing practices as the implementation ground rather than imagining a Northern-led transition.

Degrowth theory (Kallis, Hickel, et al.) argues that the quantitative reduction of economic activity in wealthy nations is necessary for ecological survival and global justice. PHREVO's relationship with degrowth is nuanced: it agrees that infinite growth on a finite planet is structurally impossible, and its regeneration principle is broadly consistent with degrowth's ecological commitments. However, PHREVO resists degrowth's tendency to prescribe specific macroeconomic outcomes —

growth or contraction — as universal prescriptions, preferring instead to create the measurement and governance systems through which communities can make those determinations contextually.

The SDGs represent the broadest existing multilateral commitment to alternative development goals. PHREVO is aligned with the SDGs on nearly every substantive target but departs from them on architecture: the SDGs were designed to be pursued within the existing capitalist system, whereas PHREVO argues that the system itself must be replaced. As the PHREVO framework puts it: "the SDGs are a patch. PHREVO is the operating system."

ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) frameworks represent the most widespread corporate adoption of alternative metrics. PHREVO treats ESG as a category error: it attempts to make capitalism more responsible without changing the underlying logic that makes it irresponsible. The PHREVO-Score differs from ESG frameworks in three fundamental ways: it is mandatory rather than voluntary, it uses binding thresholds rather than advisory scoring, and it evaluates impact rather than reporting.

3. The PHREVO Framework: Core Architecture

3.1 Philosophical Layer: The "Why" of the System

Every economic system rests on a philosophical layer — a set of assumptions about human nature, value, and the purpose of collective life. Capitalism's philosophical layer holds that competitive self-interest produces optimal collective outcomes, that monetary value is the universal measure of worth, and that growth is the primary indicator of progress. These assumptions are not natural laws. They are choices, institutionalized over centuries and naturalized through cultural production.

PHREVO begins by naming its own philosophical layer explicitly: the economy exists to serve life, not the reverse. This is not a moral aspiration — it is a design constraint. Every element of the PHREVO system is evaluated against the question: does this expand life or diminish it? The concept of "dignity as economy" — elaborated in the framework's philosophical foundations — holds that human dignity is not a moral abstraction but a measurable, designable, protectable variable. Dignity can be planned for in the same way that infrastructure can be planned for. Societies that plan for dignity produce it; societies that leave it to the market produce its absence.

The ethics of care (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984; Tronto, 1993) provides the moral architecture of the PHREVO system. Care — the practical work of sustaining life, relationships, and ecosystems — is treated not as supplementary to productive economic activity but as its most fundamental form. Economies that recognize care as productive generate different incentive structures, different property relations, and different governance systems than economies that treat it as invisible. The PHREVO-Score's Care and Wellbeing dimension and the PHREVO Labor and Care Policy (PLAB) family are direct implementations of care ethics as an operational principle.

3.2 Four Pillars

The PHREVO framework rests on four non-negotiable pillars. These are not values to be balanced against competing interests. They are design constraints: any element of the system that violates them is excluded, regardless of its other merits.

Pillar 1: Life as the measure of value. The system does not exist to reproduce capital but to reproduce life — human, communal, and ecological. Everything that PHREVO recognizes, supports, measures, or incentivizes must expand wellbeing in at least one of these three domains. Nothing that destroys life in any domain can enter the system, regardless of its financial productivity.

Pillar 2: Justice as the engine of the system. Redistribution is not a corrective mechanism applied after inequality is generated — it is built into the system's architecture from the beginning. The PHREVO framework treats inequality as a design choice. Just as capitalism is designed to concentrate, PHREVO is designed to distribute. This means that the starting conditions of any economic process — who has access, whose labor is recognized, whose territory is protected — are subject to explicit justice criteria, not left to market allocation.

Pillar 3: Community as the unit of production. In capitalism, the unit of production is the firm. In PHREVO, it is the organized community. This does not romanticize community or ignore its internal conflicts and power dynamics. It means that the legal, financial, and governance infrastructure of the system is organized around collective rather than individual actors, and that the community — defined as the people who share a territory and its consequences — is the primary decision-making authority over that territory's economic life.

