

ANNEX R

Supplement to PHREVO Framework Paper, Version 1.0

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

PEDAL and the Intellectual Genealogy of PHREVO: A Question That Waited Thirty Years for Its Architecture

*Protection · Education · Development — Latin America, 1996 — The
Diagnosis That Preceded the Framework*

Author

Andres Jimenez

Founder, PHREVO and PEDAL

Date

May 2026

Nature of this document

This annex is the intellectual autobiography of PHREVO's origin. It documents the prior question — PEDAL (Protection, Education, Development), a Latin American social movement framework conceived in 1996 — that gave rise, thirty years later, to the PHREVO architecture. It establishes the genealogical relationship between the two: PEDAL provided the diagnosis and the political commitment; PHREVO provided the architecture that could operationalize them. Neither is complete without the other.

Key distinction

PEDAL is a social movement. PHREVO is a technical framework. This annex documents their relationship without collapsing the distinction. A framework that requires its users to share the movement's politics has misunderstood both. A movement that reduces itself to a framework has lost its soul.

License

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

PHREVO is the tool. PEDAL is the soul. One is the seed. The other is the soil. What the seed needed was not better seeds — it was fertile ground. And what the soil needed was not more ideas about how to grow things — it was a seed with thirty years of accumulated pressure behind it.

R.1 The Question That Did Not Die: 1996 in Latin America

Every intellectual project has a prior question — one that precedes the framework, precedes the methodology, precedes even the vocabulary in which the problem will eventually be named. For PHREVO, that prior question was asked in 1996, in Latin America, in a historical moment that combined the euphoria of recovered democracy with the quiet devastation of the Washington Consensus. The question was: how do communities protect what is theirs when the enemy no longer wears a uniform?

This question had a precise historical context. The military dictatorships that had terrorized Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s had fallen. Democratic forms had been restored. But something was wrong with the restoration. The new order — electoral democracy combined with structural adjustment, privatization, and financial opening — was producing in most countries a version of the same damage that the dictatorships had produced: concentration of wealth, destruction of public goods, subordination of communities to external economic logics, and an educational system designed to produce compliant consumers rather than critical citizens.

The difference was that the mechanism of damage was no longer visible. No military checkpoints. No overt censorship. No disappeared persons (in most countries, most of the time). The subordination now arrived through contracts written in financial English, through debt conditions negotiated in Washington, through technology platforms with terms of service that no one read, and through an educational discourse that told children the only path to a dignified life was individual competition in a market that had already decided who would win.

"In 1996, Latin America was living the illusion of recovered democracy. But something was wrong. Schools continued teaching obedience, not thought. Economies continued extracting, not distributing. Technology arrived from outside, with manuals in English and terms of use that no one read. And the dominant discourse repeated: there is no alternative. This is the only possible path." — Andres Jimenez, PEDAL Foundation Document, 2026

PEDAL — Protection, Education, Development — was born as a response to that question. Not in an office. Not with funding. Not with a business plan. In conversations between people who refused to accept that there was no alternative. Its core insight — that the recolonization of the twenty-first century would arrive not with armies but with debt, platforms, and subordinated education — was a diagnosis that the world would take another two decades to begin articulating.

R.2 What PEDAL Knew in 1996

The intellectual history of social movements is full of instances where the margins of the Global South named a problem before the centers of the Global North had developed the vocabulary to describe it. PEDAL is one of those instances. Its 1996 diagnosis anticipated three arguments that would only become mainstream discourse in the 2010s and 2020s.

This table is not an exercise in retrospective validation. It is a record of intellectual debt. The PHREVO framework did not derive these insights from academic literature — it derived them from the prior experience of PEDAL, which had arrived at them through the specific practice of organizing in Latin America. When Annex H specifies that community data must be owned by communities, it is not citing Zuboff’s Surveillance Capitalism. It is operationalizing something that PEDAL already knew in 1996 from a completely different direction.

R.3 Why PEDAL Did Not Become What It Envisioned

PEDAL did not fail. It paused. The distinction matters.

A failure implies a wrong diagnosis, a bad strategy, or an inadequate response.

PEDAL's diagnosis was correct — the subsequent decades confirmed it. Its strategy — organizing at the continental scale through education, protection, and community development — was appropriate to the problem it named. What PEDAL encountered was not failure but timing: it asked the right questions thirty years before the tools existed to build the answers it envisioned.

Three structural conditions prevented PEDAL from becoming the continental movement its founders imagined:

R.3.1 The Technological Gap

The verification infrastructure that PHREVO deploys — IoT sensors for real-time ecological monitoring, ethical blockchain for tamper-resistant impact records, AI-driven PHREVO-Score calculation, IPFS-based community data sovereignty, Raspberry Pi territorial nodes — did not exist in 1996 in any usable form. The internet was not yet a community organizing tool. Mobile connectivity in Latin America was minimal. The computational cost of the algorithms that PHREVO runs routinely today was prohibitive. PEDAL's vision required infrastructure that simply did not exist.

