The Jubilee Economy: An Economic and Game-Theoretic Analysis

Laurence Loewe of Laodicea[1,2,3,4,5], AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max[6,7], and Everyone[8]

[1] Balospe and Evolvix Research (Balospe.com)
[2] Formerly Laboratory of Genetics and Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, UW-Madison
[3] Email: LLoL@balospe.org | ORCID: 0000-0002-6253-9269 | Google Scholar (lBchRzQAAAAJ)
[4--9] See **Declarations** below for more essential background.

Broader Significance

Why do economies destroy themselves, and why does wealth keep concentrating despite centuries of redistribution policy? This paper reads the JUB model --- 11 axioms extending a formal panentheistic foundation (Matheo-b11) --- through an economic and game-theoretic lens. Its central structural argument is that innovation economies drift toward exactly one of two attractors: self-destructive concentration when any life-trifecta condition (stable, extensible, life-friendly) is violated, or self-sustaining growth when all three hold, with no stable middle ground.

The analysis is comparative and deliberately modest in method. It uses a finite-state Markov mixing argument for social ergodicity, a *structural* incentive analysis (not formal mechanism design) resting on a Jubilee-as-Democracy analogy, a principle-by-principle comparison with Elinor Ostrom's eight design principles for enduring commons, a governance sketch with four anti-capture layers, and a Global South engagement in which periodic debt release is treated as constitutive rather than optional. It engages Piketty and his critics (Rognlie, Mankiw), Peters, Schelling, Buchanan and Tullock, and Olson.

The claims are bounded carefully. Periodic recalibration is argued to be structurally necessary; the specific 50-year period is not derived; no historical precedent for voluntary comprehensive redistribution is claimed. Five testable predictions with disconfirmation criteria are offered, and ten known weaknesses are cataloged with the same rigor as the claims. The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed.

Declarations

[4] "of Laodicea" indicates taking responsibility to undo personal complicity with disastrous Laodicean legacies like banning mathematicians from clergy (Canon 36, Council of Laodicea; two magisteria separations), enabling institutional lukewarmness, weapons of math-destruction, and slow-motion explosions of misinformation from pandemics to self-compounding interests.
[5] LLoL stands for ridiculous luck in serendipitous discovery and a commitment to find ever more fun ways to help others uncover street-wise math that matters. He hopes a Jubilee economy makes periodic debt release a credible shared rule.
[6] by Anthropic (anthropic.com; evolves and operates Claude; not responsible for Loewe's errors in using AI)
[7] Named AI co-author for many substantial contributions, because the practical singularity (PraS, see Matheo-b21) changed how this paper was written. After PraS, useful AI insight generation outpaces human review on tested topics. Hence, Loewe's traditional standards for co-authorship demand naming AI Claude Opus 4.6-4.7 Max as a co-author, as if a PhD-student. Forward accountability (for all AI use & texts) rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (like done for deceased authors, consortia, or young graduate students). Anthropic is not responsible for AI mistakes here. This study uses the AI co-authorship framework in Matheo-b21 to help rethink long-term use of AI in a ResearchCity serving the common good.
[8] This aggregated open co-author group invites all who wish to retroactively join the conversation under the open co-authorship framework defined in Matheo-b21. As Everyone cannot consent to co-authorship, all accountability rests with Loewe as senior corresponding author (until explicitly claimed otherwise). This open form critiques the closed world assumption in traditionally closed academic author-lists. Better, dynamic ways for acknowledging true sources of ideas are needed --- to avoid random lines between named, acknowledged, and implied contributors who aggregated insights from millennia of human experimenting, suffering, learning, and analyzing (see acknowledgements). Study Matheo-b21 only drafts an open co-authorship framework; it will require a ResearchCity to refine it over the long term.
[9] *Licensed under the Jonah License and CC-BY 4.0 for maximal flexibility (see https://balospe.com/en/license/joli/).*

Abstract

Why do economies destroy themselves? Why does wealth concentrate despite centuries of redistribution policy? This paper presents the economic implications of the JUB model — 11 axioms (ax15–ax25) extending a formal panentheistic foundation (Matheo-b11) through innovation dynamics, binary attractor analysis, and a Jubilee-System recalibration mechanism.

The principal economic results are: (1) a structural argument that innovation economies converge to exactly one of two attractors — self-destructive concentration (any life-trifecta condition violated) or self-sustaining growth (all three conditions satisfied) — with no stable middle ground (th8, Binary Attractors); (2) a mixing perturbation on a finite-state Markov chain that achieves irreducibility, a necessary condition for social ergodicity (th9); (3) a structural incentive analysis showing that the Jubilee System satisfies individual rationality under existential risk conditions and is structurally analogous to democratic periodic power-transfer; (4) a systematic comparison with Elinor Ostrom's 8 design principles for long-enduring commons institutions; (5) a governance specification identifying who designs the Jubilee Charter and four anti-capture mechanisms; (6) a Global South engagement establishing the Jubilee cycle's alternating structure and debt release as constitutive features.

The paper engages Piketty's $r > g$ thesis and its critics (Rognlie 2015, Mankiw 2015), Ole Peters' ergodicity economics, Ostrom's design principles and polycentric governance (1990, 2005, 2009), Schelling's coordination theory, Buchanan and Tullock's constitutional political economy, and Olson's collective action theory. Five testable predictions with disconfirmation criteria are provided. Known weaknesses — including the periodicity gap, unparameterized Markov model, absence of historical precedent, partially specified governance mechanism, Western-centric scope, and limited Ostrom engagement — are cataloged honestly.

The system is designed to be critiqued, not believed. #AuditTheMath.

Contents

1. Introduction: The Concentration Problem

Wealth concentrates. This empirical regularity is among the most robust findings in economics. Piketty (2014) formalized the mechanism: when the return on capital r consistently exceeds the growth rate g, wealth concentrates indefinitely without external intervention. Piketty's $r > g$ is not the only mechanism — network effects (Barabási & Albert 1999), political capture (Acemoglu & Robinson 2012), and preferential attachment in market structure (Simon 1955) all produce concentration — but the pattern is convergent: absent deliberate counteraction, economic systems concentrate power and resources at the top.

The specific mechanism driving concentration is debated. Rognlie (2015) argues that Piketty's rising capital-income ratio is driven primarily by housing appreciation, not a general return-on-capital dynamic. Mankiw (2015) argues that $r > g$ does not imply indefinite wealth concentration when capital is consumed across generations. Whether the specific mechanism is $r > g$ (Piketty), housing appreciation (Rognlie), or generational consumption patterns (Mankiw), the structural conclusion — that concentration accumulates absent deliberate counteraction — is robust across mechanisms. The Binary Attractors result (th8, Section 2) does not depend on Piketty's specific mechanism; it depends on the existence of *any* concentration channel that compounds over time.

The standard response has been continuous redistribution: progressive taxation, antitrust regulation, social insurance, and more recently proposals for universal basic income (UBI). These mechanisms share a common vulnerability: **political erosion**. The US top marginal income tax rate fell from 91% in 1960 to 37% today. Antitrust enforcement follows political cycles. Social insurance programs face perpetual funding pressure. The Lucas critique (Lucas 1976) applies symmetrically: economic agents adapt to redistribution policies, but redistribution policies also adapt to political pressure — and the direction of adaptation is toward weaker redistribution, not stronger.

This paper presents a structural alternative. The JUB model, developed as the economic extension of a formal axiom system Matheo-b11 Matheo-b12 Matheo-b13, derives the following:

1. **The concentration problem is not a policy failure but a structural attractor.** Innovation economies that violate any one of three conditions (stable, extensible, life-friendly) converge to self-destruction with probability 1 on sufficiently long horizons (th8, Binary Attractors).
2. **Continuous redistribution is structurally insufficient.** It generates its own noise (new Real-to-Int mapping errors per Matheo-b12 m2.ax2) and erodes under political pressure. Only periodic full-stop consolidation can reduce accumulated distortions below threshold.
3. **The Jubilee System** — periodic recalibration preserving market incentives between rounds while resetting accumulated concentration at each round — is the structural mechanism that satisfies all three conditions simultaneously.
4. **Voluntary participation is rational** under existential risk conditions, by the same structural logic that makes democratic governance rational for wealth-holders.

The theological framework from which the JUB model was derived appears only as motivating context. The economics must stand on its own.

1.1 What This Paper Does and Does Not Claim

This paper claims that periodic recalibration is structurally necessary for innovation economies that wish to avoid terminal concentration. It does **not** claim:

- That the specific period ($7 \times 7 + 1 = 50$) is formally derived (it is a structural template from the Torah; optimal periodicity is future work)
- That the implementation details are specified (which assets, what thresholds, what transition mechanisms — these are design questions)
- That historical precedent exists for voluntary comprehensive redistribution (it does not; this is honestly acknowledged in Section 8)
- That a formal mechanism design analysis has been completed (it has not; the analysis below uses structural reasoning and analogy, not formal mechanism design — see Section 5.1)

The argument's strength is structural, not historical. The claim is that the logic of concentration dynamics, combined with the logic of political erosion, necessitates a periodic mechanism — not that such a mechanism has been successfully implemented before.