Pillar 4: Autonomy as a structural right. Autonomy is not merely a value to be aspired to but a system design requirement. Without autonomy — territorial, digital, economic, political — dignity is impossible. Every element of the PHREVO system is designed to expand the real capacity for self-determination of individuals and communities, not to create new forms of dependency in the name of support.

3.3 The 4-16-64 Matrix

The structural architecture of PHREVO is organized through the 4-16-64 matrix: four pillars, each containing four domains, each domain containing four operational instruments, for a total of sixty-four instruments that constitute the system's "constitutional code." This fractal structure is designed to be both comprehensive — covering every domain of economic life — and coherent — ensuring that every instrument traces back to one of the four foundational pillars.

The matrix operates as a validation protocol as well as a structural organizing principle. Every action, project, policy, or institution that enters the PHREVO system must pass through the four pillar-level filters: Does it reduce inequality? Does it regenerate or damage the territory? Does it strengthen or weaken community wellbeing? Does it increase or decrease autonomy? These are not advisory questions. They are entry conditions with binding thresholds.

The sixteen domains translate the four pillars into operational areas: Under Economic Justice: property and distribution, access and gap-closing, work and value recognition, and impact-based income. Under Ecological Regeneration: natural cycles, circular production, living local economies, and energy transition. Under Collective Wellbeing: community health, social fabric, transformative education, and care culture. Under Technological and Financial Sovereignty: ethical data, regenerative AI, impact finance, and distributed governance.

The sixty-four instruments are the most granular level of the system — the specific mechanisms, protocols, algorithms, metrics, and governance processes through which the pillars and domains operate in practice. Examples include: Instrument 3 (Automatic redistribution protocol by impact), Instrument 13 (Basic Impact Income algorithm), Instrument 47 (Liquid governance protocol with justice weights), Instrument 53 (Social impact-aligned AI engine), and Instrument 64 (Constitutional update mechanism for the protocol). The full instrument matrix is presented in the framework's technical appendix.

4. The PHREVO-Score: Measurement Methodology

The PHREVO-Score is the measurement system at the center of the framework. It is designed to do what GDP cannot: capture the dimensions of value that matter most to human flourishing and ecological sustainability, while remaining technically rigorous enough to serve as the basis for resource allocation, governance decisions, and market operations.

The foundational claim of the PHREVO-Score is that measurement is a political act. Every metric encodes a theory of value. GDP encodes the theory that monetary transactions are the universal measure of economic worth. The PHREVO-Score encodes the theory that the quality of life — specifically, dignity, community, care, ecological sustainability, justice, and ethical technology use — is the appropriate measure of economic success.

4.1 Six Dimensions of Value

The PHREVO-Score evaluates any person, project, organization, or territory across six dimensions. Each dimension contains between eight and twelve operational indicators.

Dimension 1: Dignity and Human Wellbeing (DH). This dimension measures what the framework calls "structural stress reduction" — the degree to which an intervention, project, or system reduces the forms of insecurity that prevent human flourishing: material precarity, emotional instability, lack of autonomy, and temporal dispossession. The guiding question is: does this make someone's life more livable? Indicators include housing stability, income adequacy, emotional security, time sovereignty, and freedom from fear of structural abandonment.

Dimension 2: Community Impact (IC). No individual thrives in a broken community. This dimension measures the degree to which an action strengthens or weakens the social fabric: participation, cooperation, mutual support, trust, and collective intelligence. The guiding question is: does this strengthen or weaken the community? Indicators include levels of voluntary participation, social trust metrics, mutual aid network density, conflict incidence and resolution quality, and intergenerational connection.

Dimension 3: Care and Wellbeing (CB). This dimension makes visible what capitalism renders invisible: the work of care that sustains all other productive activity. It evaluates the accessibility and quality of care systems, the distribution of care burdens across gender and class, the quality of mental and emotional health infrastructure, and the degree to which care is recognized as productive work. The guiding question is: are care networks present, accessible, and functioning?

Dimension 4: Sustainable Depth (SP). This dimension departs from standard environmental metrics by requiring regeneration rather than merely limiting destruction. It evaluates the degree to which an activity repairs ecological cycles, respects natural limits, reduces ecological footprint, advances circularity, and contributes to bioregional resilience. The guiding question is: does this regenerate or deplete the territory?

