

ANNEX K

Supplement to PHREVO Framework Paper, Version 1.0

SSRN Abstract ID: 6614438 — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941

The Central Thesis: Decision-Making as the Hidden Core of Systemic Failure

Where PHREVO Intervenes — A Full Exposition of the Foundational Argument

Author

Andres Jimenez

Founder, PHREVO — Independent Research Initiative

Date

April 2026

Purpose

Full exposition of the central philosophical-structural argument behind PHREVO, directly from the foundational text. Covers the myth of moral failure, the structural discovery, the four universal decision variables, decisional delay, the common blind spot, the origin of the concept of avoidable suffering, and the exact point where PHREVO enters.

License

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

THE THESIS IN THREE SENTENCES

The problem was not that the world chose its values poorly, but that it never designed well how to decide them. Modern economic systems — capitalism, socialism, communism — failed not because of moral deficiency but because none designed a decisional architecture capable of incorporating human and social impact as a binding prior criterion. PHREVO does not replace these systems. It corrects the decisional structure they all share — at the exact moment, with the exact criterion, before the point of no return.

K.1 The Starting Point: Collapse That Is Not an Exception

We live in a time when damage has ceased to be exceptional and become systemic. Recurring economic crises, environmental collapse, mass human displacement, labor precariousness, mental health deterioration, and the rupture of social fabric do not appear as isolated accidents but as persistent features of the contemporary order. This is not a crisis. It was never one. Calling it a crisis is the first gesture of deception, because the word crisis suggests exception — something that erupts into a healthy system. But the world that is collapsing today was not healthy: it was functioning exactly as it was designed. The contemporary collapse is not a deviation from the path. It is the path.

For decades — centuries, in reality — we were taught to look at the breakdown as a sum of failures: financial crisis, climate crisis, crisis of representation, moral crisis. Each explained in its own compartment, each analyzed as if it had no relation to the others. As if the planet, the economy, politics, and the human body were independent systems. That is the origin error. We were educated to think about the world in pieces because that is how plunder is administered more efficiently. When you fragment reality, you also fragment responsibility. Nobody is guilty of the whole. Nobody answers for the ensemble.

The dominant responses oscillate between two equally insufficient extremes: uncritical defense of the existing system, or the promise of its total replacement by an idealized alternative. PHREVO begins from the conviction that both positions share the origin error: they are formulated at the wrong level of the problem. The question is not which system is correct. The question is why systems so different in their declared values have produced, recurrently, similar patterns of human suffering and ecological damage.

The Global South knew this before. In Latin America, Africa, Asia, collapse did not arrive as surprise. Here the system showed its true face early: eternal debt, extractivism, fragile states, monitored democracies, disposable bodies. While the North spoke of progress, the South was learning to survive. While growth was celebrated, resistance was built here. That is why this framework does not depart from imported theories or abstract models. It departs from the accumulated memory of those who have lived the future before anyone else.

K.2 The Myth of Moral Failure: Why Blaming People Prevents Fixing Systems

When systems fail, we look for culprits. This reaction is understandable: faced with suffering, injustice, or collapse, the human mind needs an identifiable cause. The great economic and social failures of modernity are typically explained as moral deviations: greed in capitalism, authoritarianism in socialism, dogmatism in communism. The narrative is reassuring because it preserves a dangerous illusion: that the system itself was correct and only the people who administered it failed.

This explanation, while emotionally satisfying, is structurally insufficient. The problem is not that systems were "betrayed" by immoral actors, but that they were designed in such a way that even well-intentioned actors end up producing predictable damage. When a system depends on individual virtue not to generate suffering, it is not a robust system: it is a fragile bet against human nature and against the complexity of the world.

The insistence on moral failure also fulfills a precise political function. By reducing collapse to corruption, ambition, or lack of ethics, it avoids questioning the architecture that allowed those behaviors to have such devastating effects. The system remains safe; individuals bear the guilt. This logic repeats itself again and again in financial crises, environmental collapses, institutional abuses, and humanitarian disasters. Some visible responsible parties are punished, cosmetic reforms are promised, and the decision-making mechanism that produced the damage remains intact.