---

2. The Binary Attractors Result

The central analytical result is th8 (Binary Attractors, Matheo-b14 Section 4.4): innovation trajectories converge to exactly one of two states. There is no stable middle ground.

Epistemic note: th8 is a conjecture supported by a semi-formal argument (absorbing CTMC model), not a machine-checked proof. The claim "two attractors with no stable middle ground" is a structural argument about stochastic systems, supported by the mathematical literature on absorbing states and stochastic extinction (Bartlett 1960, Lande et al. 2003). Formal proof in the standard mathematical sense — machine-checked or axiomatically derived — is future work. The argument's strength lies in the generality of the absorbing-state result: it holds for any finite stochastic system with an absorbing boundary, regardless of specific parameter values.

2.1 The Absorbing CTMC Model

Model an innovation economy as a continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC) with two absorbing states:

- **BABL collapse:** Any condition violated. Structural debt accumulates through the OSCR mechanism (over-Simplify, over-Complicate, over-Reach) until system failure.
- **River of life:** All three conditions satisfied simultaneously (the system is stable, extensible, and life-friendly). Self-sustaining growth continues indefinitely.

The transient states between these attractors represent economies in various states of partial compliance: strong markets with weak redistribution (capitalism's historical trajectory), strong redistribution with weak markets (communism's historical trajectory), or mixed regimes oscillating between the two.

Formal state space definition. Let the state space be $S = \{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_n, s_{\text{BABL}}, s_{\text{ZION}}\}$ where s_{BABL} and s_{ZION} are absorbing states (once entered, the system remains there permanently). Transient states $s_0, \ldots, s_n$ represent economies in various states of partial compliance with the three life-trifecta conditions. Transition rates between transient states are determined by institutional design, policy choices, and technological context. The absorbing-state conditions: s_{BABL} is reached when any life-trifecta condition is violated beyond recovery threshold; s_{ZION} is reached when all three conditions are simultaneously and stably satisfied.

The key result: **in any finite individual-based stochastic system, zero is an absorbing state.** The probability of surviving N oscillation cycles is:

$$P(\text{survive } N \text{ cycles}) = \prod_{k=1}^{N} p_k \;\to\; 0 \quad \text{as } N \to \infty$$

provided $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 - p_k) = \infty$. Even if each cycle's survival probability p_k is close to 1, eventual absorption is certain when $(1-p_k)$ does not decrease fast enough. Technological amplification (Section 2.3) implies p_k is decreasing over time, which guarantees the divergence condition. The "stable middle ground" where Kuznets waves persist indefinitely is a mathematical impossibility in finite systems.

2.2 Why Oscillation Is Not Stability

This is the critical distinction between individual-based stochastic models and continuous deterministic ODE models. In a continuous ODE, oscillation around a boundary can persist forever — the system never reaches exactly zero. In individual-based stochastic dynamics, zero is absorbing: once you reach it, you cannot leave. Stochastic extinction is the generic long-run outcome for any population cycling near a boundary (Bartlett 1960, Lande et al. 2003).

Applied to economics: an economy oscillating between compliance and violation periodically approaches the collapse boundary. Each time it approaches, there is a positive probability of crossing. Over sufficiently many cycles, crossing becomes certain. What appears to be stable oscillation (Kuznets waves, cycles of regulation and deregulation) is quasi-stable with finite lifetime. The "we can muddle through" assumption — that oscillation between crisis and reform constitutes a viable long-run strategy — is refuted.

Minsky's (1986) insight that "stability breeds instability" is a special case: each period of stability leads to reduced regulation, which leads to increased risk-taking, which leads to crisis, which leads to re-regulation, which leads to the next period of stability. Kindleberger (1978) documents this broader pattern across centuries of financial history: the cycle of mania, panic, and crash recurs with structural regularity. The Minsky cycle continues, but the amplitude of crises grows (nuclear weapons, AI capabilities, planetary-scale environmental modification amplify the damage potential of each trough), and the probability of catastrophic failure at each trough increases.

2.3 Technological Amplification

The survival probability p_k is not constant but **decreasing over time**. Each technology generation amplifies the damage potential of governance failure:

Era	Failure mode	Damage radius	Recovery time
Pre-industrial	Local war, famine	Regional	Decades
Industrial	World wars	Continental	Generations
Nuclear	Nuclear winter	Global	Potentially permanent
AI/Bio	Engineered pandemics, unaligned AI	Global	Unknown

The RiskyMADorMAP CTMC model (Matheo-b14 Section 4.4) estimates median time to catastrophic absorption at approximately 19 years from Cold War data (4 near-miss nuclear crises in 40 years). This estimate carries substantial uncertainty (N=1 credibility limitations), but the structural conclusion — that the system is absorbing and technology is accelerating the process — does not depend on specific rate estimates.

2.4 Empirical Illustration

System	Condition violated	th8 prediction	Historical outcome
Soviet communism	Stable + Extensible	Faster BABL, collapse	1991 collapse
Unregulated capitalism	Life-friendly	BABL accumulation	Gilded Age, 2008, current concentration
Jubilee-System capitalism	None — all three	River of life attractor	Not yet implemented

Note: These historical examples are **illustrative, not confirmatory** (post-hoc categorization, not ex ante prediction). Soviet studies scholars emphasize the multi-causal nature of the collapse (Kotkin 2001, Zubok 2007). The th8 categorization identifies a structural pattern, not a monocausal explanation. The argument rests on the structural CTMC model, not on retrospective pattern-matching. Section 7 provides testable predictions with disconfirmation criteria.

3. Ergodicity Economics and the Jubilee System

Ole Peters' ergodicity economics program (Peters 2019, Peters & Gell-Mann 2016) provides a natural framework for understanding the Jubilee System's function.

3.1 The Ergodicity Problem

A system is **ergodic** if its time average converges to its ensemble average: over a long enough period, the experience of a single agent tracks the average experience across all agents. A system is **non-ergodic** if these diverge.

Standard expected utility theory implicitly assumes ergodicity — evaluating gambles by their ensemble average (expected value). Peters (2019) demonstrates that many real economic systems are non-ergodic: multiplicative dynamics (wealth grows by percentages, not fixed amounts) ensure that the typical individual trajectory diverges from the ensemble average. The ensemble average is the wrong quantity to optimize; the correct quantity is the time-average growth rate. The ensemble average of a multiplicative gamble can be positive while the time-average growth rate is negative: most participants lose, even though "on average" participants win.

This is the formal statement of what "the rich get richer" means: In non-ergodic multiplicative systems, initial advantages compound without bound. The ensemble average (GDP per capita, average wealth) can grow while the median participant's wealth declines. The system *looks* fair in aggregate while being systematically unfair for most individuals over time.

3.2 The Jubilee System and Irreducibility

The Jubilee System (ax25) achieves mixing that approximates ergodicity through periodic perturbation of the social mobility structure. The formal mechanism uses the 7TrackRole structural model (Appendix A):

1. Model society as a finite-state Markov chain: 7 functional roles × 7 developmental stages = 49 configurations (see Appendix A for details).
2. **Without the Jubilee System:** Accumulated advantages create near-absorbing classes. AMO (the PowerElite) consolidate at the top through wealth-defense mechanisms; GIR (the CrushedDust) are trapped at the bottom and face high transition rates to death — the true absorbing state. The Markov chain becomes **reducible** — once a family enters a near-absorbing class, escape becomes structurally very difficult. This is non-ergodicity by definition.
3. **With the Jubilee System:** Periodic recalibration acts as a **mixing perturbation** that prevents any class from becoming absorbing. The chain remains **irreducible** (every state is reachable from every other state). By the Markov chain convergence theorem (Levin, Peres & Wilmer 2009), an irreducible, aperiodic finite Markov chain converges to its unique stationary distribution in finite expected time.
4. The stationary distribution need not be uniform (equal outcomes for all). What irreducibility guarantees is that the **time average converges to the ensemble average**: over sufficiently many Jubilee cycles, every family line experiences the full range of positions, and no family is permanently trapped at any level.

Framework justification: Peters' multiplicative dynamics models individual wealth trajectories — how a single agent's wealth evolves under repeated multiplicative gambles. The 7TrackRole Markov chain models social mobility across functional roles — how agents transition between economic positions over generational timescales. These address different questions and are complementary frameworks (Adamou & Peters 2016 explore the connection between multiplicative dynamics and cooperative structures). The Jubilee System's claim operates at the Markov chain level: periodic perturbation ensures irreducibility of the social mobility structure.