Dimension 5: Justice and Autonomy (JA). This dimension evaluates the distribution of power. Who decides? Who accesses? Who receives? Who has been historically excluded, and how is that exclusion being corrected? It includes indicators of equitable access, redistributive effectiveness, governance justice, protection of vulnerable groups, and the real capacity for self-determination. The guiding question is: who decides, who accesses, and who is excluded?

Dimension 6: Ethical Technology (TE). Technology is not neutral. This dimension evaluates whether technological systems respect community sovereignty over data, maintain transparency and explicability of algorithms, advance rather than undermine democratic governance, and serve life rather than subordinating it. The guiding question is: does this technology serve life, or does life serve it?

4.2 Formula and Dynamic Weighting

PHREVO-Score = (DH + IC + CB + SP + JA + TE) ÷ 6, adjusted by territorial context weighting

In its base form, the PHREVO-Score is the equally-weighted average of the six dimensions. However, the framework incorporates three contextual weighting mechanisms that reflect the specific conditions of the territory being evaluated.

Territorial vulnerability weighting amplifies the Justice and Autonomy dimension in territories with documented structural inequality. Ecological urgency weighting amplifies the Sustainable Depth dimension in territories facing acute ecological crisis or high climate vulnerability. Community fragmentation weighting amplifies the Care and Community Impact dimensions in territories with documented social fabric deterioration.

This contextual sensitivity distinguishes the PHREVO-Score from universal metrics applied uniformly regardless of context. The score does not claim to produce comparable cross-territorial rankings. It produces contextually appropriate evaluations that reflect the specific wounds and assets of each territory.

Binding threshold conditions apply to the score independently of its average: no project, policy, or organization may enter the PHREVO system if it scores below the minimum threshold in any single dimension, regardless of high scores in others. This prevents the "compensatory" dynamic in ESG frameworks, where high performance in one domain is used to offset harmful performance in another.

4.3 Applications Across Actors

The PHREVO-Score is applied at four levels of analysis. At the individual level, it informs support allocation and autonomy mapping without surveillance. At the project level, it determines access to PHREVO financing, certification, and market access. At the organizational level, it evaluates internal cultures, labor practices, governance structures, and redistributive effectiveness. At the territorial level, it

produces a multidimensional profile of entire bioregions, municipalities, or regions that informs governance priorities and resource allocation.

5. Ten Policy Families: Governance Architecture

One of the most important ways in which PHREVO distinguishes itself from alternative frameworks is its insistence on specifying governance architecture. Values without institutions are aspirations. PHREVO proposes ten policy families that together constitute a complete alternative to the governance systems of capitalism, covering every domain in which economic decisions are made.

Each policy family contains eight structural components and is designed to be modular — implementable independently by a municipality, a cooperative network, or a national government, while remaining coherent when implemented as a complete system.

These policy families are not merely a catalog of good policies. They are a coherent system: each family reinforces the others, and the ten together constitute what the framework calls "the PHREVO standard" — a comprehensive governance architecture against which any political and economic system can be evaluated and toward which any such system can transition.

6. Operational Layer: Technology and Evaluation Systems

6.1 Three Evaluation Applications

The PHREVO framework is not only a theoretical architecture. Three working evaluation applications demonstrate the system reasoning in real time. These applications represent the first operational deployment of the PHREVO-Score across the three primary domains of economic life: civil society, governance, and capital. The Social Project Evaluator (phrevo-ai-198929095844.us-west1.run.app) applies the PHREVO framework to social projects submitted for evaluation. It analyzes the project against the six PHREVO-Score dimensions, applies binding threshold conditions, and generates a transparent evaluation showing the reasoning at each stage. The application is powered by large language model reasoning that has been prompted to apply the PHREVO framework consistently, with explicit reasoning chains that make the evaluation auditable.

The Governance Copilot (phrevo-statecraft-copilot-1499434518.us-west1.run.app) evaluates public policies and governance decisions by country or region. It models structural risk, institutional coherence, and cumulative effects — producing an assessment of how a given governance decision scores across the PHREVO dimensions and what its projected impact on territorial wellbeing might be.