K.2.1 The Comfort of Personal Guilt

Explaining collapse as moral failure is emotionally effective. It allows us to be indignant without being too uncomfortable. It authorizes us to believe the problem would be solved with better people: more honest leaders, more conscious entrepreneurs, more empathetic bureaucrats. It offers a simple exit: change the actors without changing the script. But history insists on ruining that consolation. Again and again, people with genuine convictions enter systems promising to do things differently. And again and again, the result ends up being unsettlingly similar: concentration of power, late decisions, normalized social damage, lives converted into costs.

There is a powerful figure at the heart of this narrative: the virtuous manager. The honest leader. The conscious entrepreneur. The enlightened technocrat. The person who, supposedly, could make the same system work without producing damage, simply by administering it better. This fantasy fulfills a key political function: it displaces the discussion from design to personality. Not how decisions are made, but who makes them. Not incentives, but values. But historical experience is overwhelming: even well-intentioned people, operating within certain frameworks, end up making decisions that contradict their own convictions. Not from moral weakness, but from institutional survival.

K.2.2 The Repetition That Accuses Structure

If an error occurs once, it may be moral. If it occurs systematically, it is structural. And here an unsettling regularity appears: different systems, with opposed ideologies and incompatible languages, produce surprisingly similar effects. Discourses change, symbols change, declared enemies change, but the pattern repeats: decisions taken far from human impact, damage treated as externalities, suffering converted into secondary variable. This cannot be explained solely by the recurring moral weakness of individuals. It would be statistically absurd. Historically naive. Politically functional.

More plausible — and more uncomfortable — is to accept that there is something in the architecture itself that pushes toward this result. Errors that hurt once exist. And errors that, when they repeat, cease to be errors and become method. The historical repetition of this pattern reveals a shared blind spot. Neither capitalism nor its classical alternatives incorporated social impact as a binding prior criterion of decision. Impact was treated as result, externality, or subsequent correction. When it appeared as a problem, it was already not avoidable, only manageable.

K.2.3 Damage as a Footnote

One of the most perverse features of modern systems is the way they treat damage. They do not deny it. They administer it. Human and environmental impact rarely occupies the center of decision-making. It appears afterward: as a report, as compensation, as a discourse of social responsibility, as a promise of future correction. Damage does not stop the decision; it barely accompanies it. Only when suffering becomes visible, massive, scandalous or politically costly does it become relevant. By then, it is no longer preventable. It is a consummated fact to be managed with words, figures, or excuses.

Every system has a hierarchy, even when it does not declare it. The hierarchy is not visible in the discourses, but in the order of the questions. What is asked first? What is evaluated last? What can wait? In the majority of contemporary systems, the hierarchy is clear: Is it viable? Is it profitable? Is it stable? Is it legal? And only then, if the process advances: Who does it affect? Who does it harm? Who pays the price? When damage appears at the end of the reasoning, it has already lost. It is no longer an error signal, but a datum to manage. It does not interrupt the decision: it accompanies it.

Moral without power is impotent. And power without ethical design is devastating. Not to deny individual responsibility. But to recognize that no system that depends on the constant good will of its decision-makers can sustain itself without producing accumulated suffering. Ethics cannot be a discursive ornament nor a heroic expectation about isolated individuals. It must translate into operational criteria that govern decision-making before damage occurs. When this does not happen, the system can continue proclaiming noble values while reproducing, systematically, unacceptable results.

K.3 Ideologies That Promise, Systems That Repeat: The Convergence

The great economic ideologies of modernity were born as responses to real crises. Capitalism emerged as a reaction to the feudal order; socialism and communism arose in the face of exploitation and alienation produced by industrial capitalism. Each formulated different promises about freedom, equality, efficiency, or justice. However, when we observe their historical trajectories, an uncomfortable fact emerges: despite their doctrinal differences, these ideologies produced surprisingly similar patterns of damage. Not identical. Not equivalent. But convergent. And that convergence is not explained by individual betrayals or conjunctural errors. It is explained by something deeper: the place where promises become decisions.

