NA-06 Panarchy: adaptive cycles, revolt and remember across scales

The permanent loss of industrial supply chains and the contraction of state reach necessitate a fundamental reevaluation of how human communities organize, endure, and ultimately collapse. To build a robust theoretical foundation for the third volume of the *THRIVING after the FALL* series, *GOVERNING after the FALL*, it is imperative to move beyond static, equilibrium-based models of governance. The historical and ecological records demonstrate that human systems are not stable architectures; they are dynamic, non-linear, and bound by cyclical constraints. The panarchy framework, developed by C.S. Holling and Lance Gunderson in their 2002 work *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems*, provides the most rigorous heuristic architecture for understanding these temporal and spatial dynamics[1]. By mapping the nested cycles of growth, collapse, and reorganization across different scales of time and space, panarchy offers a precise diagnostic tool. It allows us to determine when governance structures become dangerously rigid, when they fall into inescapable poverty traps, and how a localized collapse at a lower level of social organization can be safely managed if the level above retains the necessary institutional memory.

This exhaustive research report provides a granular analysis of the panarchy framework, its translation into institutional governance by leading resilience scholars, and the fierce critiques leveled against it by political ecologists who warn of its blindness to power asymmetries. It then rigorously evaluates four distinct historical and theoretical governance arrangements through the lens of post-collapse viability. Each arrangement is subjected to a strict analytical separation of participants' claims versus the historical record, a comprehensive Scale Ledger quantifying its viability across eight rungs of human organization, and a Dark Triad Capture Test to evaluate its vulnerability to individuals exhibiting narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy.

1. The Mechanics of the Panarchy Framework

At the core of the panarchy framework is the adaptive cycle, a heuristic model detailing how social-ecological systems evolve through the dynamic tension between the generation of novelty and the optimization of efficiency[1]. Unlike traditional ecological or economic models that assume systems naturally settle into a single stable equilibrium, the adaptive cycle proposes that systems iterate through four distinct phases. These phases exist within a three-dimensional topological space defined by three variables: *potential* (the accumulated capital, nutrients, or skills available to the system), *connectedness* (the rigidity, density, and strength of internal network interactions), and *resilience* (the capacity of the system to absorb disturbances and reorganize without shifting to a fundamentally different state or identity)[1].

The four phases of the adaptive cycle trace a figure-eight path composed of a slow "front loop" of growth and a rapid "back loop" of destruction and renewal:

1. **Exploitation (r phase):** This is a period of rapid growth, colonization, and resource capture. Early actors or pioneer species capitalize on newly available, unexploited

resources. In this phase, system potential is low but rapidly accumulating, connectedness among actors is low, and resilience is high because the system is flexible and unconstrained by rigid bureaucratic or ecological dependencies[1].

2. **Conservation (K phase):** As the system matures, it becomes highly efficient, dense, and interconnected. Resources and capital are increasingly locked up in established structures, dominant institutions, or climax species. While the system's potential is at its absolute peak, its connectedness also reaches a maximum, causing resilience to plummet. The system becomes rigid, over-optimized for a specific set of conditions, and acutely vulnerable to external shocks or internal anomalies[1].
3. **Release (Ω phase):** The inevitable consequence of the K phase is a rapid, chaotic period of "creative destruction," triggered by a disturbance that exceeds the system's depleted resilience. The brittle, hyper-connected structures collapse, rapidly releasing bound capital and resources. Connectedness plummets instantly, and resilience is temporarily moot as the system loses its defining structure[1].
4. **Reorganization (α phase):** Following the collapse, the system enters a phase of intense innovation, restructuring, and uncertainty. The resources released during the Ω phase are reassembled in novel configurations. Potential is high (as a blank slate of available capital), connectedness is low, and resilience is high, as multiple experimental trajectories compete to establish the next r phase[1].

Pathologies of the Cycle: Poverty, Rigidity, and Dissolution Traps

Systems do not always cycle smoothly; they frequently fall into systemic pathologies or traps that prevent the natural progression of the adaptive cycle. Understanding these traps is vital for post-collapse governance, as they represent the primary failure modes of human organization.

A **rigidity trap** occurs in the late Conservation (K) phase when a social-ecological system becomes hyper-connected, self-reinforcing, and wholly inflexible[1]. While accumulated potential and connectedness are exceptionally high, resilience is dangerously low. In governance, this manifests as an over-bureaucratized state, a rigid caste system, or an over-optimized agricultural monoculture where any minor perturbation threatens total, unrecoverable collapse[9]. Institutions in a rigidity trap suffer from an inability to engage in double-loop learning; they can only apply existing, highly refined single-loop solutions to increasingly novel problems[11].