The Corporate Analyzer (corporations-phrevo-ai-269553358880.us-west1.run.app) applies PHREVO logic to corporate evaluation, assessing externalities and the consistency between a corporation's economic activity and its social and planetary impact. This application is particularly relevant for impact investors and institutional actors who need to evaluate corporate behavior against criteria that go beyond ESG reporting.

All three applications were built using Gemini as the AI reasoning engine and deployed on Google Cloud Run. The current phase of PHREVO development includes migrating these applications to the Claude API (Anthropic) as the reasoning layer, which provides stronger extended reasoning capabilities for the complex multi-dimensional evaluations the PHREVO-Score requires.

6.2 The Dignity Toolkit: First Operational Proof

The most important evidence for PHREVO's operational viability is not the evaluation applications but the Dignity Toolkit (dignitytoolkit.org), a coordination infrastructure for immigrant communities currently operating in New York City in partnership with NYC4All and fiscally sponsored by Good Shepherd Church.

The Dignity Toolkit demonstrates the PHREVO principle of dignity as infrastructure in direct operational form. It connects immigrant families to verified resources without requiring disclosure of immigration status — removing the surveillance dimension that makes most welfare-adjacent systems dangerous for undocumented people. It coordinates volunteers through a structured matching system that reduces burnout and ensures capacity arrives where it is most needed. It operates with a privacy-first architecture: no unnecessary data collection, no status databases, no exposure risk. The Dignity Toolkit is simultaneously a humanitarian response to an immediate crisis and a proof of concept for the PHREVO framework at the community scale. Every design decision in the Dignity Toolkit traces back to a PHREVO principle: the autonomy pillar (access without surveillance), the community governance principle (coordination through trusted intermediaries rather than state infrastructure), the

dignity as economy concept (treating coordination capacity as the essential infrastructure it is, rather than a charitable add-on to existing systems). The Dignity Toolkit is the first PHREVO case study — the evidence that the framework produces different, better outcomes in practice than existing alternatives, not as a claim to be taken on faith but as a documented operational reality.

7. Theory of Change: Construction Over Rupture

PHREVO's theory of change departs fundamentally from the revolutionary rupture model associated with Marxist political praxis. The rupture model holds that the existing system must be destroyed before the new one can emerge — that the state must be captured, the old institutions dismantled, and the new system imposed through the exercise of power by those who have seized it.

The historical record of this approach is instructive. In every case where revolutionary rupture was attempted in the twentieth century, the result was the reproduction of concentrated power in new forms. The Soviet Union, Maoist China, Cuba — each began with genuine commitments to liberation and ended with new forms of domination. The vanguard that claimed to represent the proletariat became a new ruling class. This was not a failure of particular individuals. It was a systemic failure of a theory of change that concentrated power before the alternative institutions capable of distributing it had been built.

PHREVO proposes a different theory of change: construction over rupture. The post-capitalist system must be built while the capitalist system still operates — not waiting for collapse, not seeking to seize existing institutions, but creating new institutions, new metrics, new markets, new governance systems that are more legitimate and more effective than their capitalist counterparts. As more communities, organizations, and territories adopt PHREVO principles, the weight of institutional reality shifts. The old system does not fall; it becomes progressively less necessary and less legitimate.

This approach is not naively reformist. It does not claim that capitalism can be persuaded to reform itself or that good-faith engagement with existing institutions is sufficient. It claims that the construction of functional alternatives is the most effective form of systemic challenge — that a community that can govern itself through PHREVO protocols has more genuine power than a community that marches against capitalism. Practice is politics.

The theory of change has three phases. In the first phase — which PHREVO is currently in — the framework, technology, and first operational proof are developed and made publicly available. In the second phase, the framework is adopted by a growing network of territories, organizations, and municipalities that implement PHREVO protocols and demonstrate measurable improvements in wellbeing, governance, and ecological health. In the third phase, the weight of evidence and institutional reality forces engagement from larger actors — national governments, multilateral institutions, international capital — on terms set by the communities that have already proven the alternative works.