K.3.1 Capitalism: Efficiency That Displaces Damage

Contemporary capitalism organizes itself around clear and coherent criteria: efficiency, profitability, growth, value maximization. These criteria have permitted unprecedented levels of innovation, production, and material complexity. But every criterion organizes a hierarchy. And in that hierarchy, human and ecological impact rarely occupies first place. Damage is not ignored: it is externalized. Not denied: it is accounted as a cost. Not invisible: it is postponed. While a decision is profitable, viable, and legal, it can advance. The suffering it produces will be managed afterward: with compensations, with discourses, with social responsibility, with promises of future growth. The logic is not perverse. It is consistent. And precisely for that reason it is dangerous. Because when the system functions well according to its own criteria, it can produce massive damage without considering itself in error.

K.3.2 Socialism and Communism: Justice That Silences Correction

Historical socialist and communist experiences departed from radically different values: not market efficiency but emancipation, not individual growth but collective equality. However, when translated into systems, they faced the same dilemma: how to decide at large scale under scarcity, conflict, and urgency. The answer was centralization. Hierarchical apparatuses. Planning from above. The coherence of the plan became the criterion. Doctrinal fidelity became the guarantee. In this framework, damage did not disappear. It changed name. It was called necessary sacrifice. Temporary deviation. Cost of transition. External threat. When the real impact of decisions began to hurt, it could no longer be corrected without putting the entire system in question. The feedback circuit was annulled. Critique became treason.

K.3.3 The Common Blind Spot

Here appears the core of the problem: neither capitalism nor its classical alternatives incorporated human impact as a binding prior criterion of decision. Impact was treated as result. As externality. As a subsequent problem. Never as an early signal of error. That is why systems react late in the face of health crises,

environmental collapses, human displacements, labor precariousness. Not because there is no information, but because that information does not have decisional power. Damage only matters when it threatens the stability of the system. In the meantime, it can accumulate.

This blind spot worsens when ideologies defend themselves. Against damage, capitalism tends to invoke future growth as compensation; socialism invoked historical justice or the necessity of present sacrifice. In both cases, current suffering is justified in the name of a greater projected good. The decision is displaced toward the future; the damage is naturalized in the present. The promise substitutes for correction.

K.4 Suffering as Ignored Signal: The Informational Argument

In the majority of contemporary economic and political systems, human suffering appears late. Not because it does not exist before, but because it is not recognized as relevant information at the moment of deciding. It becomes visible when it can no longer be ignored: when it reaches media scale, when it threatens institutional stability, or when it translates into crisis. By then, the damage has ceased to be preventable and has become something to be managed.

This document sustains that suffering is not, in the first place, a moral problem or an inevitable tragedy, but an early signal of decisional failure. Like any signal, its utility depends on the moment at which it is interpreted. Heard in time, the system corrects. Systematically ignored, the system collapses or normalizes the damage. The problem worsens when suffering is naturalized. Over time, societies learn to coexist with increasing levels of damage as if they were part of the landscape. We speak of "social costs," "necessary sacrifices," "painful transitions," or "inevitable collateral effects." This language does not describe reality: it anesthetizes it. It transforms error signals into narratives of normality.

K.4.1 The Obsession with Measuring What Is Convenient

Economic modernity developed a sophisticated capacity to measure what it considers valuable: growth, productivity, inflation, profitability, financial risk. However, it relegated human suffering to secondary, fragmented, or retrospective indicators. Poverty is measured after it has formed; illness when it becomes a statistic; environmental degradation when already visible; violence when it erupts. In all cases, the system acts when the signal has ceased to be preventive. This gap is not accidental. The dominant decision criteria were designed to optimize results internal to the system, not to detect emerging damage in real life. Suffering, not fitting easily into metrics of efficiency or ideological coherence, becomes noise.

K.4.2 Suffering as Noise

In every complex system exists a basic operation: separate signal from noise. The signal orients, allows adjustment, guides action. Noise distracts, confuses. So it is filtered. The problem begins when suffering is classified as noise. Not because it is not real, but because it does not fit the dominant decision criteria. It does not contribute clarity to the central objective. It does not optimize. It does not stabilize. It interrupts. And what interrupts is discarded. The first signals of damage almost always appear as complaint. Dispersed claims. Diffuse malaise. Growing discomfort. They do not come ordered, they do not come quantified, they do not come aligned with technical language. So they are dismissed. The system demands hard evidence when suffering still speaks softly. And while evidence is awaited, the damage advances.