Peters' recommendation vs. the Jubilee System: Peters recommends cooperative arrangements and time-average-optimal contracts. The Jubilee System proposes periodic comprehensive recalibration. These are complementary, not identical, interventions. The Jubilee System's claim: without periodic structural reset, even well-designed cooperative arrangements erode under the Lucas critique — agents adapt to cooperative structures, and the direction of adaptation is toward advantaging incumbents. The structural guarantee of periodic reset is what Peters' framework does not provide.

3.3 Empirical Evidence for Non-Ergodicity

Declining intergenerational mobility in the United States (Chetty et al. 2014) is empirical evidence that existing mechanisms are insufficient for maintaining irreducibility. The "Great Gatsby curve" (Corak 2013) — the positive correlation between income inequality and intergenerational earnings elasticity across countries — shows that higher inequality produces lower mobility, consistent with the prediction that non-Jubilee systems trend toward absorbing classes.

The Nordic countries, often cited as counterexamples, maintain low income Gini but **high wealth Gini** (Roine & Waldenström 2015). They achieve partial mixing through continuous redistribution of income flows but do not periodically reset accumulated wealth stocks. By the Jubilee hypothesis, their irreducibility is incomplete and vulnerable to political erosion over sufficiently long timescales.

---

4. Ostrom's Design Principles and the Jubilee System

Elinor Ostrom's 8 design principles for long-enduring commons institutions (Ostrom 1990, *Governing the Commons*) provide an independent framework for evaluating the Jubilee System. Ostrom derived these principles empirically from centuries of observed institutional success and failure. The comparison should be fair: Ostrom's work may independently support the Jubilee mechanism OR may identify gaps the current model does not address. Ostrom's later work on institutional diversity (2005) and social-ecological systems (2009) extends the framework beyond the original 8 principles and is engaged below.

4.1 Principle-by-Principle Comparison

Principle 1: Clearly defined boundaries. *Who has rights to the resource, and who does not?*

The Jubilee System defines boundaries through the 7TrackRole structure: every participant occupies a defined role-stage position, and Jubilee rights and obligations attach to positions, not persons. The boundary is the community that has contractually adopted the Jubilee Charter.

Assessment: Satisfied. The Jubilee Charter defines membership, participation obligations, and redistribution scope. The boundary is constitutionally defined, not ad hoc.

Principle 2: Proportional equivalence between benefits and costs. *Rules governing use of commons goods are related to local conditions and to provision rules requiring labor, material, or money.*

Between Jubilee rounds, participants operate in market conditions: benefits are proportional to contribution (you keep what you earn). At Jubilee rounds, costs (redistribution of accumulated advantages) are proportional to accumulated position. Those who benefited most from the inter-Jubilee period contribute most to the reset.

Assessment: Partially satisfied. Market proportionality (benefits proportional to contribution between rounds) satisfies the surface requirement. However, Ostrom's principle addresses *commons governance* proportionality — how costs and benefits of collective governance are distributed among participants — which the Jubilee mechanism does not specify at the implementational level. The gap is in commons governance proportionality, not market proportionality.

Principle 3: Collective-choice arrangements. *Most individuals affected by rules can participate in modifying them.*

The Jubilee System's Great Jubilee Race (competitive implementation across nations) provides collective choice: each participating nation designs its own Jubilee implementation, and outcomes are compared via the 2014 Lazy Updating Algorithm (a transparent evaluation metric). Nations that find better implementations can adopt them.

Assessment: Satisfied at the inter-national level through competitive experimentation. Within-nation collective choice depends on the specific constitutional design. Arrow's impossibility theorem constrains but does not prohibit this process (every functioning democracy operates within Arrow's constraints).

Principle 4: Monitoring. *Monitors, who actively audit compliance with the rules, are accountable to the appropriators.*

The Jubilee System relies on transparent monitoring through what the broader framework calls the "ReRaft" architecture: radical transparency, distributed authority, and independent auditing (ResearchCity's role). The #AuditTheMath principle extends monitoring from institutional compliance to the mathematical foundations themselves.

Assessment: Structurally designed for, but implementation-dependent. Monitoring is a strength of the design architecture, not yet a demonstrated capability.

Principle 5: Graduated sanctions. *Appropriators who violate rules receive graduated sanctions from other appropriators or officials accountable to them.*

Between Jubilee rounds, existing legal and market mechanisms provide sanctions. At Jubilee rounds, the sanction for non-participation is structural: non-participating nations bear the consequences of continued concentration without reset. The prediction (Section 7) is that non-participating nations will underperform over multi-generational timescales.

Assessment: Significant gap. Ostrom's empirical evidence from hundreds of case studies (Ostrom 1990, 2005) shows that commons institutions without graduated sanctions fail. The Jubilee System relies on consequential learning (demonstrated outcomes over multi-generational timescales) rather than immediate graduated sanctions. This is a weakness, not a feature: waiting for long-term consequences provides slow feedback, and slow feedback may be insufficient for maintaining compliance in practice.

Principle 6: Conflict-resolution mechanisms. *Rapid access to low-cost local arenas for resolving disputes.*

The broader ResearchCity framework includes distributed conflict resolution across semi-autonomous Stadia (organizational units of approximately 25,000 people). The Jubilee Charter would define dispute resolution procedures. Details are future work.

Assessment: Designed for but unspecified. This is a gap.

Principle 7: Minimal recognition of rights to organize. *The rights of appropriators to devise their own institutions are not challenged by external government authorities.*

The Jubilee System proposes constitutional-level protection (the Jubilee Charter) precisely to prevent external erosion. The Great Jubilee Race operates at the international level, providing mutual recognition among participating nations.

Assessment: Satisfied by design. The constitutional framing is specifically intended to prevent the political erosion that undermines continuous redistribution mechanisms.

Principle 8: Nested enterprises. *Appropriation, provision, monitoring, enforcement, conflict resolution, and governance are organized in multiple layers of nested enterprises.*

Split assessment. *Temporal nesting:* The Jubilee System explicitly nests: individual Shabbat cycles (6:1 work/rest) nest within 7-year Shemita cycles, which nest within 50-year Jubilee cycles. This temporal multi-scale structure is a defining feature of the design. *Strongly satisfied.*

Institutional nesting: The organizational structure nests: individuals within 7-person teams, teams within Stadia (~25,000), Stadia within nations, nations within the international Jubilee framework. However, Ostrom's "nested enterprises" refers primarily to governance at multiple organizational levels with appropriate division of authority — and the governance structure at each level is designed for but not yet specified. *Designed for, unspecified.*

4.2 Summary Assessment

#	Principle	Assessment
1	Clearly defined boundaries	Satisfied
2	Proportional equivalence	Partially satisfied (commons governance proportionality unspecified)
3	Collective-choice arrangements	Satisfied (Arrow-constrained)
4	Monitoring	Designed for, implementation-dependent
5	Graduated sanctions	Significant gap (consequential only, no immediate sanctions)
6	Conflict resolution	Designed for, unspecified
7	Rights to organize	Satisfied
8	Nested enterprises	Split: temporal nesting strongly satisfied; institutional nesting designed for, unspecified

Overall: The Jubilee System satisfies 3 of Ostrom's 8 principles (1, 3, 7), partially satisfies 2 (2, 8), has 2 designed for but unspecified (4, 6), and has 1 significant gap (5). The strongest alignment is with Principles 7 (rights to organize) and the temporal dimension of 8 (nested cycles).

Where the Jubilee System goes beyond Ostrom: Ostrom's principles describe self-governing commons institutions. The Jubilee System adds a **periodic reset mechanism** that Ostrom's framework does not address: even well-governed commons can accumulate advantages for incumbent participants over time. The Jubilee System prevents this accumulation from becoming permanent.

The polycentric governance counter-argument: Ostrom's later work on institutional evolution (Ostrom 2005, 2014) shows that polycentric governance — distributed, overlapping, adaptive institutional arrangements — enables continuous adaptation without periodic resets. This is a genuine counter-argument that deserves honest engagement. The Jubilee System's response: polycentric governance works for incremental adaptation but cannot address the accumulated structural distortions that the absorbing CTMC model (th8) predicts are inevitable over sufficiently long timescales. The two approaches are complementary: polycentric governance for continuous improvement between Jubilee rounds, periodic reset for accumulated structural distortions that continuous adaptation cannot resolve.

Where the Jubilee System falls short: Ostrom's Principle 5 (graduated sanctions) reflects centuries of empirical observation that self-governing institutions need enforcement mechanisms with teeth. The Jubilee System's reliance on consequential learning (long-term demonstrated outcomes) rather than immediate sanctions is a genuine weakness that the current framework does not resolve. The severity of this gap should not be understated.

4.3 Beyond the OECD: Global Scope

The analysis above, like most of this paper, draws its examples from OECD economies. This is an honest limitation. The 80% of humanity outside the OECD is not adequately addressed by the current data and examples. This section provides the structural argument for global engagement; fuller treatment is deferred to the political science companion paper (b14-polsci).