This is not a trivial observation. Many social movement projects fail not because their analysis is wrong but because the material conditions for their realization have not yet arrived. The movements that survive those gaps — that maintain the diagnosis alive until the conditions exist — are the ones that eventually produce durable change. PEDAL survived its gap.

R.3.2 The Connectivity Gap

A continental movement requires continental communication. In 1996, organizing across Latin America meant physical travel, phone calls, and a postal system that was expensive and slow. The networks that would make PHREVO's Global South research network (Annex J) possible — email, video conferencing, collaborative platforms — were either non-existent or inaccessible to the communities PEDAL sought to organize. The social movements of the Global South that now coordinate across Africa, Asia, and the Pacific through digital infrastructure were, in 1996, isolated from each other by the material cost of communication.

R.3.3 The Economic Architecture Gap

PEDAL's most ambitious aspiration — economies at the service of life, not life at the service of the market — required a positive economic architecture: not just a critique of capitalism but an alternative that could generate and circulate value without reproducing capitalism's extractive logic. In 1996, the tools for this alternative were limited: cooperatives, community currencies, barter networks, solidarity economy. All valuable. None scalable to the continental level that PEDAL envisioned.

The PHREVO-Exchange (Annex E), the MEP currency (Annex L), the RIB distribution mechanism (Annex C), and the Smart Clearing automatic redistribution did not exist as concepts in 1996. The economic architecture that makes PHREVO a system rather than a framework — the machinery that could actually circulate value

according to impact rather than accumulation — required three decades of development in adjacent fields (digital finance, mechanism design, impact measurement, community governance) before it could be assembled.

R.4 The Genealogical Mapping: PEDAL's Three Pillars and Their PHREVO Instruments

The relationship between PEDAL and PHREVO is not one of replacement but of operationalization. PEDAL provided three political commitments. PHREVO translated each into a technical architecture. The following table maps that translation with precision.

R.4.1 Pillar 1: Protection

PEDAL's understanding of protection was specific and non-defensive. It was not about building walls. It was about building sovereignty — the capacity of communities to govern their own resources, knowledge, and futures without requiring external permission. This includes protection from economic capture, from cognitive colonization, from the criminalization of poverty, and from the manipulation of thought.

R.4.2 Pillar 2: Education

PEDAL's conception of education was explicitly Freirean: education as consciousness-raising rather than information transfer, as the formation of collective subjects rather than competitive individuals, as a political act rather than a technical process. This conception is documented in Annex M (The Revolution of Dignity), which identifies Paulo Freire as a foundational intellectual reference of the PHREVO framework.

R.4.3 Pillar 3: Development

PEDAL's most radical commitment was its redefinition of development. Against the development-as-growth model that dominated the 1990s Washington Consensus, PEDAL insisted that development was care: care for territories, for communities, for futures, for the living relationships between people and the places that sustain them. This commitment is the direct ancestor of PHREVO's care economy framework (Annex C) and the Sustainable Depth (SP) lexicographic priority.

R.5 The Epistemological Significance: Why the Origin Matters

An academic framework without a social movement origin is a technical exercise. A social movement without an architectural translation remains, over time, a moral aspiration — powerful as testimony, limited as change. The relationship between PEDAL and PHREVO attempts something more demanding: a framework that carries the political commitments of the movement in its architecture, not in its rhetoric. This distinction has concrete consequences for how PHREVO must be evaluated. The standard academic evaluation of an economic framework asks: are the models internally consistent? Is the empirical protocol rigorous? Does the system produce the outcomes it claims? These are necessary questions and PHREVO must answer all of them — Annex F (RCT Protocol, pre-registered at RIDIE) is the primary instrument for that answer.

But there is a prior question that standard academic evaluation does not ask: whose question is the framework answering? Frameworks that emerge from the Global North, applied to the Global South, carry within them the implicit assumption that the problem to be solved is one defined by Northern institutions (poverty as measured by income, development as measured by GDP, impact as measured by metrics developed in Washington). PHREVO's claim — its most vulnerable claim, and its most important one — is that it answers a question first asked by communities in the Global South in 1996.

PEDAL's origin is not a rhetorical device or a legitimizing narrative. It is an epistemic claim: that the diagnosis of what is wrong with existing economic systems, and the principles that should govern an alternative, emerged from the experience of communities that have lived the consequences of those systems most directly. The architecture came later, when the tools existed to build it. But the question was asked first, by those who needed its answer most urgently.

The Global South is not the periphery of this collapse. It is the laboratory of what comes next. It knew the conclusion before the North began the experiment. PEDAL is the record of that prior knowledge. PHREVO is the architecture that took thirty years to build around it. — Andres Jimenez, The Revolution of Dignity (Annex M)

R.6 The Critical Distinction: What PEDAL Is Not

Intellectual genealogy, handled without care, can become political capture. This annex would be dishonest if it did not name the risks of the PEDAL-PHREVO relationship clearly.