The body is the first sensor of error. Before reports, before indicators, before the system recognizes the problem — bodies know. The increase in mental illnesses, the deterioration of community health, collective exhaustion, daily violence: all of that appears long before the system recognizes it as a problem. The system cannot read bodies: it can read figures. And when the figures finally reflect the damage, the message has already arrived too late.

K.4.3 The Perverse Inversion

When suffering is managed instead of prevented, the decisional logic inverts. Decisions are no longer evaluated for their capacity to avoid damage, but for their future promise. The present is sacrificed in the name of a greater projected good. The damage of today is justified by the stability of tomorrow. The present precariousness, by future development. The concrete loss, by the coherence of the system. This inversion explains why policies, investments, and technologies continue to be executed even when their negative effects are evident. The system does not deny the damage: it postpones it. Instead of stopping the action, suffering begins to confirm it. If it hurts, it is because we are transforming. If there is resistance, it is because the change is real. Damage ceases to be a warning and becomes an argument. That is the perverse inversion.

K.4.4 Between Fatalism and Ingenuity

PHREVO proposes recovering the informational value of suffering without falling into dramatism or moralization. For this it introduces a key distinction: not all suffering is avoidable nor is every loss unjust, but a significant part of contemporary damage is. It concerns suffering produced by human decisions that could have been taken earlier, differently, or with different criteria. Predictable damage. Repeated. Normalized. Identifying that margin of avoidability is the first step toward real structural correction. This distinction allows escaping two common traps. The first is fatalism, which assumes suffering as inevitable destiny. The second is naive idealism, which pretends to eliminate all pain. PHREVO situates itself in a more demanding intermediate point: reduce avoidable suffering before damage crosses thresholds of irreversibility. This formulation does not promise perfection; it demands responsibility.

K.5 The Structural Discovery: The Decision as Hidden Core

There is a point in every crisis where explanations are exhausted. Not because words are lacking, but because there are too many. Repeating diagnoses no longer clarifies: it conceals. It becomes elegant noise. The question that follows all the critique is more uncomfortable because it has no easy alibi: where is damage really decided? Not in discourses. Not in declared values. Not in historical promises. It is decided in a much more silent place: the moment of the decision.

The thesis that traverses this section is uncomfortable because it dismantles a deeply rooted belief: that the results of a system depend primarily on its ideology. History shows something else. Systems with opposed values — freedom or equality, market or planning — end up producing similar damage when they decide in the same way. When they prioritize certain criteria, when they postpone others, when they learn late, when they justify suffering in the name of a future promise. It is not the ideology that repeats. It is the decisional architecture.

There is a moment — brief, almost invisible — in which the future changes direction. It does not occur in squares, nor in discourses, nor even in open crises. It occurs in closed rooms, in shared screens, in reports that summarize lives in columns. It occurs when someone says yes, not yet, or let us continue. That moment is the decision.

K.5.1 Decision Is Not a Neutral Act

Modernity achieved something remarkable: making the decision-making process appear almost natural. As if deciding were simply applying objective criteria to a given reality. As if it did not imply choosing between alternatives that affect different bodies, territories, and times. But every decision implies power. And every power implies consequences. Deciding is always deciding for someone and about someone. Even when done in the name of the general interest, of growth, or of stability. The neutrality of the decision is a functional fiction.

The trap of inevitability: "There was no alternative" is the phrase most repeated by systems that do not want to recognize themselves as decision-makers. The economy is invoked, the market, the technique, history, urgency. Speech is in the third person. Nobody decides: it is decided. That impersonality is not innocent. It is functional. It eliminates the question of responsibility and blocks the imagination of other paths. But inevitability is almost always retrospective. The alternatives existed before. Afterward, only their administration remains. Deciding late fabricates inevitability.

K.5.2 The Four Universal Decision Variables

Every economic decision — without exception — is traversed by four fundamental variables. They are not ideological. They are structural. They appear in capitalism, in socialism, in the state, in the market, in the company, in public policy. They are not always named. But they always operate.

--	--	--	--

These four variables do not operate in isolation. They mutually reinforce each other. When those who decide do not bear the consequences, they tend to adopt criteria that minimize their own exposure to risk. When criteria exclude human impact, decisional delay becomes acceptable. When damage is externalized, correction ceases to be urgent. The result is a decisional architecture robust for sustaining the system, but fragile for protecting life. And the most relevant fact: this architecture reproduces itself independently of ideology.