Conversely, a **poverty trap** occurs in the back loop, when a system loses its capacity to transition from Reorganization (α) to Exploitation (r). In a poverty trap, potential, connectedness, and resilience are all chronically low[1]. The system suffers from a continuous depletion of resources and lacks the capital, trust, or organizational focus required to generate a new growth trajectory[11]. In social systems, this is characterized by a traumatized,

disorganized population that may generate abundant survival ideas but lacks the mechanism to focus resources on a promising trajectory, trapping them in endless, ineffective reorganizations[8].

A third, less commonly cited pathology is the **dissolution trap**, wherein uncontained crises in the Ω phase completely destroy the foundational capital of the system, requiring external intervention to prevent absolute extinction[11].

To quantify the academic focus on these dynamics, a bibliometric analysis by Malmborg, Castell, and Schrenk analyzing $N = 2,177$ academic documents on panarchy revealed that 81% of the literature focuses strictly on the adaptive cycle, while the mechanics of poverty and rigidity traps remain critically under-theorized in empirical settings[1].

Cross-Scale Interactions: Revolt and Remember

The defining feature of the panarchy framework, distinguishing it from a simple cyclical model, is its conceptualization of nested scales. A panarchy is a hierarchy of adaptive cycles operating at different spatial and temporal scales (e.g., a household operating on a daily cycle, nested within a village operating on a seasonal cycle, nested within a bioregion operating on a decadal cycle)[6]. Crucially, unlike traditional top-down hierarchies, control in a panarchy flows in multiple directions through two critical cross-scale vectors:

- **Revolt:** This upward-cascading dynamic occurs when a smaller, faster-moving system enters the Release (Ω) phase, and its localized collapse triggers a crisis in the larger, slower system above it. This is highly probable if the larger system is brittle and stuck in a rigidity trap, allowing a minor localized failure (e.g., a localized crop failure or a minor factional dispute) to overwhelm the entire region[3].
- **Remember:** This downward-cascading dynamic occurs when a smaller system enters the Reorganization (α) phase, and the larger, slower system above it (provided it remains intact in its own K phase) provides the institutional memory, genetic material, and structural templates required to guide and stabilize the recovery of the lower level[3]. The larger system acts as a repository of accumulated wisdom, ensuring the localized collapse does not result in a permanent poverty trap.

2. The Application to Governance Regimes

The translation of the ecological panarchy framework into the realm of human governance and institutional design has been spearheaded by scholars associated with the Resilience Alliance, notably Carl Folke, Brian Walker, David Salt, Ahjond Garmestani, Craig Allen, and David Angeler[4].

Folke and colleagues (2005) established the concept of **adaptive governance**, noting that the history of human ecosystem management is often a tragic cycle of increasing command-and-control that reduces natural variability but inadvertently increases the likelihood of catastrophic spatial failure[15]. Adaptive governance requires polycentric networks, strong bridging organizations, and high social capital to monitor slow-moving ecological variables and

manage resources adaptively[16]. Crucially, Folke argues that a resilient social-ecological system does not simply survive a crisis; it uses the Ω phase as a "window of opportunity" to transform into a more desired state, utilizing social memory to navigate the reorganization[15].

Brian Walker and David Salt (2006, 2012) popularized **Resilience Thinking**, explicitly moving the discourse beyond simple sustainability. They focus heavily on *transformability*—the capacity to actively cross a critical threshold into a new regime when the current ecological, economic, or social structures become untenable[6]. They argue that conventional resource management operates on a pathology of maximizing returns via controlled optimal states (attempting to freeze the system in a permanent K phase). Mathematically, this guarantees eventual, unmitigated collapse by ignoring the systemic necessity of the Ω phase[19].

Garmestani, Allen, and Angeler apply panarchy directly to environmental law, emphasizing that traditional legal frameworks suffer from severe rigidity traps because they assume top-down, static control based on stationarity[6]. Panarchy demonstrates that bottom-up, cross-scale cascading change is inevitable. Therefore, they advocate for **transformative governance**, which differs from adaptive governance by actively seeking to trigger regime shifts in degraded systems[14]. When a system is locked in a poverty trap or an undesirable coercive regime, transformative governance dictates that administrators must purposefully engineer an Ω event—breaking the maladaptive resilience to force the system into a Reorganization phase[14].

3. The Critics: Power, Anti-Politics, and Diminishing Returns

The wholesale importation of resilience and panarchy into the social sciences has provoked severe, highly valid critiques. The foremost theoretical criticism is that panarchy is frequently deployed as a "boundary concept" characterized by vague metaphors and unfalsifiable claims, lacking the empirical rigor required for genuine predictive capacity[22].

More critically, political ecologists and social scientists, led by Paul Nadasdy (2007) and Andrea Nightingale and Muriel Cote (2012), accuse resilience theory of possessing a profound, structural blind spot regarding social power, inequality, and human agency[24]. In ecological terms, resilience is morally neutral; a toxic, highly polluted lake is highly resilient, just as a brutal totalitarian dictatorship is highly resilient. When resilience thinking is imported into governance without modification, it often smuggles in a normative assumption that "resilient" equates to "good"[24]. Nadasdy argues this creates an "anti-politics of resilience" that legitimizes existing power structures and inequalities by framing deeply political conflicts over resource distribution as mere technical issues of system optimization[25].