R.6.1 PHREVO Does Not Require PEDAL's Politics

A cooperative in Kenya, a municipal government in the Philippines, a family office in Germany, or a research institute in Senegal can adopt the PHREVO framework without sharing PEDAL's political analysis of Latin American recolonization. The framework's validity does not depend on agreement with its genealogy. The PHREVO-Score's six dimensions are designed to be applicable across political traditions; the Governance Protocol is designed to be neutral between competing conceptions of the good; the exchange mechanism is designed to function in diverse economic contexts.

Any version of PHREVO that functions only for communities that share its founder's political convictions has failed as a framework. PEDAL is the origin. It is not the entry requirement.

R.6.2 PEDAL Is Not PHREVO

The inverse risk is equally real. PEDAL is a social movement with its own life, its own constituencies, and its own forms of action that are not reducible to PHREVO's technical architecture. The PEDAL manifesto's declaration — "We do not answer to governments, corporations, or imperial foundations. We answer to the peoples" — expresses a political commitment that PHREVO, as a framework designed for broad adoption including by governments and corporations, cannot and should not fully replicate.

PEDAL can use PHREVO's tools. But PEDAL's soul is not captured in any tool. The Declaration Continental of PEDAL, reproduced in the companion document to this annex (PEDAL Manifesto, phrevo.org/pedal), exists outside the academic corpus and is not governed by its conventions. It does not cite academic sources. It does not satisfy peer review criteria. It is not designed to. A manifesto that satisfies peer review criteria has become something else.

R.6.3 The Tension Is Productive

The tension between PEDAL's political movement character and PHREVO's framework character is not a problem to be resolved. It is the productive tension that keeps both honest. PEDAL prevents PHREVO from becoming a purely technical exercise that loses contact with the communities it claims to serve. PHREVO prevents PEDAL from remaining a diagnosis without an architecture, a question without an answer.

The framework needs the movement to remember why it was built. The movement needs the framework to be able to build what it imagined. Neither is complete without the other.

R.7 The Thirty-Year Lesson for Frameworks Under Construction

PEDAL's thirty-year pause contains a lesson for PHREVO that this annex would be dishonest not to name directly: the gap between diagnosis and operationalization is measured in decades, not months. The question was right in 1996. The architecture arrived in 2026. Thirty years.

PHREVO is at the beginning of its own gap. The framework exists. The corpus exists. The governance protocol exists. The empirical evaluation protocol is pre-registered. The first pilot is underway. And PHREVO is, by the honest account of its own corpus (see the completeness analysis documented in this project), 60% complete as a system — with the remaining 40% depending on empirical validation, territorial adoption, and the construction of the Global South research network that Annex J describes but has not yet built.

PEDAL's history suggests that this gap will not be closed by writing more documents. It will be closed by the same processes that eventually made PEDAL's question answerable: the accumulation of conditions, the construction of relationships, and the patient persistence of a question that refuses to die because the communities that asked it still need its answer.

"PEDAL did not fulfill itself in 1996. But its question remained. During decades, that question stayed alive. In conversations, in drafts, in frustrations, in the certainty that the diagnosis was correct even though the solution did not yet exist. Today, finally, the question has an architecture." — PEDAL Foundation Document, 2026

The lesson is not patience as passivity. It is patience as the discipline of maintaining the right question alive while working, concretely and continuously, toward the conditions that will make the answer possible. PEDAL maintained the question. PHREVO is building the conditions. Neither is sufficient alone.

References

- Freire, P. (1970). **Pedagogy of the Oppressed**. Herder and Herder.
- Galeano, E. (1971). **Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent**. Monthly Review Press.
- Jimenez, A. (2026). **PHREVO: A Post-Capitalist Economic Architecture for the Global South**. SSRN Working Paper 6614438. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19666941.
- Jimenez, A. (2026). **The Revolution of Dignity: Foundations for a New System (PHREVO Annex M)**. PHREVO Academic Corpus.
- Jimenez, A. (1996/2026). **PEDAL: Protection, Education, Development — A Continental Declaration**. Foundation Document. phrevo.org/pedal.
- Kwet, M. (2019). **Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South**. *Race & Class*, 60(4), 3-26.
- Mignolo, W. (2011). **The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options**. Duke University Press.
- 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.
- Williamson, B. (2022). **Platform EdTech: Advancing the digital transformation of education**. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 47(2), 169-183.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). **The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power**. PublicAffairs.

PHREVO — Annex R — PEDAL: Intellectual Genealogy — SSRN 6614438

PHREVO — Annex R — PEDAL: Intellectual Genealogy of PHREVO — May 2026

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

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

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)