K.6 Decisional Delay and Irreversible Harm: The Temporal Dimension of Power

Decisions are not only defined by what they choose, but by when they do so. In contemporary systems, time is typically treated as a technical variable — deadlines, cycles, calendars — when in reality it is a central ethical dimension. Deciding late is not a simple inefficiency; it is a specific form of producing damage. A large part of contemporary suffering does not come from wrong decisions in content, but from correct decisions taken too late.

K.6.1 The Pedagogy of "Let Us Wait a Little More"

There is a silent pedagogy that traverses economic and political modernity. It is not taught in manuals nor proclaimed in discourses, but it is learned quickly in the practice of power. It is the pedagogy of waiting. Of reasonable postponement. Of the still not that sounds prudent, responsible, adult: "Let us wait a little more." "It is not yet the moment." "More data are needed." "We must let it mature." These phrases are not neutral. They are training devices. They teach tolerance of damage while presenting it as transitory. They educate decision-makers in the idea that not acting is in itself a form of good sense. But this pedagogy does not teach how to care. It teaches how to postpone.

In contemporary systems, waiting is associated with maturity. Acting early is labeled as impulsive. Stopping in time, as alarmist. Whoever proposes braking before the crisis is usually accused of exaggerating, of not understanding the complexity, of putting stability at risk. Thus a culture forms where prestige lies in not rushing, even when rushing is not the problem. The problem is the delay. The pedagogy of "let us wait a little more" converts passivity into virtue and early intervention into suspicion.

K.6.2 Time Is Not Neutral

Time is not a neutral background where decisions occur. It is an active variable of power. Deciding when to act — or when not to — defines the scope of damage as much as the content of the decision itself. Deciding early opens options. Deciding late closes them. The clock does not run equally for everyone. For some, time is margin, expectation, projection. For others, it is urgency, wear, survival. While certain decision-makers can allow themselves to "wait and see what happens," there are bodies that cannot wait without suffering irreversible consequences. This temporal asymmetry is a form of structural inequality. Deciding late is usually a privilege. Bearing the delay is not.

There is another even more powerful form of distance: temporal. Deciding today in the name of a better future. Postponing the impact in the name of a promise. Displacing the cost toward generations that do not participate in the decision. This distance is especially effective because it cannot protest. The future does not vote. It does not strike. It does not appear in current statistics. Thus, damage becomes invisible in advance.

K.6.3 The Fabrication of Inevitability

Paradoxically, systems that delay the decision then generate scenarios of extreme urgency. The lack of early action accumulates pressure until the intervention becomes inevitable and drastic. The final urgency is not spontaneous. It is the result of the prior delay. Thus, the system presents itself as reacting to an emergency

when, in reality, it produced it. The phrase "there was no alternative" is the most powerful phrase of modern power. Not because it is true, but because it closes imagination. It ends the discussion. It absolves whoever decides. It transforms a historical choice into a natural necessity. But that phrase almost never describes the past. It describes the present of whoever has already decided. The alternatives existed before. Deciding late fabricates inevitability.

K.6.4 The Principle of Irreversible Harm

Every significant decision operates on time. However, not all the consequences it produces are equivalent. Some can be corrected, mitigated, or compensated; others, once triggered, do not admit reversal. There exist damages that, upon crossing certain thresholds, cease to be quantitative and become qualitative. They are not "more damage," but a different state of the world. Death, extinction, the loss of fundamental capacities, the irreversible fragmentation of social fabric, and the collapse of ecosystems are clear examples of this type of damage.

PHREVO maintains that every decision that crosses a point of irreversible damage constitutes a serious decisional failure, independently of its collateral benefits. A system that permits irreversible decisions without incorporating that limit in its decisional criterion is designed to produce losses that it cannot repair. The principle of irreversible harm redefines the notion of risk. When the impact is irreversible, probability ceases to be the central factor. Even a low probability of irreversible damage demands a stricter precautionary criterion. Not because the system should be paralyzed, but because the cost of error is no longer correctable.

Death, in this framework, does not present itself as rhetorical tragedy nor as an absolute moral argument, but as an operational limit. It marks the moment when the decision can no longer correct the damage. Similarly, there exist social and ecological deaths: communities that do not recover, territories that do not regenerate, human capacities that cannot be reconstructed. These points of no return are the true ethical limits of systemic design. The central decisional question ceases to be "do we have enough evidence to act?" and becomes "what damage becomes irreversible if we wait longer?"