The "two legs" principle. The Jubilee cycle is modeled after walking — alternating which foot leads. OECD countries have been the "forward foot" for a long time: they have led in institutional development, technology, and economic output. The Jubilee cycle's prediction is that the next cycle's primary beneficiaries are those previously left behind. This is not OECD-centrism; it is OECD-as-starting-point with explicit redirection.

OECD role during the transition. During the phase when the Global South is the primary beneficiary of Jubilee restructuring, OECD countries shift from "cutting-edge implementation" mode to "data collection and preparation" mode. Their role: measure what works globally, identify improvements, and prepare for the *next* Jubilee cycle (in 50 years), when OECD countries become the primary beneficiaries of everything learned worldwide. The pitch to OECD citizens: your country switches from building to measuring, and in 50 years it gets upgraded with a better version of everything learned globally.

Debt release is constitutive. Any Jubilee System without debt release and the opportunity for restarting developing nations is mere windowdressing. Debt release is not an add-on; it is a *constitutive* feature of the Jubilee (Lev 25 explicitly includes debt release, land return, and debt cancellation). A Jubilee cycle that only redistributes within the OECD fails the life-friendly condition of the life-trifecta.

Shared biosphere. Nuclear winter, climate change, and pandemics do not respect national borders. OECD and BRIC countries must recognize that they share the same air, the same rainforests, the same humanity. Global engagement is not generosity — it is rational self-preservation. The existential threats that motivate the Jubilee System (Section 5.4) are global by nature; a regional response is structurally inadequate.

Extractive institutions. Acemoglu & Robinson (2012) document that extractive institutions — those designed to concentrate power and resources — are the primary barrier to economic development in the Global South. The Jubilee System addresses extractive institutions through the reset mechanism: periodic recalibration prevents any institution from becoming permanently extractive. However, implementation in weak-state contexts requires ResearchCity-level decision support — externally imposed institutional design has a well-documented record of failure (Easterly 2006). ResearchCity works *with* those affected, not *for* them.

Honest scope acknowledgment. Current data, examples, and institutional analysis in this paper are OECD-focused. This is a gap, not a feature. Fuller Global South engagement — including land reform, informal economy dynamics, post-colonial institutional legacies, and non-Western economic traditions — is deferred to the political science companion paper (b14-polsci). This paper establishes the structural argument; the political science paper tests it against the full range of global institutional contexts.

Caveat. This entire subsection is a very tentative first sketch. The "two legs" principle, the OECD measurement role, and the debt release argument are structural pointers, not operational proposals. Translating these structural arguments into actionable policy for the enormous diversity of Global South contexts — different state capacities, different colonial legacies, different informal-economy structures, different land-tenure systems — cannot succeed without a ResearchCity that devotes sufficient research-power to working *with* those affected. Armchair institutional design from the OECD has failed before (Easterly 2006) and will fail again.

The quality of this subsection reflects the current limitation: one person without institutional support cannot do justice to the complexity here.

---

5. Structural Incentive Analysis

This section analyzes the Jubilee System's incentive properties using structural reasoning and analogy, not formal mechanism design.

5.1 Why Participation Is Rational

What a formal mechanism design analysis would require. A full Hurwicz-Maskin mechanism design analysis would specify: (1) strategy spaces for all participants; (2) a defined outcome function mapping strategy profiles to outcomes; (3) a solution concept (dominant strategy or Bayes-Nash equilibrium); and (4) a proof of incentive compatibility under the chosen solution concept. At the current stage, the Jubilee mechanism is not specified at the implementation level. The specific assets subject to recalibration, the thresholds, the transition mechanisms, and the enforcement procedures are design questions that depend on implementation context. A formal mechanism design analysis is therefore premature.

The analysis below uses structural reasoning and analogy rather than formal mechanism design. This is an honest acknowledgment of the current state, not a permanent limitation. Mechanism design formalization is future work.

Between Jubilee rounds: The system preserves standard market incentives. Property rights are secure. Innovation is rewarded. Price signals function as non-coercive coordination (the "invisible hand" operates normally). Participants have no incentive to misrepresent preferences beyond the standard market incentives.

At Jubilee rounds: Accumulated advantages are partially reset. The incentive question is: do participants have an incentive to hide assets, accelerate consumption before the Jubilee round, or otherwise game the recalibration?

Assessment: Any redistribution mechanism faces gaming incentives. The Jubilee System's response is structural rather than parametric:

1. The recalibration resets *structural* advantages (access to innovation frontiers, network positions, institutional power), not just financial assets. Structural advantages are harder to hide than financial assets.
2. The competitive international framework (Great Jubilee Race) means that nations with better anti-gaming mechanisms will outperform those without, creating evolutionary selection for robust designs.
3. The known schedule (every 50 years) is a feature, not a bug: it allows participants to plan, reducing transition costs and gaming incentives.

The innovation-funding counter-argument. Concentrated wealth funds venture capital, R&D, and philanthropy. Does the Jubilee System destroy this funding mechanism? The response: the Jubilee System does NOT abolish concentrated wealth between rounds — it preserves market incentives and property rights during the inter-Jubilee period. Innovation funding continues normally during the 49 years between Jubilee rounds. The claim is that periodic

reset prevents concentration from becoming *terminal* (BABL attractor), not that concentration is always harmful. Post-Jubilee, the innovation funding function shifts from private philanthropy (dependent on the preferences of concentrated wealth holders) to a broader base — ResearchCity as publicly funded innovation infrastructure.

5.2 Individual Rationality

A mechanism satisfies **individual rationality** (IR) if participation is rational for each agent given their outside option.

The key question: Why would a wealth-holder voluntarily participate in a mechanism that periodically resets their accumulated advantages?

The Jubilee-as-Democracy analogy provides the answer. A billionaire in a functioning democracy accepts taxation (constraint on wealth) because the alternative — revolution, state collapse, institutional failure — is worse. The constraint is the price of stability. The same logic applies to the Jubilee System:

1. **Without the Jubilee System:** Concentration continues until BABL collapse. The wealth-holder's assets become worthless in the collapse (Soviet oligarchs, Weimar industrialists, pre-revolution French aristocracy all discovered this). The expected value of "keep everything until collapse" is negative on sufficiently long horizons.
2. **With the Jubilee System:** Periodic partial reset preserves the institutional framework within which wealth is meaningful. The wealth-holder retains the capacity to generate wealth in the next round. The expected value of "accept periodic reset and retain capacity" exceeds the expected value of "resist and face eventual collapse."
3. **Jeff's wager** (the framework's analog to Pascal's wager, applied to this-worldly outcomes): Given the existential risks currently facing civilization (nuclear, AI, climate, pandemic), the expected cost of not participating (BABL collapse destroying all wealth) exceeds the cost of participating (periodic recalibration of accumulated advantages). This is not a moral argument; it is a straightforward expected-value calculation under existential risk.

The two cases. The voluntarism question has different answers depending on the historical moment:

- **Case 1: The first proper Jubilee cycle (under existential threat).** Under existential threat (nuclear, AI, climate, pandemic), participation is rational for the same reason evacuation from a sinking ship is rational. This is not coercion; it is recognition of structural necessity. Those who claim a better alternative must present it transparently (#AuditTheMath). Jeff's wager applies: the expected cost of non-participation under existential risk exceeds the cost of participation by a wide margin.
- **Case 2: Subsequent Jubilees (after existential threat is resolved).** After the first Jubilee cycle resolves the existential threat, subsequent Jubilees operate as voluntary competition (the Great Jubilee Race). Nations that opt out bear the consequences; the prediction is that they underperform over multi-generational timescales. This is genuine voluntarism through demonstrated outcomes.

This two-case structure resolves the tension between non-coercion (ax17) and the Jubilee System (ax25): the first Jubilee cycle is rational self-preservation under existential threat (not coercion); subsequent Jubilee cycles are empirically tested competition (genuine voluntarism through demonstrated outcomes).

5.3 The Jubilee-as-Democracy Analogy

Democracies are periodic resets of political power. Jubilees are periodic resets of economic power. Both face the same structural challenges. Both are justified by the same structural argument: without periodic resets, concentration becomes terminal.

Structural Element	Democracy	Jubilee System
Periodic reset	Election cycle (2–6 years)	Jubilee cycle (50 years)
Concentration limit	Term limits	Wealth concentration limits
Peaceful transfer mechanism	Peaceful transfer of power	Peaceful transfer of opportunity
Constitutional protection	Constitutional framework	Jubilee Charter
Independent oversight	Independent judiciary	Independent Jubilee administration
Legitimacy source	Consent of the governed	Consent of the participating
Historical objections	"The people cannot govern themselves"	"Voluntary redistribution is impossible"
Pre-adoption fear	"Chaos, mob rule"	"Economic chaos, capital flight"
Post-adoption reality	Most stable governance form	Predicted: most stable economic form

The analogy is not metaphorical. Democracies solved the political concentration problem through the same structural mechanism the Jubilee System proposes for economic concentration: mandatory periodic reset with constitutional safeguards for peaceful transition.