Furthermore, Joseph Tainter (1988) in *The Collapse of Complex Societies* poses a fundamental challenge to the panarchic assumption that systems can adapt infinitely. Tainter posits that human societies are problem-solving organizations that invest in socio-political complexity to address environmental and social stress. However, this investment eventually reaches a

mathematical point of declining marginal returns[26]. Once complexity costs more metabolic energy to maintain than it yields in problem-solving capacity, the society enters a terminal rigidity trap. Tainter argues that collapse—a rapid, localized simplification of the system—is not necessarily a catastrophe to be managed, but rather a rational, mathematical economizing process when the energy costs of the K phase can no longer be met[26].

To utilize these frameworks for a post-collapse setting, one must aggressively avoid the naturalistic fallacy and the romance of the primitive. Old does not mean good, and small does not mean fair. Traditional, enduring systems are frequently maintained through intense coercion, brutal demographic corrections, and rigid exclusionary boundaries.

4. Evaluated Governance Arrangements

The following section evaluates four distinct historical and theoretical governance arrangements through the strict analytical constraints required for *GOVERNING after the FALL*. Each arrangement includes a separation of historical claims versus empirical realities, a Scale Ledger quantifying its viability across demographic rungs, and a Capture Test detailing its vulnerability to Dark Triad personality traits.

Arrangement 1: The Swiss Alpine Commons (Torbel)

This arrangement is based on Robert Netting's (1981) landmark anthropological study, *Balancing on an Alp: Ecological Change and Continuity in a Swiss Mountain Community*. Netting documented how the villagers of Torbel successfully managed communally owned grazing lands, forests, and alpine meadows in a highly marginal, low-energy environment from the 13th to the 20th century[28].

Analytical Separation:

- **What participants said it did:** The villagers claimed the communal system was a moral and practical necessity for survival. They believed that individual ownership of the high alps would inevitably result in starvation due to the inability of any single household to absorb the risk of localized micro-climatic failures (e.g., an avalanche destroying a single family's pasture).
- **What the record shows it did:** The arrangement successfully maintained the ecological integrity of the Alps for over seven centuries. However, it was not a peaceful, self-regulating ecological equilibrium; it relied on strict, often violent exclusion of outsiders and brutal demographic corrections. For example, in 1532–1533, the Black Death eliminated a massive percentage of the population, which violently rebalanced the population-to-resource ratio necessary to sustain the institution[31].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The Torbel system represents a highly optimized K phase maintained through strict social boundaries and low energy inputs. Its success was predicated on a severe lack of technological disruption and a geographically enforced upper limit on complexity. It proves that longevity requires a stable slow variable (population) relative to a fixed resource constraint.

Scale Ledger: Swiss Alpine Commons	Viability	Reasoning
Household (4–10)	Failed	Far too small to provide the intensive, simultaneous labor required for alpine dairy herding, cheese making, and infrastructure maintenance.
Hamlet (30–50)	Worked	Operated highly effectively as specific user groups (e.g., single-alp consortia) nested within the broader village framework.
Village (150–500)	Worked	The primary unit of absolute success (Torbel population hovered around 300). This scale is perfectly sized for daily face-to-face monitoring, gossip, and severe social sanctioning[30].
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Worked	Operated as loose, slow-moving federations for managing larger watersheds and inter-village border disputes.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Failed	Breakdown of face-to-face trust; transaction costs for monitoring free-riders exceed the value of the alpine cheese produced.
Region (0.5m–5m)	Failed	Failed entirely when regional state markets introduced external energy (fossil fuels) and alternative

		wage labor, breaking the closed-loop interdependence of the village.
Nation (50m–500m)	Untried	Inapplicable to local pastoralism.
Planet (8 billion)	Untried	Inapplicable.

Capture Test: A person exhibiting Dark Triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy) would attempt to capture this system by manipulating the allocation of communal grazing rights. Specifically, a Machiavellian actor would attempt to monopolize the winter feed production on their private valley plots to dominate the summer communal herds, thereby extracting wealth from the commons while externalizing the ecological degradation.

- *Historical cases:* Wealthier families in the Valais region frequently attempted to overgraze the commons by sending excess cattle, leveraging their social status to avoid sanctions.
- *Resisting Capture:* Torbel successfully resisted capture through a strict, mathematically verifiable proportional rule: a citizen could only send as many cows to the communal summer pasture as they could successfully feed through the winter using hay exclusively from their private land[32]. This rigid physical limitation, combined with absolute visual transparency in a 300-person village, made psychopathic hoarding impossible to hide.