8. Governance Design: Anti-Capture Architecture

One of the most important lessons of the twentieth century's experiments with alternative economic systems is that horizontal, community-centered governance structures are vulnerable to capture by organized minorities. A system that begins as genuinely democratic can be transformed into an instrument of concentrated power through the accumulation of informal influence, the manipulation of formal procedures, or the simple exhaustion of participants who lack the resources to sustain long-term governance engagement.

PHREVO takes this risk seriously and builds anti-capture mechanisms into the architectural core of the system rather than treating them as secondary safeguards. The governance structure operates through three circles of power with explicitly non-interchangeable roles. Territorial Assemblies — the communities that have registered territory in PHREVO and are actively regenerating — hold sixty percent of system-level voting power and one hundred percent veto authority over their own territories. No external actor, regardless of the capital they have contributed or the expertise they have demonstrated, can override a territorial assembly's decision about its own territory. The Stakeholders Council — impact projects, investors, regenerative companies, and scientific institutions — holds thirty percent of system-level voting power and zero territorial veto authority. The PHREVO Operational Team — the technical staff who maintain the infrastructure — holds ten percent of operational decision authority and zero strategic authority, and can be removed by territorial assemblies.

Six structural anti-capture protections are built into the system. PHREVO is not a company — there are no shares and no equity accumulation, which eliminates the primary mechanism by which external capital captures alternative institutions. Vote weighting is capped at five percent for any single investor, regardless of capital contributed. Territorial assemblies always hold majority voting power by constitutional design, not by current circumstance. All votes, proposals, and financial transactions are recorded on a public blockchain, making secret arrangements structurally impossible. The system's code is open source, meaning that if PHREVO is captured by extractive actors, any territory can fork the code and continue independently. And major constitutional changes require extended deliberation periods and supermajority approval, preventing rapid capture through procedural manipulation.

The emergency clause deserves specific attention: if seventy percent of active territories conclude that PHREVO has been captured by extractive actors, they can activate an automatic hard fork. The code, data, and territorial relationships continue under new governance. The capturing capital is excluded. The system regenerates itself. This is not a rhetorical commitment — it is an executable smart contract.

9. Research Agenda and Limitations

PHREVO is presented as a working paper, not a finished system. The framework has significant limitations that the research agenda is designed to address.

The most fundamental limitation is empirical: PHREVO has not yet been deployed at scale in a single territory with sufficient duration to produce robust outcome data.

The Dignity Toolkit represents the first operational proof of principle, but it addresses one specific application of one PHREVO principle in one specific context.

The framework's claim that PHREVO produces measurably better outcomes than capitalist alternatives requires longitudinal evidence from multiple territories across diverse contexts. Generating that evidence is the primary research priority.

The PHREVO-Score methodology requires independent validation. The six dimensions and their indicator sets were developed through the framework's own theoretical framework, not through empirical validation of the dimensions against actual outcome data. What matters to communities — what actually produces dignity, community health, ecological regeneration, and autonomy — needs to be verified through participatory research in specific contexts rather than assumed from theoretical principles.

The framework has been developed primarily by a single researcher from Latin America. While the Global South grounding is a methodological strength, the framework's claims to universality — its applicability across the extraordinary diversity of Global South contexts, from West African communities to South Asian cooperatives to Pacific Island governance systems — require engagement with researchers and communities from those contexts. The framework invites this engagement explicitly and acknowledges that its current form reflects one set of experiences and intellectual traditions within the Global South.

The governance architecture, while carefully designed, has not been tested against the kinds of stress that alternative institutions historically encounter. The anti-capture mechanisms are logically coherent, but logic and practice are different domains. Research into historical cases of governance capture and institutional resilience — particularly in the cooperative, commons, and solidarity economy traditions — is necessary to stress-test the governance design.

The relationship between PHREVO and existing legal systems is underdeveloped. Property rights, contract enforcement, data sovereignty, and corporate law are all domains where PHREVO principles conflict with existing legal frameworks in most jurisdictions. The pathways through which PHREVO governance achieves legal recognition — or the conditions under which it can operate in productive tension with existing legal systems — require specific legal research.