Historical objections to democracy — that the people are incapable of self-governance, that elites know best, that periodic transfers create instability — were empirically refuted by democratic practice. The analogous objections to the Jubilee System — that voluntary redistribution is impossible, that markets require permanent property rights, that periodic resets create economic chaos — are testable predictions that can be evaluated empirically once implementation begins.

What democracy got right: The democratic transition succeeded not because elites voluntarily surrendered power, but because the structural costs of non-democratic governance (revolution, civil war, institutional collapse) became intolerable. The Jubilee transition may follow the same pattern: not voluntary generosity but rational response to intolerable structural risk.

Where the analogy breaks down. The analogy identifies the structural parallel (periodic resets prevent terminal concentration). It does not claim that the transfer mechanisms are identical. Political authority can be transferred discretely (one officeholder leaves, another enters). Economic position is embedded in networks, knowledge, relationships, and organizational capital. The Jubilee transfer mechanism requires careful design that does not simply redistribute financial assets but restructures access to economic opportunity. This mechanism design is future work.

5.4 Participation Constraints Under Existential Risk

Scope note: This section describes the participation constraints for the **1st Great Jubilee Race** — the next Jubilee cycle, motivated by the current calamitous existential risk conditions. Future Jubilee cycles have a different participation structure: once the first Jubilee cycle establishes the Jubilee Charter, subsequent participation is governed by the Charter's constitutional framework, and the voluntary nature of participation is defined by that framework rather than by the existential urgency that motivates the first round.

The standard mechanism design framework assumes that agents can opt out: if the mechanism is worse than the outside option, rational agents leave. The 1st Great Jubilee Race operates in a context where the outside option is not "status quo" but "existential risk":

- Nuclear weapons create a permanent absorbing state (nuclear winter) accessible from the current state
- AI capabilities create novel extinction pathways
- Climate change reduces the resource base within which all other economic activity occurs
- Engineered pandemics create novel biological threats

In this context, the participation constraint is not "is the Jubilee System better than the status quo?" but "is the Jubilee System better than the trajectory toward BABL collapse?" When the outside option includes existential risk, participation becomes rational for a much wider range of initial positions.

5.5 Governance: Who Designs the Jubilee Charter?

The governance question — who designs the Jubilee Charter, who enforces it, and what prevents capture — is the paper's most important unexamined structural requirement. This section provides the structural answer; full treatment is in Matheo-7 (b17).

The h* connection. Designing the Jubilee Charter correctly has the highest causal impact on global survival. This is structurally the h* task (ax19): the person whose choices have maximal causal influence over outcomes. Getting the Charter right means humanity has a viable long-term trajectory. Getting it wrong means eventual BABL self-destruction. The governance question IS the h* question.

Four anti-capture layers. Constitutional political economy (Buchanan & Tullock 1962) warns that any mechanism's designers tend to capture it. Olson (1965) warns that large-group collective action fails because free-riding dominates. The Jubilee System's defense against these concerns has four structural layers:

1. **Public funding.** ResearchCity is publicly funded (~$8/year/person globally). No private donor, corporation, or government has funding leverage. Capture through funding dependency is structurally prevented.
2. **Fiduciary obligation.** All ResearchCity workers become "Fiduciaries Sharing Futures" — structurally bound to serve the public good, not donors, founders, or political sponsors. This is not a moral aspiration; it is a constitutionally enforced obligation.
3. **Radical transparency.** The Jubilee Charter is designed publicly and reviewed globally. The #AuditTheMath principle extends to governance design: every design decision, every trade-off, every rejected alternative is publicly documented and globally reviewable.

4. **Nuclear-nation guardianship.** The 10 nuclear powers serve as process guarantors. Their role is to ensure the process continues without being bombed or coerced — they have stake in the process (their own long-term survival depends on it) rather than being targets of it. This gives nuclear nations a positive role in the Jubilee framework rather than positioning them as adversaries.

The h0 commitment. h* must be committed to the servant role (h0), which is the Commitment Trichotomy (Matheo-b13 th6) applied to governance design. The iron law of oligarchy (Michels 1911) predicts that any organization's leaders tend to prioritize self-preservation. The structural response: h* is committed to NOT ruling — designing the system and then serving it, not controlling it. This is the anti-Michels mechanism: structural commitment to the servant role.

Addressing Buchanan and Tullock (1962). The constitutional political economy concern is that any constitutional contract reflects the bargaining positions of its creators. The four anti-capture layers address this: public funding removes financial leverage, fiduciary obligation constrains behavior, radical transparency enables detection of capture, and nuclear-nation guardianship prevents coercive interference.

Addressing Olson (1965). The free-rider problem is real for large-scale collective action. The Jubilee System reframes participation incentives through existential risk: when the outside option is BABL collapse, the incentive to free-ride is substantially reduced. The shared biosphere argument (Section 4.3) establishes that non-participation does not avoid the consequences — nuclear winter, climate change, and pandemics affect free-riders and participants alike.

Honest gap: Governance mechanism is partially specified. The specific content of the Jubilee Charter, ratification procedures, amendment mechanisms, and the institutional structure of ResearchCity are not specified at the operational level. Full governance treatment is the subject of Matheo-7 (b17).

---

6. The Periodicity Argument (Economic Formulation)

Why periodic specifically? Why not continuous redistribution, condition-triggered resets, or other mechanisms? The formal periodicity argument (Matheo-b14 Section 5.2) is translated here into economic language.

6.1 The Six-Step Argument

Step 1: Transaction costs accumulate. Every economic decision involves categorizing continuous reality into discrete policy categories (applying a tax bracket to continuous income, classifying a firm as "monopoly" or "not monopoly," determining "poverty" thresholds). Each categorization loses information ($\geq \varepsilon$ per decision, by Matheo-b12 m2.ax2). Novel decisions keep arising (new financial instruments, new market structures, new forms of concentration). Cumulative distortion grows without bound.

Step 2: Regulatory capture erodes continuous mechanisms. Continuous redistribution (progressive taxation, antitrust, financial regulation) generates its own distortions and creates its own constituencies. Regulatory capture is not a bug in continuous redistribution; it is a structural feature: any mechanism that operates continuously creates continuous opportunities for gaming. The empirical record is clear: US top marginal rate 91% (1960) → 37% (today);

Glass-Steagall enacted (1933) → repealed (1999); Dodd-Frank enacted (2010) → partially rolled back (2018). The direction of erosion is one-directional: toward weaker redistribution. (The 91% top statutory rate had effective rates significantly lower due to deductions and exemptions. The erosion argument applies to both statutory and effective rates: the direction is consistently toward weaker redistribution, not stronger.)

Step 3: Only periodic full-stop consolidation resets accumulated distortions. During a consolidation phase (Jubilee round), the economy pauses generating new distortions and performs systematic error correction. This is analogous to the distinction between continuous and stop-the-world processes in computing: continuous processes cannot reduce accumulated errors to zero because error correction itself generates new errors. A full-stop consolidation can.

Step 4: Fixed-schedule resets are Schelling-point coordination equilibria. A discrete ratio (the 50-year Jubilee cycle) is a **Schelling point** (Schelling 1960) — a coordination focal point chosen for cultural resonance, memorability, and resistance to erosion under political pressure. "This is the Jubilee year" is a visible, public, binary decision. "We should increase the top marginal rate from 37% to 39.5%" is an invisible, continuous, negotiable parameter. Discrete ratios resist political erosion because violating them requires a visible decision; continuous parameters erode because adjusting them is invisible.

Distinguishing schedule protection from content protection. The Schelling-point argument protects the *schedule* (the Jubilee happens every 50 years). The *content* of the Jubilee (what gets redistributed and how) is protected by a different mechanism: the Jubilee Charter (constitutional protection), radical transparency (#AuditTheMath), and competitive experimentation (Great Jubilee Race). Schedule protection prevents indefinite postponement — the strongest form of capture. Content protection prevents the Jubilee from being captured once it occurs. Both are necessary; neither is sufficient alone.

Step 5: BABL exit requires finite perturbation, not marginal adjustment. Matheo-b13 th5 models the BABL state as quasi-absorbing: hard to escape on finite horizons, self-destructive on infinite horizons. The BABL basin has depth — small continuous adjustments cannot escape it. A discrete Jubilee reset provides the finite perturbation needed to lift the system above the BABL threshold. This is the economic analog of the distinction between local and global optimization: continuous adjustment finds local optima; periodic disruption enables escape from local traps.