Arrangement 2: Polycentric Common-Pool Resource Governance

This arrangement is based on Elinor Ostrom's (1990) Nobel-winning research on how user groups self-organize to govern common-pool resources (CPRs) without state coercion or private property rights[33]. It is evaluated here using the robust meta-analysis by Cox et al. (2010), which tested Ostrom's Design Principles across a sample size of $N = 91$ empirical cases[33].

Analytical Separation:

- **What participants said it did:** Resource users (e.g., Spanish irrigators, Nepali foresters, Japanese inshore fishermen) generally claimed their systems were simply localized, common-sense traditions designed to resolve disputes and ensure everyone received a fair, proportional share of water, timber, or fish.
- **What the record shows it did:** The 91-case meta-analysis proved that polycentric systems operating with well-defined boundaries, graduated sanctions, and collective-choice arrangements vastly outperformed both centralized state management and fully privatized markets in preventing ecological collapse[33]. They achieved higher compliance rates and superior resource conditions compared to top-down government mandates.
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Polycentricity effectively institutionalizes the panarchy

framework[37]. By breaking a large governance system into "nested enterprises" (Ostrom's Principle 8), a failure or Ω phase in one localized node does not cascade to destroy the entire network[38]. The overarching rules act as the "remember" function, allowing local nodes to experiment, fail, and reorganize autonomously[37].

Scale Ledger: Polycentric CPRs	Viability	Reasoning
Household (4–10)	Worked	The foundational unit of resource appropriation and provision.
Hamlet (30–50)	Worked	The optimal zone for intense monitoring and immediate sanctioning.
Village (150–500)	Worked	Highly robust. Groups of this size can afford to hire specialized, local monitors while retaining strict oversight.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Worked	Maintained viability if heavily sub-divided into nested, semi-autonomous zones (e.g., secondary irrigation canals).
Town (15,000–50,000)	Worked	*Only* works if strictly structured as "nested enterprises" (polycentricity), where base units federate upwards into overarching councils[38].
Region (0.5m–5m)	Failed	Centralized state apparatuses at this scale tend to impose uniform rules ("panaceas") that destroy the requisite variety

		of local adaptations, leading to collapse[23].
Nation (50m–500m)	Failed	State ownership of forests in Nepal and India uniformly resulted in massive deforestation compared to local management.
Planet (8 billion)	Untried	Currently theoretically debated for global climate governance, but lacking empirical precedent.

Capture Test: A corporate psychopath would capture a CPR by seeking a position as an external liaison, representative, or official monitor, subsequently manipulating information flows between the local resource users and the nested level above them. Research by Boddy (2011) and Lazreg & Lakhal (2022) demonstrates that corporate psychopaths utilize high "political skill" to mask their exploitative behaviors, allowing them to rise in bureaucratic structures by charming superiors while ruthlessly exploiting subordinates[39].

- *Historical cases:* In government-sponsored REDD+ forest projects in Nigeria and Malawi (Neiland et al. 2005; Russell & Dobson 2011), local elites captured the collective-choice arrangements by exploiting their literacy and connections to state officials, effectively freezing out the wider indigenous participant base and monopolizing the carbon-credit revenues[25].
- *Resisting Capture:* Ostrom's Principle 4A (Monitors must be accountable to the appropriators) and Principle 6 (Low-cost, local conflict resolution) are the primary defense mechanisms[41]. When the community retains the absolute, unmediated right to fire the monitor immediately, the Machiavellian actor loses their structural leverage.

Arrangement 3: The Stationary Bandit

Based on Mancur Olson's (1993) structural-demographic model of state formation, wherein a rational, self-interested warlord ("roving bandit") realizes that settling down ("stationary bandit") to systematically tax a population yields greater long-term wealth than perpetually pillaging and moving on[43].

Analytical Separation:

- **What participants said it did:** Stationary bandits historically justified their rule through claims of divine right, ancestral mandate, or paternalism, asserting they provided sacred protection, law, and order to the peasantry in exchange for justified tribute.
- **What the record shows it did:** The stationary bandit successfully established a monopoly on violence and extracted the absolute maximum possible surplus from the population without triggering mass starvation or out-migration. The historical record confirms they provided public goods (e.g., defense against other bandits, basic property

rights) solely because doing so increased the taxable output of the territory[43].

- **What modern scholarship infers:** This is an "anti-social contract"[44]. The stationary bandit develops an "encompassing interest" in the territory's economic output[44]. In panarchy terms, it represents a highly rigid, top-down K phase governance structure that survives by ruthlessly suppressing localized Ω phases (rebellions) through state violence. According to Turchin's structural-demographic theory, this inevitably leads to elite overproduction and eventual catastrophic collapse when external shocks exceed the state's military capacity to suppress internal revolt[43].