K.7 From Value to Criterion: Why Values Do Not Govern Systems

Modern economic and political systems are saturated with values. Freedom, equality, efficiency, justice, sustainability, wellbeing. These values are declared in constitutions, government plans, corporate reports, and institutional discourses. However, the persistence of systemic damage suggests a disturbing paradox: the abundance of values has not produced better decisions. The problem is not the absence of values, but their incapacity to govern action.

Values, by themselves, do not decide. They orient, inspire, justify, but they do not operate. In practice, when a decision must be made under pressure, conflict, or uncertainty, values dissolve and other more determining factors emerge: incentives, metrics, deadlines, hierarchies, and perceived risks. It is in that moment — the real moment of the decision — where the fundamental difference between a value and a criterion is revealed.

K.7.1 The Difference Between Value and Criterion

A criterion is an operational filter. It defines what information matters, what alternatives are discarded, and what consequences are considered acceptable. While values express what a society says it wants, criteria determine what it effectively does. This distinction is key to understanding why systems loaded with humanist values can produce profoundly dehumanizing results. Values decorate; criteria govern. In contemporary systems, dominant criteria are usually implicit and difficult to question: profitability, growth, stability, competitiveness, ideological coherence.

Human and social impact, in contrast, rarely reaches that status.

A system is as humane as the criteria with which it decides under pressure — not as the values it proclaims in the abstract, but as the limits it imposes upon itself when those values enter into conflict with power, interest, or urgency.

This gap explains why public debates stagnate. Opposed values are discussed — freedom versus equality, growth versus sustainability — without intervening at the level where damage is produced. The conflict presents itself as irreconcilable when, in reality, the problem resides in the fact that none of those values was translated into binding criteria capable of guiding decision under tension. Without criterial translation, there is no real power.

K.8 Avoidable Suffering: The Operational Definition

Speaking of suffering in the economic and political domain typically generates discomfort. For some, it introduces an emotional charge incompatible with technical analysis; for others, it refers to a moral dimension they consider subjective or imprecise. This discomfort has led to relegating suffering to the terrain of humanitarian discourse or activism, deliberately separating it from structural decision-making. PHREVO maintains that this separation is one of the most costly errors of economic modernity.

PHREVO does not propose an emotional category, but an operational definition that functions as a decisional variable. The objective is not to expand the field of compassion, but to reduce the margin of systemic error. For this, it is necessary to distinguish with precision between inevitable suffering and suffering produced by correctable human decisions.

K.8.1 Three Elements of the Definition

From this definition, avoidable suffering is not an emotional category, but an early signal of decisional failure. It functions as a systemic risk indicator comparable to others that systems already consider legitimate, such as inflation, financial volatility, or political instability. Ignoring this signal is not neutral; it is an implicit choice in favor of other criteria. PHREVO does not propose measuring individual emotions, but evaluating observable impacts on basic human capacities, community integrity, and ecological viability.

K.8.2 The Five Types of Avoidable Suffering

PHREVO distinguishes between types of avoidable suffering not to describe victims, but to identify design failures:

Suffering by decisional abandonment: when no one decides, and inaction produces damage. The most invisible type — it appears as natural when it is structural.

Suffering by delay: when one decides late. The mechanism detailed in Section K.6 — the most common type in contemporary systems.

Suffering by exclusion: when those who bear the impact do not participate in the criterion. The most systematic type — embedded in the four-variable decisional architecture.

Suffering by arbitrariness: when the decision lacks clear criteria and is therefore inconsistent, opaque, and uncorrectable.

Suffering by invisibilization: when the damage is not measured or recognized. The most insidious type — it does not appear in any indicator because the indicator was designed not to capture it.

K.9 PHREVO as Universal Corrective Layer: The Exact Point of Intervention

PHREVO does not seek to replace existing economic systems with a new ideology. It presents itself as a universal corrective layer: a transversal decisional architecture capable of inserting itself in different institutional contexts — capitalist, socialist, mixed, communitarian — to intervene at the exact point where all have failed: the moment, the criterion, and the responsibility of the decision.