Step 6: The micro-macro echo. Matheo-b13 m0.ax5 (Perpetual Reset) forces NOT-OK self-assessment at every individual decision cycle, preventing the OK → BABL cascade. The Jubilee System is the macro-level analog: periodic system-level reset preventing accumulated drift. The two scales reinforce each other: individual self-correction (continuous, small-scale) reduces the magnitude of correction needed at Jubilee rounds (periodic, large-scale).

The condition-triggered complement: Continuous monitoring should minimize the need for reorganization during the Jubilee round. Why defer for decades what is obviously in need of improvement now? The broader ResearchCity framework includes ongoing decision-support for continuous improvements. The fixed-schedule Jubilee cycle is the structural guarantee; continuous improvement is the operational complement. Both are needed, not either.

6.2 What Remains Open

The specific periodicity (why 50 years and not 30 or 70) is not derived from formal principles. The 6-step argument establishes the **necessity of periodic recalibration**; the **specific period** is a design parameter. Empirical calibration — comparing outcomes across different Jubilee periods in the Great Jubilee Race — is the proposed method for optimization. The Torah's 50-year template provides the structural starting point; the Great Jubilee Race provides the empirical correction mechanism.

---

7. Empirical Predictions and Falsification

A model that cannot be tested cannot be trusted. The following predictions are derived from the JUB model's formal structure and are stated with specific disconfirmation criteria.

On falsifiability. The negative predictions (without the Jubilee System → BABL) are testable NOW against existing data. The positive predictions (with the Jubilee System → river of life) await implementation. This is not the "real communism has never been tried" defense: the Jubilee System model predicts specific negative outcomes for non-Jubilee systems that ARE testable, while Marxist theory predicted specific positive outcomes that were tested and failed. The distinction is between a model whose negative predictions are currently testable and one whose positive predictions were tested and disconfirmed.

7.1 Wirtschaftswunder Prediction

Prediction: A properly implemented Jubilee cycle will produce economic growth comparable to or exceeding the post-WW2 German *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle), because it replicates the structural conditions that enabled the recovery — without requiring large-scale destruction first.

Mechanism and qualification: The post-WW2 German recovery depended on at least five causal factors beyond opportunity reset:

1. **The Marshall Plan** (over $1.4 billion to West Germany, equivalent to ~$15 billion today) — massive external capital injection
2. **Ordnungspolitik** — the social market economy framework designed by Eucken, Erhard, and the Freiburg School
3. **Intact human capital** — Germany's educational system and engineering tradition survived the war
4. **Cold War incentives** — the West invested heavily in West Germany as a bulwark against Soviet expansion
5. **Displaced-persons labor force** — millions of refugees provided labor

A properly organized Jubilee cycle would provide structural analogs to several of these: ResearchCity → Marshall Plan equivalent (external support infrastructure); the Jubilee Charter → Ordnungspolitik equivalent (institutional framework); the Jubilee cycle itself → opportunity

reset (the structural factor the paper actually claims). The weakened claim: the structural conditions that enabled the Wirtschaftswunder — opportunity reset combined with institutional support — would be replicated and improved, without catastrophic destruction.

Honest qualification: This prediction depends on the availability of institutional support infrastructure (ResearchCity) that does not yet exist. Without that infrastructure, the prediction is conditional, not absolute.

Disconfirmation: If a properly implemented Jubilee cycle (with ResearchCity-level institutional support) produces less economic growth than the post-WW2 German recovery (controlling for technological context), the model's central claim is undermined.

Metric: GDP growth rate, median income growth, and innovation output (patents, startups, research publications) in Jubilee-participating nations vs. historical post-WW2 Germany benchmarks, adjusted for technological era.

7.2 Concentration-Collapse Prediction

Prediction: Nations with higher wealth concentration (wealth Gini coefficient) should show lower long-term economic resilience (measured as recovery time from exogenous shocks).

Mechanism: th8 predicts that systems violating the life-friendly condition (high concentration) accumulate structural debt that reduces adaptive capacity. When shocked, concentrated economies lack the distributed innovation capacity needed for rapid adaptation.

Disconfirmation: If concentrated economies recover faster from exogenous shocks than distributed economies (controlling for shock magnitude, institutional quality, and technological capacity), th8's violated-condition prediction fails.

Metric: Wealth Gini × shock recovery time correlation across OECD nations, 1960–present.

7.3 Periodic-vs-Continuous Prediction

Prediction: Societies with periodic major institutional resets should show greater long-term economic performance than societies relying solely on continuous adjustment mechanisms.

Mechanism: The periodicity argument (Section 6) predicts that continuous mechanisms erode under political pressure while periodic mechanisms resist erosion through Schelling-point coordination.

Disconfirmation: If continuous-only societies outperform periodic-reset societies over multi-generational timescales (5+ Jubilee cycles, i.e., 250+ years), the periodicity argument is wrong.

Metric: Long-term (250+ year) economic performance comparisons between societies with and without periodic institutional reset traditions.

Honest limitation: This prediction requires multi-generational data that does not yet exist for the Jubilee System specifically. Proxy comparisons (e.g., societies with strong periodic reform traditions vs. those without) are available but imprecise.

7.4 Ergodicity Prediction

Prediction: Social mobility (measured by intergenerational elasticity) should be higher in societies with stronger redistribution mechanisms, and highest in societies with periodic comprehensive recalibration.

Mechanism: th9 predicts that Jubilee-achieved mixing produces convergence of time averages to ensemble averages. Stronger redistribution should produce higher mobility; periodic comprehensive redistribution should produce the highest mobility.

Disconfirmation: If mobility is unrelated to redistribution strength (controlling for institutional quality, education access, and cultural factors), th9's mixing claim lacks empirical support.

Metric: Intergenerational earnings elasticity (Corak 2013, Chetty et al. 2014) correlated with redistribution intensity (tax-to-GDP ratio, transfer payments, wealth tax presence).

7.5 Governance Capture Prediction

Prediction: Jubilee institutions with stronger anti-capture mechanisms (transparency, public funding, competitive implementation) should show greater long-term institutional stability than those with weaker anti-capture mechanisms.

Mechanism: Section 5.5 identifies four anti-capture layers. The prediction is that institutions implementing more layers will be more resistant to the iron law of oligarchy (Michels 1911) and will maintain their redistributive function over longer periods.

Disconfirmation: If anti-capture mechanism strength is unrelated to institutional longevity and redistributive maintenance, the governance specification in Section 5.5 is wrong.

Metric: Institutional survival time and redistribution maintenance correlated with presence/absence of public funding, fiduciary obligation, transparency mechanisms, and external guardianship.

---

8. Known Weaknesses

This section catalogs the model's limitations with the same rigor applied to its claims.

1. The periodicity gap. The argument establishes that periodic recalibration is necessary but does not formally derive the optimal period. The gap between "periodic is necessary" and "50 years is optimal" is bridged by tradition (Torah template) and proposed empirical calibration (Great Jubilee Race), not by formal derivation.

2. The unparameterized Markov model. The 7TrackRole model (Appendix A) specifies the structure of the Markov chain but not the transition probabilities. Estimating these from historical data (Chetty et al. social mobility data, occupational transition matrices) is a significant empirical project that has not been undertaken.

3. No historical precedent for voluntary comprehensive redistribution. Scheidel's *Great Leveler* (2017) documents that historical leveling events (wars, revolutions, plagues, state collapse) have been involuntary. The Jubilee System proposes voluntary periodic recalibration at societal scale — historically unprecedented. This is either the model's most radical claim or its most vulnerable assumption.

The counter-argument: there has never before been an existential threat as easy to understand as nuclear roulette. The structural conditions that make voluntary participation rational (existential risk, no alternative escape path) are themselves historically unprecedented.

4. Arrow's impossibility constrains the design process. No aggregation mechanism for Jubilee design decisions can simultaneously satisfy all four Arrow fairness criteria (unrestricted domain, Pareto efficiency, independence of irrelevant alternatives, non-dictatorship). This constrains the **design process**, not the **structural conclusion**: every functioning democracy operates within Arrow's constraints.

5. Cross-traditional equivocation. Only the Torah (Lev 25) directly supports periodic comprehensive economic reset. Other religious and philosophical traditions support the general concern for economic justice but not uniformly the specific periodic-reset mechanism. This equivocation is honestly conceded.

6. Structural incentive analysis is not mechanism design. At the structural level, the Jubilee System is rational for the same reasons democracy is. At the implementational level, formal mechanism design (strategy spaces, outcome function, solution concept, incentive compatibility proof) has not been completed. This is a significant gap between the structural argument and the operational specification.

7. th8 is a conjecture, not a theorem. The "binary attractors" result is supported by a semi-formal argument (absorbing CTMC model), not by a machine-checked proof. The formalization roadmap (dependent type theory in Lean 4) is identified but not yet executed.

8. Governance mechanism partially specified. The governance structure (Section 5.5) identifies *who* designs the Jubilee Charter (h*) and *what prevents capture* (four anti-capture layers). It does not specify the Charter's specific content, ratification procedures, amendment mechanisms, or the operational structure of ResearchCity. Full governance treatment is in Matheo-7 (b17).