Scale Ledger: Stationary Bandit	**Viability**	**Reasoning**
Household (4–10)	Failed	Insufficient surplus agricultural production to support a non-producing specialist class of violent enforcers.
Hamlet (30–50)	Failed	Populations this small can easily utilize mobility to flee extortion.
Village (150–500)	Worked	The minimum viable scale for a protection racket to transition into early localized warlordism.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Worked	Highly effective scale for surplus extraction; a small retinue of armed enforcers can dominate this population.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Worked	The standard historical scale of feudal baronies and early city-states.
Region (0.5m–5m)	Worked	Scaled successfully through multi-tiered vassalage

		systems.
Nation (50m–500m)	Worked	Scaled through extensive bureaucratic hierarchies, culminating in the modern nation-state's monopoly on violence.
Planet (8 billion)	Untried	Prevented by the geopolitical balance of power and the impossibility of achieving a planetary monopoly on violence.

Capture Test: This arrangement *is* the successful capture of a territory by an individual or faction exhibiting maximum Dark Triad traits. Psychopaths and Machiavellians seek power specifically to exploit it; the stationary bandit is the ultimate, macro-scale manifestation of the corporate psychopath achieving unchecked territorial control[39].

- *Historical cases:* Modern empirical evidence from coltan-mining regions of the Democratic Republic of Congo demonstrates this perfectly. Warlords transition from roving killers to stationary tax collectors strictly when the global price of coltan rises (coltan $136/kg vs. gold $17k/kg). By instituting poll taxes and taxing local consumption, they extract exact, calculated monthly revenues (e.g., $5,644 from beer, $12,666 from cigarettes), demonstrating calculated exploitation rather than benevolence[45]. Furthermore, Bastos et al. (2025) note that modern populist leaders modulate their behavior along the roving/stationary spectrum strictly based on their expected regime length[47].
- *Resisting Capture:* Reversing this capture requires a systemic "Revolt" dynamic—a violent release (Ω phase) that shatters the bandit's monopoly on force. Alternatively, mobility (the ability of the captive population to flee into ungoverned terrain) drastically reduces the bandit's encompassing interest, forcing them to offer concessions[48].

Arrangement 4: Institutional Memory via Lithic Commemoration (Tsunami Stones)

Based on the Japanese practice of erecting stone monuments (*tsunamihi*) to warn future generations of the absolute geographic limits of tsunamis. This represents an attempt to institutionalize traditional ecological knowledge (TEK), particularly heavily implemented after the 869 AD Jogan tsunami and the 1854 Ansei tsunamis[49].

Analytical Separation:

- **What participants said it did:** The erectors of the stones stated they were sacred

warnings intended to protect descendants. The Aneyoshi stone explicitly reads: "High dwellings ensure the peace and happiness of our descendants. Remember the calamity of the great tsunami. Do not build any homes below this point"[49].

- **What the record shows it did:** For several centuries, the stones successfully functioned as a localized, infallible "remember" mechanism, actively preventing construction in the fatal inundation zone. As a direct result of obeying the stone, the village of Aneyoshi suffered zero casualties and zero structural losses during the 2011 Tohoku tsunami, despite run-up heights exceeding 38 meters[49].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Fikret Berkes (1999) in *Sacred Ecology* identifies this as the physical engineering of institutional memory across millennial timescales[50]. However, the framework is highly susceptible to a modern rigidity trap: as technological complexity increased (e.g., the construction of massive concrete seawalls), modern populations discarded the ancient social memory, prioritizing the short-term economic exploitation of coastal land over the deep-time warnings[50].

Scale Ledger: Lithic Commemoration	Viability	Reasoning
Household (4–10)	Worked	Intergenerational transmission of the stone's meaning via family oral history.
Hamlet (30–50)	Worked	Taboos strictly enforced by local elders.
Village (150–500)	Worked	Functioned perfectly when governed by localized social taboos and ancestor veneration (e.g., Aneyoshi).
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Failed	Broke down during post-WWII urbanization. The sheer influx of outside populations diluted the local institutional memory and cultural taboos.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Failed	Economic incentives of coastal industrialization entirely overrode the lithic

		warnings.
Region to Planet	Untried	Irrelevant; the mechanism requires highly localized geographic specificity (the exact high-water mark on a specific hill).

Capture Test: A narcissist or psychopath involved in real estate development or municipal planning would capture this by dismissing the stones as "unscientific" or "superstitious" remnants of a pre-digital age[50]. Leveraging state-funded seawalls as a false guarantee of safety, they justify building highly lucrative coastal property. Because corporate psychopaths demonstrably lack empathy and long-term consequence processing, they gladly externalize the catastrophic risk of a 100-year disaster onto the future buyers of the homes to secure immediate profits[39].

- *Historical cases:* The widespread destruction of Kesennuma and other coastal cities in 2011, where developers and the state actively ignored the local warning stones in favor of engineered seawalls that subsequently suffered catastrophic failure[49].
- *Resisting Capture:* Capture is only resisted when the lithic memory is paired with an unbreakable cultural or religious taboo that completely overrides immediate economic incentives.