The research agenda that flows from these limitations includes the following priorities. First, empirical deployment studies: longitudinal impact evaluations in pilot territories implementing PHREVO protocols, with rigorous methodology and independent evaluation. Second, PHREVO-Score validation: participatory indicator development with diverse community contexts to test and refine the six-dimension framework against actual community-defined notions of wellbeing. Third, comparative governance research: systematic analysis of the anti-capture mechanisms against historical cases of alternative institution capture and resilience. Fourth, legal pathway research: jurisdiction-specific analysis of the legal frameworks through which PHREVO governance can achieve recognition and protection. Fifth, cross-regional translation: collaborative research with scholars and communities

from Africa, South and Southeast Asia, and the Pacific to test and adapt the framework across diverse Global South contexts.

10. Conclusion

This paper has presented the PHREVO framework as a complete post-capitalist economic architecture. It is not a critique that awaits an alternative. It is an alternative that acknowledges its own incompleteness and invites the collaboration necessary to complete it.

The central claim is simple but consequential: the failure of alternative economic frameworks is primarily a failure of architectural completeness, not a failure of values. The values are widely shared. What is missing is a system detailed enough to implement — one that specifies not only what we want but how we get it, not only the destination but the institutional infrastructure of the journey.

PHREVO is an attempt to provide that infrastructure. It builds on the most rigorous structural diagnosis of capitalism available — Marx — while correcting its most consequential failures. It draws on the governance wisdom, ecological knowledge, and community practice of the Global South as its primary intellectual resource. It proposes measurement systems that make visible what capitalism renders invisible. It designs governance structures that protect against the capture that has defeated previous alternatives. And it is already operational, in the modest but real form of the Dignity Toolkit.

The Global South did not fail the economy. The economy failed the Global South. PHREVO is the answer that rises from that truth — a Planetary Human Revolution that replaces the logic of accumulation with the logic of life. Built on dignity. Measured by impact. Governed by communities. Not an idea imported from elsewhere. This is not charity. This is not inclusion. This is those who sustained the world, finally building the one that sustains them back.

The invitation this paper extends is specific: not endorsement, but engagement. Critique the PHREVO-Score methodology. Test the anti-capture mechanisms against historical evidence. Identify the ways in which the framework reproduces assumptions that need to be challenged. Propose alternative formulations of the dimensions it gets wrong. Bring the knowledge of communities and contexts that the framework has not yet reached.

Post-capitalist economics has never lacked for diagnosis or for hope. What it has lacked is a complete, implementable, improvable system — one rigorous enough to survive peer scrutiny and flexible enough to adapt to the diversity of human experience. That is what PHREVO attempts to be. The attempt is incomplete. The incompleteness is not a confession of failure. It is an invitation to collaboration.

References

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Harvard University Press.
- Hickel, J. (2020). *Less Is More: How Degrowth Will Save the World*. Heinemann.
- Hickel, J., & Kallis, G. (2020). Is Green Growth Possible? *New Political Economy*, 25(4), 469-486.
- Kallis, G., Paulson, S., D'Alisa, G., & Demaria, F. (2020). *The Case for Degrowth*. Polity Press.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Das Kapital: Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie, Band I*. Verlag von Otto Meissner. [English translation: *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I*. Penguin Classics, 1990].
- Mazzucato, M. (2018). *The Value of Everything: Making and Taking in the Global Economy*. Allen Lane.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. University of California Press.
- Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. de S. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South and the Future*. *From the European South*, 1, 17-29.
- Tronto, J. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. Routledge.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Resolution A/RES/70/1. United Nations General Assembly.
- World Economic Forum. (2024). *The Global Risks Report 2024*. World Economic Forum.
- PHREVO. (2026). *PHREVO Framework Paper, Version 1.0*. SSRN Working Paper 6614438. Available at: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6614438>
- PHREVO. (2026). *Dignity Toolkit — Community Coordination Infrastructure for Immigrant Communities*. Available at: <https://dignitytoolkit.org>
- PHREVO Framework Paper — Version 1.0 — April 2026*
- SSRN Abstract ID: 6614438** This study is registered in the **AEA RCT Registry**.
Unique identifying number: AEARCTR-0018502.
- Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International*
phrevo.org — hello@phrevo.earth