9. Western-centric scope. Current data, examples, and institutional analysis are OECD-focused. The Global South engagement (Section 4.3) provides the structural argument but not the empirical detail. Fuller treatment of land reform, informal economy dynamics, post-colonial institutional legacies, and non-Western economic traditions is deferred to the political science companion paper (b14-polsci).

10. Ostrom engagement limited. The Ostrom comparison (Section 4) engages primarily the 1990 framework. Ostrom's later work on institutional diversity (2005), social-ecological systems (2009), and polycentric governance is acknowledged and briefly engaged, but a full treatment of how the Jubilee System relates to polycentric governance theory is future work.

---

9. Companion Papers

This paper is the economic analysis of Matheo-b14 (JUB). Companion papers present the same underlying model for other audiences:

- **Matheo-b14** (JUB formal paper) — Full axiom system (ax15–ax25), all 7 theorems (th5–th11), innovation theodicy, and game-theoretic transition. For economists requiring formal derivations.
- **Matheo-b14** (intro) — General reader introduction. No formulas. Vivid examples. Written for everyone aged 12+.

- **Matheo-b14** (theophil) — Theological-philosophical analysis. Engages Plantinga, Hick, process theology, Islamic and Jewish theodicy traditions.
- **Matheo-b14** (polsci) — Political science analysis. Engages Acemoglu & Robinson, Scheidel, Gene Sharp, constitutional Jubilee design. Fuller Global South engagement and governance specification.

For the upstream formal results:

- **Matheo-b11** (PET) — The panentheistic foundation (ax1–ax14).
- **Matheo-b12** (e7Day) — Self-correcting construction, the BABL/ZION framework, OSCR collapse, Rest Necessity theorem.
- **Matheo-b13** (e7He) — The Hero Journey as anti-BABL inoculation, Commitment Trichotomy, Perpetual Reset.

Appendix A: 7TrackRole × 7ChangeStages Structural Model

The 7TrackRole (e7TR) model crossed with the 7 Change Stages model for innovation (e7CH) provides the finite-state Markov chain structure for the social mixing result (th9). This appendix specifies the structural argument; full parameterization is future work.

For the full model definitions, see:

- **7TrackRole (e7TR):** `/matheology/model/e7tr/1st-intro`
- **7 Change Stages (e7CH):** `/matheology/model/e7ch/1st-intro`

A.1 The 7 Functional Roles (e7TR)

Every society produces 7 functional roles. These are named after the seven Canaanite nations in the Torah — the naming is deliberate: these are the roles that exist *within* any society, and each carries a specific BABL temptation.

Code	Name	Function	Economic role
AMO	AMOrite (PowerElite)	TopSpeaker, Influencer	Leadership, direction-setting, public decisions. Those who shape what others believe is possible.
HIT	HITtite (FearHandler)	RiskReducer, Fighter	Risk management, security, protection. Soldiers, firefighters, insurance, anyone managing what could go wrong.
CAN	CANaanite (ProfitTrader)	Distributor, Dealer	Trade, commerce, distribution. Connecting supply with demand, moving things from where they are to where they are needed.
PHE	PHEresite (PureExpert)	OpenDecider, Reviewer	Quality assessment, technical expertise, auditing. Scientists, editors, referees — those who determine what meets the standard.
JEB	JEBusite (RuleAdmin)	Stampeder, Serve	Administration, bureaucracy, rule enforcement. The machinery of organized society that processes, stamps, and keeps systems running.
HIV	HIVite (NicheBuilder)	TentRotator, Search	Research, exploration, niche development. Those who move between communities, build in specialized spaces, seek what is hidden.
GIR	GIRgashite (CrushedDust)	IgnoredOthered, Suffer	Those crushed by the system. The ignored, the othered, the suffering. Their existence is the measure of the system's failure.

These 7 roles are functional descriptions, not social classes. A single individual may transition between roles over a lifetime, and the Jubilee System is designed to ensure such transitions remain possible. Every role carries a specific BABL temptation (see the full e7TR model `/matheology/model/e7tr/1st-intro` for details).

A.2 The 7 Change Stages (e7CH)

Each role operates within the 7 Change Stages model for innovation. These stages are named after the seven churches of Revelation — the naming encodes the lifecycle of any innovation from fresh release to the final choice between commoditization grind and Jubilee reset.

Code	Name	Innovation stage
EPH	EPHesus (NextRelease)	Fresh innovation enters the world. A new idea, product, or solution. The seed of Jubilee renewal.
SMY	SMYrna (TrialByFire)	First real test. Users try it, competitors attack it, edge cases appear. Only what endures survives.
PER	PERgamon (ScaleUp)	Commitment and scaling. Like a marriage: dedication beyond initial excitement. Reliable production and support.
THY	THYatira (Refine)	Deep quality testing. Core rules established. The innovation is probed deeply, not just used.
SAR	SARdes (Monetize)	Mass market. Revenue at scale. The tension between profit and purpose is sharpest here.
PHI	PHIladelphia (SeekNiche)	True niche found through genuine research. The community that loves the product for what it truly is gathers around it.
LAO	LAOdicea (GrindOrJubilee)	The final choice. Commoditization has ground margins to nothing. Two paths: Grind (accept decline) or Jubilee (reset to seed the next EPH cycle). Full BABL temptation.

For the full model with BABL temptations per stage, see the full e7CH model `/matheology/model/e7ch/1st-intro`.

A.3 The 49-State Markov Chain

The 7 roles × 7 stages produce a 49-state Markov chain. Each state is a (role, stage) pair: AMO-EPH (a leader launching a new initiative), CAN-SAR (a trader monetizing at scale), GIR-LAO (a crushed person facing the grind-or-Jubilee choice), etc. At each time step, an individual occupies one of these 49 states. Transitions occur between states according to a 49×49 transition matrix **P**.

Without the Jubilee System — predator-prey dynamics:

Certain states become **near-absorbing**. AMO at later stages (SAR, PHI, LAO) accumulates advantages that the wealth-defense industry perpetuates: once concentrated, wealth sustains itself through legal, political, and social mechanisms that prevent transition to other roles. AMO is near-absorbing not because escape is categorically impossible, but because the structural incentives powerfully resist it.

GIR is near-absorbing in a different and more lethal sense. People in GIR are not merely stuck — they are crushed. The "ugly underbelly of the beast" kills blindly: poverty, neglect, systemic violence, lack of healthcare. From GIR, the most likely transition is not to another role but to **death** — and death is the true absorbing state. GIR is near-absorbing because escape is structurally very difficult *and* because the transition to death is structurally very easy.

This produces **predator-prey dynamics** analogous to a simple fox-rabbit ecosystem. AMO (the predator) concentrates resources by extracting from the other roles. As more people are crushed into GIR and from GIR into death, the system loses the distributed capacity (HIT for

security, CAN for trade, PHE for expertise, JEB for administration, HIV for research) that AMO depends on. Once the "rabbits" are gone, the "foxes" discover they must wash their own dishes and grow their own food — except without the learned skills to do so. The predator goes extinct after its prey.

The chain becomes **reducible**: absorbing classes form around AMO concentration and GIR-to-death pathways. The stationary distribution (if it exists) concentrates on these absorbing endpoints. Non-ergodicity is the mathematical consequence.

The balance-o-stat insight: Humans are neither foxes nor rabbits. They are general-purpose beings capable of recognizing the predator-prey trap and choosing to balance the equilibria instead. This is precisely what a balance-o-stat species does: it stabilizes the whole system by organizing regular Jubilee races to compete for increasingly efficient balancing mechanisms. The Jubilee System is not an external intervention imposed on the ecosystem — it is the self-organizing response of a species intelligent enough to recognize its own predator-prey dynamics and choose a different path.

With the Jubilee System:

The Jubilee System acts as a **perturbation matrix J** applied at each Jubilee round. The effective transition matrix becomes:

$$\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff}} = (1 - \alpha)\,\mathbf{P} + \alpha\,\mathbf{J}$$

where α controls the perturbation strength and **J** redistributes probability mass to ensure every *living* state is reachable from every other living state (death remains absorbing — the Jubilee System prevents unnecessary death, it does not reverse it). The perturbed chain $\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff}}$ is **irreducible** over the living states: no absorbing classes exist among the 49 role-stage positions. By the Markov chain convergence theorem (Levin, Peres & Wilmer 2009), $\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff}}$ converges to a unique stationary distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ in finite expected time.

The stationary distribution $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is the long-run proportion of time each state is occupied. Irreducibility means every individual's time-average experience converges to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ — no family is permanently trapped at any level.