5. Collapse and Re-formation: When to Let it Fall

Applying the panarchy framework to the core premise of *GOVERNING after the FALL*: When should a level of governance be allowed to collapse, and what must the level above hold in memory?

A governance level must be actively allowed to collapse (enter the Ω Release phase) when it exhibits the pathology of a rigidity trap—specifically, when its maintenance requires more energy than the system can sustainably generate. This aligns with Tainter's theory of diminishing marginal returns: when the bureaucratic, defensive, or infrastructural costs of maintaining the K phase exceed the metabolic output of the community, the system is mathematically doomed[26]. Attempting to preserve a rigid, energy-starved institution artificially via coercion will only ensure that when the collapse inevitably occurs, it is deeply catastrophic, completely destroying the underlying capital base, and triggering a severe "Revolt" cascade across all scales.

The level above (or the broader cultural matrix surrounding the collapsing node) must hold the "Remember" elements required for the subsequent α Reorganization phase. Crucially, it does not hold the old, rigid institutions or the specific rules of the failed K phase. Rather, it must

hold the *templates* of survival: basic literacy, localized dispute resolution frameworks, seed banks, foundational ecological knowledge (TEK), and accurate calendars[50]. If the overarching system remembers *how* to govern, the lower system can safely disintegrate, clear out accumulated maladaptations, and reform sustainably.

6. Implementability after the Fall

To establish a minimum viable version of polycentric adaptive governance in a post-collapse environment—characterized by the total absence of a state, an electrical grid, and the internet—the following structures must be deployed:

The Household (4 to 10 people)

- **Minimum Viable Version:** Absolute resource pooling, strict skill diversification, and centralized caloric allocation.
- **Needs to Start:** Basic weatherproof shelter, secure and hidden caloric storage, and a shared internal consensus on caloric distribution protocols.
- **First Failure to Expect:** Authoritarian capture. During winter scarcity, the strongest or most violent member may attempt to seize total control of caloric rationing, effectively becoming a micro-scale stationary bandit.

The Village (300 people)

- **Minimum Viable Version:** A Common-Pool Resource (CPR) council directly managing the local watershed, timber allocation, and perimeter defense.
- **Needs to Start:** A shared, accurate physical calendar to coordinate planting/harvesting cycles, a designated physical meeting place (a commons hall), basic literacy to record rules and infractions, and a strict, heavily enforced physical boundary defining who is a member and who is an outsider.
- **First Failure to Expect:** The "Roving Bandit" threat. External raiders, refugees, or disorganized groups will violently test the perimeter before the village's internal defensive institutions fully solidify.

The District (3,000 people / ~10 villages)

- **Minimum Viable Version:** A nested enterprise (federation). Local villages send instantly recallable, mandated delegates to a district council whose authority is strictly limited to mediating inter-village water/land disputes and coordinating mutual defense against large-scale threats.
- **Needs to Start:** Written records of treaties, a neutral meeting ground situated between villages, and a standardized unit of account (e.g., standard grain weight or silver) for dispute restitution and trade.
- **First Failure to Expect:** The "Stationary Bandit" capture. The individual or faction appointed to coordinate district-wide defense will inevitably attempt to monopolize force and demand permanent, non-negotiable tribute from the 10 constituent villages, effectively establishing a coercive feudal state.

7. Summary and Principles

Summary of Robust Findings The panarchy framework empirically demonstrates that

social-ecological systems must cycle through phases of growth, conservation, release, and reorganization; attempting to freeze a governance system in a permanent conservation phase creates a fatal rigidity trap. Adaptive governance requires cross-scale interactions where small, localized systems can experiment and fail, while larger systems provide institutional memory and stability. Elinor Ostrom's polycentric governance provides the strongest empirical model for this, proving across 91 documented cases that nested, locally managed common-pool resources vastly outperform centralized states in preventing ecological collapse. However, any system generating a surplus is acutely vulnerable to capture by actors with Dark Triad traits, who utilize political skill to mask psychopathy and capture monitoring positions to extract wealth. Historically, this dynamic manifests as the "stationary bandit," where warlords establish states solely to monopolize theft and extraction. Resilience itself is morally neutral and can sustain brutal power structures; therefore, post-collapse governance must actively engineer "release" phases to prevent elite capture and must anchor institutional memory in inescapable physical or cultural realities to survive multi-generational decay.