This claim requires precision. PHREVO is not agnostic about values: it prioritizes dignity, care, community, ecological regeneration, justice, and technological autonomy. But it recognizes that these values are insufficient if they do not translate into binding operational criteria. A system does not become just by declaring justice as a value. It becomes just by designing mechanisms that cannot advance when justice is violated.

K.9.1 What PHREVO Corrects (The Four Failures)

K.9.2 What PHREVO Is Not

PHREVO operates as a systemic consciousness, not as an ethics committee. The distinction is fundamental. An ethics committee is a subsequent corrective instance, advisory, without veto power over decisions. A systemic consciousness is an architectural component that makes certain decisions impossible rather than merely undesirable. PHREVO designs systems where avoidable damage cannot advance by inertia, not systems where avoidable damage is discouraged by moral appeals. This distinguishes PHREVO from all previous approaches to the social responsibility of economic systems — CSR, ESG, impact investing, conscious capitalism. All of these maintain impact as a subsequent variable: something to measure after deciding, to report, to compensate, to communicate. PHREVO inverts this logic entirely: impact is the prior condition of possibility, not the subsequent communicative consequence.

"PHREVO does not need heroes to be ethical. It eliminates the need for heroism." A system that requires extraordinary virtue from ordinary people not to cause harm is a badly designed system. PHREVO is the attempt to design the system well enough that not causing harm is the path of least resistance, the default choice, the architecture of the normal.

K.9.3 The Exact Point of Intervention

PHREVO enters when the decision exists and asks whether it is still possible to correct it before the point of no return. Its ambition is not totalizing but rigorous: to demonstrate that changing how we decide can transform the result without requiring the imposition of a new ideology. This is not an invitation to believe, but to examine. Not a manifesto, but a conceptual architecture designed to be tested.

--	--

K.10 The Epilogue: The Problem Was Never the Values

The foundational text of PHREVO closes with a sentence that compresses the entire argument: "The problem was not that the world chose its values poorly, but that it never designed well how to decide them."

This sentence contains the complete thesis. The problem is not values: every system of the last two centuries had values, many of them admirable. Freedom, equality, justice, dignity, solidarity, progress — none of these were absent from the declarations, constitutions, and founding documents of the great economic experiments of modernity. The problem is the absence of an architecture capable of making those values operative: binding, verifiable, and correctable.

PHREVO is the answer to that specific problem. Not the answer to "which values should we have?" but to "how do we design systems where our values actually govern decisions, especially when those decisions are difficult, costly, and politically inconvenient?" The future is not predicted. It is decided. Decision by decision, territory by territory, architecture by architecture. PHREVO exists to make the right decisions the designed ones.

The political act of this time is not to propose solutions: it is to name the problem correctly. We are not facing a sum of crises. We are facing the exhaustion of a form of organizing life. While we continue explaining the collapse as a recent error, a correctable deviation, a passing storm, we will continue trapped in the same circle. Changing administrators of the disaster, not the disaster itself. If the error was of origin, the exit must be too.

References

- Escobar, A. (2018). **Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds.** Duke University Press.
- Federici, S. (2012). **Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle.** PM Press.
- Fraser, N. (2022). **Cannibal Capitalism: How Our System Is Devouring Democracy, Care, and the Planet.** Verso.
- Hayek, F.A. (1945). The Use of Knowledge in Society. *American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519-530.
- Jimenez, A. (2026). **PHREVO: A Post-Capitalist Economic Architecture for the Global South.** SSRN Working Paper 6614438. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941.
- Marx, K. (1867). **Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I.** Progress Publishers.
- Mises, L. von (1920/1935). **Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth.** In F.A. Hayek (Ed.), **Collectivist Economic Planning.** Routledge.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). **Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.** Cambridge University Press.
- Poulantzas, N. (1978). **State, Power, Socialism.** Verso.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 215-232.
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). **Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide.** Paradigm Publishers.
- Wright, E.O. (2010). **Envisioning Real Utopias.** Verso.

PHREVO — Annex K — Central Thesis and Decisions as Concept — April 2026

SSRN Abstract ID: 6614438 — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941

Andres Jimenez — hello@phrevo.earth — phrevo.org

Andres Jimenez — PHREVO — phrevo.org — 17