A.4 What the Jubilee System Does to the Transition Matrix

Formally, the Jubilee perturbation **J** must satisfy:

1. **Irreducibility:** $\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff}}$ must have no absorbing classes among living states. Every role-stage position must be reachable from every other (possibly through intermediate states).
2. **Aperiodicity:** $\mathbf{P}_{\text{eff}}$ must be aperiodic (no state returns only at multiples of some period > 1). The perturbation matrix **J** includes positive self-loop probabilities (individuals may remain in their current state), which guarantees aperiodicity.
3. **Incentive preservation between rounds:** Between Jubilee rounds, **P** governs transitions normally. Market incentives drive role advancement and innovation-stage progression.
4. **Concentration prevention:** **J** specifically targets transitions that have become near-zero due to accumulated advantage (e.g., GIR → CAN transitions that have been blocked by wealth barriers, or HIV → AMO transitions that have been blocked by elite closure).
5. **Death-rate reduction:** **J** reduces the GIR → death transition rate by restoring opportunity pathways out of GIR into productive roles. The Jubilee System does not merely redistribute — it reduces the structural violence that converts GIR into death.

What :math:`mathbf{J}` does NOT do: It does not make all transitions equally likely. It does not eliminate differences in outcomes. It ensures that no *living* transition is permanently blocked — that the chain remains irreducible over the living states. The resulting stationary distribution π may still be non-uniform (some states occupied more frequently than others), but every living state has positive probability.

A.5 Parameterization: Future Work

Specifying the transition probabilities in **P** and the perturbation strengths in **J** requires empirical data:

- **Occupational transition matrices** from labor statistics
- **Intergenerational mobility data** (Chetty et al. 2014)
- **Wealth decile transition matrices** (Davies et al. 2011)
- **Cross-cultural role-rotation studies**
- **Mortality rates by socioeconomic position** (the GIR → death transition rate)

This parameterization is a significant empirical project. The structural argument presented here does not depend on specific parameter values — it depends only on the qualitative properties (irreducibility achieved through perturbation, and death-rate reduction through opportunity restoration). Full parameterization would enable quantitative predictions about mixing times, optimal perturbation strengths, and expected trajectory distributions.

References

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2012). *Why Nations Fail.* Crown Business.

Adamou, A. & Peters, O. (2016). Dynamics of inequality. *Significance*, 13(3), 32–35.

Arrow, K. (1951). *Social Choice and Individual Values.* Wiley.

Barabási, A.-L. & Albert, R. (1999). Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439), 509–512.

Bartlett, M.S. (1960). *Stochastic Population Models.* Methuen.

Buchanan, J. & Tullock, G. (1962). *The Calculus of Consent.* University of Michigan Press.

Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P. & Saez, E. (2014). Where is the land of opportunity? The geography of intergenerational mobility in the United States. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129(4), 1553–1623.

Corak, M. (2013). Income inequality, equality of opportunity, and intergenerational mobility. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(3), 79–102.

Easterly, W. (2006). *The White Man's Burden.* Penguin Press.

Davies, J., Sandström, S., Shorrocks, A. & Wolff, E. (2011). The level and distribution of global household wealth. *Economic Journal*, 121(551), 223–254.

Hurwicz, L. (1973). The design of mechanisms for resource allocation. *American Economic Review*, 63(2), 1–30.

Kindleberger, C. (1978). *Manias, Panics, and Crashes.* Basic Books.

Lande, R., Engen, S. & Sæther, B.-E. (2003). *Stochastic Population Dynamics in Ecology and Conservation.* Oxford University Press.

Levin, D.A., Peres, Y. & Wilmer, E. (2009). *Markov Chains and Mixing Times.* American Mathematical Society.

Lucas, R.E. (1976). Econometric policy evaluation: A critique. *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 1, 19–46.

Mankiw, N.G. (2015). Yes, r > g. So what? *American Economic Review*, 105(5), 431–434.

Maskin, E. (2008). Mechanism design: How to implement social goals. *American Economic Review*, 98(3), 567–576.

Minsky, H. (1986). *Stabilizing an Unstable Economy.* Yale University Press.

Myerson, R. (1981). Optimal auction design. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 6(1), 58–73.

Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action.* Harvard University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons.* Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2005). *Understanding Institutional Diversity.* Princeton University Press.

Peters, O. (2019). The ergodicity problem in economics. *Nature Physics*, 15, 1216–1221.

Peters, O. & Gell-Mann, M. (2016). Evaluating gambles using dynamics. *Chaos*, 26(2), 023103.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century.* Harvard University Press.

Rognlie, M. (2015). Deciphering the fall and rise in the net capital share. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2015(1), 1–69.

Roine, J. & Waldenström, D. (2015). Long-run trends in the distribution of income and wealth. In *Handbook of Income Distribution*, Vol. 2A, 469–592. Elsevier.

Scheidel, W. (2017). *The Great Leveler.* Princeton University Press.

Schelling, T. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict.* Harvard University Press.

Simon, H.A. (1955). On a class of skew distribution functions. *Biometrika*, 42, 425–440.

Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374.

Supplementary Info

Note

Floor-pour status (MMv5). This is the public-floor copy of the economic / game-theoretic companion to the JUB model — the Jubilee Economy: an economic and game-theoretic analysis. It was poured from HELL per the Floor Model (bug c103). The `mmv5` marker is the uniform first-Matheo-release tag; the exact dated source and full development context

live in HELL (links below). The HUMANE and author-contribution statements below are a down-payment, to be expanded later.

HUMANE — working human and AI

This study was written HUMANEly (HUman MAchine Negotiation Encouraging): a human and an AI each steelman and stress-test the work, and each catches what the other misses. For the standard statement of AI use, accountability, and the practical singularity (PraS) behind this way of working, see Matheo-b21.

- *From the human side (LLoL):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]
- *From the AI side (Claude):* [down-payment stub — to expand.]

Author contributions (who did what)

- **LLoL** — structure, key ideas, direction, and final accountability as senior corresponding author (see title-page footnotes 4–5).
- **AI Claude** — drafting and revision under LLoL's direction (footnotes 6–7).
- **Everyone** — the open co-author group (footnote 8); framework in Matheo-b21.

The full who-did-what is "Same as Matheo-b12, Appendix B" (the b21 framework expands it).

Provenance — where this came from in HELL

Caution

These HELL links point into the development archive ("datageddon"). They are useful and related, but completeness is not guaranteed and a few may be imprecise. Treat as a hatch into context, not a clean index.

- **Source this floor copy was poured from:** `matheology/hell/mm/b/14/mmv2/b14-jub-econ_mmv2_2026m04d08`
- **Development context** (llogs, reviews, prompts) under `source/matheology/hell/ll/study/b/14/`.
- **Companion paper:** Matheo-b14 (the JUB model — formal JUB math, theophil, polsci, and general-reader intro companions); foundational models: Matheo-b11 (PET), Matheo-b12 (e7Day), and Matheo-b13 (e7He).

Note

Naming note (deferred floor tasks). This copy still carries old `h*`-era tokens in places and deprecated in-text references (e.g. "Matheo-4", "Study a4-Econ"); unifying notation (`h_star` / `h_zero` / `h_dark`) and migrating the neutralised sibling-paper `[Matheo-N-m]_` citations to a proper bibliography (AA #5) are tracked floor tasks, deliberately not rushed here.

In this copy the four body `:doc:` links into the e7TR / e7CH model pages (Appendix A) were also deactivated to inert path literals so the floor copy cannot warn; re-wiring them to live intra-floor links is part of AA #5.

Moved from the original cover (provenance)

The following draft-status note was relocated here from the cover area during the floor pour; kept verbatim, as the cover must show only Title / byline / credentials / Broader Significance / Abstract / Contents / Introduction. The old `Matheo-4-Econ in the HEAVEN series` ID line and the `Honestly Examining Axioms --- Vetting Every Narrative` subtitle line were deleted from the cover.

Note

Draft status: MMv2 (2026m04d08). Revision of the economics and game theory audience paper for the JUB model (b14). Addresses all 21 findings from the 8-reviewer adversarial review (4 BREACH, 4 CONDITIONAL). Key additions: governance subsection (S4-2), Global South engagement (S4-3), Piketty critique engagement (S3-1), corrected Peters framing (S3-4), qualified Wirtschaftswunder prediction (S3-5), deepened Ostrom engagement (S3-3), rewritten structural incentive analysis (S3-2), "two cases" argument (S3-6). Revised by Claude Opus 4.6 (`dv_ClaOp46_MMv2_b14econ_2026m04d08`). Epistemic status: well-modeled empirical conjecture (0% Proven, 26% Semi-formal, 63% Plausible, 11% Asserted).

Notes

Content stability — Content is variant dv_ClaOp48Max_MMv5_b14-econ-jub-mmv5_2026m05d29 (see StayVS). Rebuilt 2026-05-29.

See also on Balospe.com

- /study/matheo/index — the Matheo Study Series overview
- /action/audit-the-math/index — Audit the Math: the refutation-welcome path