Contested or Open Questions

- Can polycentric governance scale beyond the bioregional level without inevitably centralizing into a coercive, macro-scale stationary bandit?
- Is it possible to design an α (reorganization) phase that systematically screens out individuals with Dark Triad traits, or is psychopathic ruthlessness an evolutionary necessity for group survival during chaotic, post-collapse reorganizations?
- How can a post-industrial society accurately measure the "diminishing marginal returns" of its own institutional complexity before suffering a catastrophic rigidity trap?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Gunderson, L.H., & Holling, C.S. (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems*. Island Press.
2. Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Tainter, J.A. (1988). *The Collapse of Complex Societies*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). "Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 30, 441-473.
5. Olson, M. (1993). "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." *American Political Science Review*, 87(3), 567-576.
6. Netting, R. (1981). *Balancing on an Alp: Ecological Change and Continuity in a Swiss Mountain Community*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Boddy, C.R. (2011). *Corporate Psychopaths: Organisational Destroyers*. Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Nadasdy, P. (2007). "Adaptive Co-management and the Gospel of Resilience." In *Adaptive Co-management*. UBC Press.
9. Berkes, F. (1999). *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management*. Taylor & Francis.
10. Cox, M., Arnold, G., & Villamayor-Tomás, S. (2010). "A Review of Design Principles for Community-based Natural Resource Management." *Ecology and Society*, 15(4).

Principles for Governing After the Fall

- **The Panarchy Principle:** Governance structures that artificially suppress small, localized collapses will eventually suffer a catastrophic, unmanageable systemic collapse across all scales.
- **The Principle of Nested Enterprises:** Large-scale resource governance will fail unless it is built upon a foundation of highly autonomous, self-governing local nodes.
- **The Tainter Principle of Complexity:** Any governance solution that increases institutional complexity will eventually reach a point of negative marginal returns on energy investment, rendering it dangerously fragile.
- **The Principle of Accountable Monitoring:** Any monitoring mechanism not directly accountable to, and instantly recallable by, the local resource users will eventually be captured by Machiavellian actors.
- **The Stationary Bandit Principle:** A monopoly on violence will inevitably extract the maximum possible surplus from a population unless strictly constrained by the population's physical mobility or a credible threat of revolt.
- **The Principle of Institutional Memory:** Ecological and systemic warnings passed across generations will be discarded if they conflict with immediate economic incentives, unless enforced by absolute cultural taboos.
- **The Anti-Politics Principle:** Any framework claiming to optimize a system solely for "resilience" without explicitly defining who benefits and who suffers is masking a power asymmetry.

Works cited

1. Panarchy: ripples of a boundary concept - Ecology & Society, https://ecologyandsociety.org/vol27/iss3/art21/
2. (PDF) Panarchy: ripples of a boundary concept - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363079824_Panarchy_ripples_of_a_boundary_concept
3. Types of learning, with panarchical change as (i) incremental, http://coevolving.com/blogs/learning-panarchical-change/
4. (PDF) Panarchy: ripples of a boundary concept - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347965603_Panarchy_ripples_of_a_boundary_concept
5. Towards Integrating Political Ecology into Resilience-Based ... - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9276/5/4/31
6. Panarchy, Adaptive Management and Governance: Policy Options, https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1048&context=nlr
7. Cross-scale interactions in flood risk management - NTNU, https://www.ntnu.edu/documents/140166/22317808/r%C3%A4s%C3%A4nen_2021_IJDRR2.pdf/466e4461-f5fb-9ec7-2214-8827d67b6f44?t=1620738832234
8. (PDF) Adaptive Capacity and Traps - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/42763644_Adaptive_Capacity_and_Traps

9. Measuring soil sustainability via soil resilience, https://literatur.thuenen.de/digbib_extern/dn059755.pdf
10. Advancing Empirical Approaches to the Concept of Resilience - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/8/9/935
11. Supply chain resilience: an adaptive cycle approach, https://www.emerald.com/ijlm/article/31/3/443/445093/Supply-chain-resilience-an-adaptive-cycle-approach
12. Panarchy Holling | PDF | Self-Improvement | Science & Mathematics, https://www.scribd.com/document/150493840/Panarchy-Holling
13. Toward a theory of punctuated subsistence change - PNAS, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1503628112
14. (PDF) Transformative Environmental Governance - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309579924_Transformative_Environmental_Governance
15. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems - Slunik, https://slunik.slu.se/kursfiler/LU0058/20069.1112/Folke_et.al_2005.pdf
16. Adaptive Governance of Social-Ecological Systems - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228662276_ADAPTIVE_GOVERNANCE_OF_SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL_SYSTEMS
17. Resilience – the good, the bad and the ugly - Sustainability Bites, https://sustainabilitybites.com/resilience-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/
18. Resilience Practice: Building Capacity to Absorb Disturbance and, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Resilience-Practice%3A-Building-Capacity-to-Absorb-Walker-Salt/4849e19c0368487c8516a5cb85dd6e658c04a785
19. Resilience and Thresholds in Ecosystems | PDF | Coral Reef - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/34111320/Resilience-Thinking
20. A Framework for Resilience-based Governance of Social-Ecological, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/256046387_A_Framework_for_Resilience-based_Governance_of_Social-Ecological_Systems
21. Transformative Environmental Governance - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7326237/
22. (PDF) Interrogating resilience: toward a typology to improve its, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303365761_Interrogating_resilience_toward_a_typology_to_improve_its_operationalization
23. Moving beyond panaceas: a multi-tiered diagnostic approach for, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/environmental-conservation/article/moving-beyond-panaceas-a-multitiered-diagnostic-approach-for-socialecological-analysis/F4870A21ED502BB7D9A1784CF2B9E100
24. resilience thinking: lessons for public administration - Academia.edu, https://www.academia.edu/35189823/RESILIENCE_THINKING_LESSONS_FOR_PUBLIC_ADMINISTRATION
25. Working Paper Series - WorldFish Digital Repository, https://digitalarchive.worldfishcenter.org/bitstreams/ec3aaca1-420a-49bd-b258-afa3d5b37827/download
26. A New Interdisciplinary Science Plan for Urban Health and,

https://bcas.edpsciences.org/articles/bcas/full_html/2022/01/bcas2022001/bcas2022001.html
27. Panarchy: Implications For Economic & Social Policy - Resilience.org, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2014-12-12/panarchy-implications-for-economic-social-policy-2/
28. Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons [1, https://dokumen.pub/routledge-handbook-of-the-study-of-the-commons-1nbsped-1138060909-9781138060906.html
29. A farewell to the market! Constructing a Carolingian subsistence, https://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/propylaeumdok/3984/1/Meier_A_farewell_2011.pdf
30. COLLECTIVE ACTION AND COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCE, https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstreams/040dcf7a-92c4-4151-8f52-67f8035ba619/download
31. Smallholders, Householders: Farm Families and the Ecology of, https://dokumen.pub/smallholders-householders-farm-families-and-the-ecology-of-intensive-sustainable-agriculture-9781503622067.html
32. Advantages of Tibetan Fraternal Polyandry | PDF | Marriage - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/543457123/Tibetan-Fraternal-Polyandry-A-Review-of-its-Advantages-and-Break
33. Issues of water management in Albania in light of climate change, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/156486/1/881860077.pdf
34. Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems, https://web.pdx.edu/~nwallace/EHP/OstromPolyGov.pdf
35. (PDF) Are REDD+ community forest projects following the principles, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316203508_Are_REDD_community_forest_projects_following_the_principles_for_collective_action_as_proposed_by_Ostrom
36. Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems, https://wtf.tw/ref/ostrom_2010.pdf
37. Polycentric Systems of Governance: A Theoretical Model for the, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318989317_Polycentric_Systems_of_Governance_A_Theoretical_Model_for_the_Commons
38. polycentric governance of complex economic systems, https://dlc.dlib.indiana.edu/dlc/bitstreams/0a7a52e6-8cf0-42c3-ae20-776095e6fd1d/download
39. Corporate law and corporate psychopaths - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9090396/
40. Moderators and mediators in the relationship between Dark Triad, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/organizational-psychology/articles/10.3389/forgp.2026.1731150/full
41. The social dynamics around shared sanitation in an informal, https://iwaponline.com/washdev/article/9/1/102/65138/The-social-dynamics-around-shared-sanitation-in-an
42. (PDF) Assessing Indigenous Forest Management in Mount Merapi,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374563470_Assessing_Indigenous_Forest_Management_in_Mount_Merapi_National_Park_Based_on_Ostrom's_Design_Principles
43. (PDF) The Stationary Bandit and His Stationary Captives, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336778612_The_Stationary_Bandit_and_His_Stationary_Captives
44. The Stationary Bandit Model of Intellectual Property - Cato Institute, https://www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2017/stationary-bandit-model-intellectual-property
45. STATIONARY BANDITS AND TAXATION IN EASTERN CONGO, http://cpd.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Bandits-or-states.pdf
46. (PDF) State crisis theory: A systematization of institutional, socio, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370120481_State_crisis_theory_A_systematization_of_institutional_socio-ecological_demographic-structural_world-systems_and_revolutions_research
47. The political economy of populism regime length - JP Bastos, https://jpmvbastos.com/files/research/bastos-cachanosky-faintich-2025-populism-regime-length.pdf
48. Frankfurt School – Working Paper Series Roving Bandits in Action, https://d-nb.info/1024173771/34
49. Intergenerational Ethical Issues and Communication Related ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6920231/
50. Remember the Flicking Tail of the Lizard - Open Journal System, https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/pq/article/download/5371/4700/7480
51. (PDF) Evolution of tsunami warning systems and products, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282128495_Evolution_of_tsunami_warning_systems_and_products
52. Indigenous knowledge data management issues and co-production, https://cdnsciencepub.com/doi/abs/10.1139/as-2024-0006
53. The implications of corporate psychopaths for business and society, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229005647_The_implications_of_corporate_psychopaths_for_business_and_society_An_initial_examination_and_a_call_to_arms
54. Dr. Fikret Berkes Publications List - University of Manitoba, https://umanitoba.ca/environment-earth-resources/cbrm-publications-page