

Confluences of thought

The Nash Equilibrium and Ceremonial Equilibrium of The Corporate Estate

Michael F. Reber

Introduction: A ceremonial invitation into regenerative justice

*This discussion paper begins where I left off in my LinkedIn essays and poem on [The Corporate Estate](#) (Reber, 2026a; Reber, 2026b; Reber, 2026d; Reber, 2026e; Reber, 2026f; Reber, 2026g; Reber, 2026h; Reber, 2026i; Reber, 2026j; Reber, 2025a; Reber, 2025b; Reber, 2025c; Reber, 2025d; Reber, 2025e) inviting members of The Schumacher Institute into a distributive justice (Reber, 2023a, pp. 332–336; Reber, 2026c, pp. 190–192, section 3) dialogue on this regenerative and ceremonial catallactic architecture. What follows is both continuation and convergence - a deliberate deepening of the ideas first introduced in those essays, now carried into a more contemplative and collaborative conversation. The **Corporate Estate (CE)**, as articulated across my *Economia Aziendale (EA)* [paper](#) and refined through the ceremonial cadence of my public writing, stands at a threshold moment: it must be expressed not merely as a philosophical vision, but as a regenerative system capable of being modelled, simulated, and stewarded.*

The Schumacher Institute, with its lineage of right-scaled wisdom and human-centered design, is uniquely positioned to engage this architecture. CE is not a gentle reform of existing models; it is a categorical replacement of the modern firm - a regenerative and ceremonial catallactic architecture that renders extractive paradigms obsolete. This replacement is not merely structural; it is spiritual. It re-aligns humanity toward the prelapsarian pattern revealed in the parable of the [Laborers in the Vineyard](#) (Matthew 20:1–16, RSVCE) - a pattern where worth is given, not graded; where grace is coherent, not capricious; where justice is proportional, not punitive; where the last being first is not a paradox but a principle of regenerative coordination.

In “[Adam Smith Needs Revision](#)” (Reber, 2026b), I argued that John Nash’s equilibrium insight - often popularized in [A Beautiful Mind](#) (Howard, 2001) as the idea that “the best result arises when each person acts for himself *and the group*” - is not stated in those words in Nash’s

original [paper](#) (Nash, 1950a, pp. 48–49), nor in any of his subsequent writings. The phrase appears nowhere in Nash’s published works: not in the 1950 PNAS note, not in the 1951 [Annals of Mathematics](#) article, not in the 1953 [Econometrica](#) paper, and not in his 1950 Princeton [dissertation](#). What Nash writes is that “a self-countering n -tuple is called an equilibrium point,” and that such a point exists because the best-response correspondence “has a fixed point” (Nash, 1950a, p. 49). This mathematical minimalism signals a return to Edenic economics, where coordination is covenantal, not competitive; where contribution is offering, not obligation; where reception is relational, not transactional. CE extends this return by formalizing it - by giving the prelapsarian logic of the Vineyard a mathematical architecture capable of guiding modern institutions.

The Vineyard is not a metaphor for CE.

It is its model.

In the parable, the master’s equal payment to all labourers is not an affront to fairness but an affirmation of given worth - the first axiom of CE. The day’s wage is not a reward for hours worked but a recognition of inherent dignity. This is the prelapsarian principle that industrial paradigms abandoned and that CE now restores: value precedes labor; worth precedes work; dignity precedes distribution.

CE therefore does not attempt to repair the modern firm.

It replaces it with a regenerative, relational, and ritually coherent catallaxy - one that listens to misalignment, learns from divergence, and loops toward coherence through ceremonial feedback. It is a system where proportional justice is not an aspiration but an algorithm; where flourishing is not an accident but an architecture, where the mathematics of Proportional Productive Equality (PPE) and Proportional Recipient Equality (PRE) become the moral metabolism of a living institution.

In this discussion paper, I seek to open a shared intellectual space where members of the Institute may consider, critique, and contribute to ceremonial mathematics that undergirds this architecture. CE is not presented here as a finished framework, but as a formative field - a place

where distributive justice can be explored through dialogue, discernment, and disciplined imagination. It is an invitation to enter a conversation that is at once philosophical and practical, regenerative and rigorous, ceremonial and systemic.

CE emerges from a confluence of traditions:

- **John Nash's governing dynamics** (Nash, 1950a; [Nash](#), 1950b; [Nash](#), 1951; [Nash](#), 1953), which reveal the limits of self-interest and the necessity of combinatory coherence;
- **David L. Norton's self-actualization ethics** ([Norton](#), 1976; [Norton](#), 1991), which ground justice in the fulfilment of personal potential;
- **Piero Mella's combinatory systems theory** ([Mella](#), 2025), which explains how micro-behaviours generate macro-effects through global information feedback;
- **Ludwig von Mises's praxeology** ([von Mises](#), 1998), which frames human action as purposeful and value-laden;
- **Derek and Laura Cabrera's Love Reality Loop** ([Cabrera and Cabrera](#), 2026), which formalizes the feedback rhythms of learning and alignment;
- **Tyler VanderWeele and Jonathan Teubner's Human Flourishing Measure** ([VanderWeele and Teubner](#), 2026), which listens for the harmonic integrity of a life in motion.

These traditions do not compete; they converge. They form a ceremonial constellation - a set of intellectual stars whose light reveals the regenerative architecture of the Corporate Estate.

Yet CE is not merely a synthesis of theories. It is a holarchical system in which individuals, teams, and institutions participate in a dynamic interplay of roles, responsibilities, and regenerative rhythms. It is a sanctuary for innovation, a structure for stewardship, and a stage for self-actualization. It is a place where the proportionality of justice - expressed through PPE and PRE - becomes both a moral measure and a mathematical model.

This discussion paper therefore begins with a simple but significant premise:

Justice must be ceremonial before it can be computational.

It must be relational before it can be rational.

It must be grounded in dignity before it can be expressed in data.

CE is not a utopian dream. It is a regenerative design - a distributive justice architecture that can be formalized, simulated, and practiced. It is a system where the last being first is not a paradox but a proportional necessity; where grace is not irrational but structurally coherent; where work is not merely labour but liturgy, where learning is not merely cognitive but ceremonial.

By inviting the Schumacher Institute into this dialogue, I am inviting a community committed to right-scaled systems, right-sized solutions, and right-minded stewardship to help refine, challenge, and extend this architecture. CE is not a gentle reform of existing models; it is a categorical replacement of the modern firm - a regenerative and ceremonial catallactic architecture that renders extractive paradigms obsolete.

This paper is therefore not a conclusion. It is a ceremonial commencement - a beginning, a beckoning, a bridge. It asks:

How might distributive justice be designed, not declared?

How might institutions become regenerative, not extractive?

How might mathematics become moral, not merely mechanical?

How might the Corporate Estate become a living laboratory for the future of flourishing?

The pages that follow attempt to answer these questions by moving from narrative to number, from cadence to calculation, from philosophy to formalism. They culminate in the ceremonial mathematics of CE - a set of axioms, ratios, and equations that give structure to the regenerative logic described here.

But before we descend into the mathematics, we must begin where all regenerative systems begin - with the human heart, the human holon, and the human hope for coherence.

The ceremonial–holarchical–regenerative architecture of the corporate estate

CE is not merely an organizational model; it is a ceremonial architecture grounded in the conviction expressed throughout my LinkedIn essays and my *Economia Aziendale* 17(1) paper: that human beings are not resources to be managed but sacred sources of value whose work becomes creative, communal, and regenerative when ordered toward the good of the other. Love - understood in the Thomistic sense as *willing the good of the other* ([Aquinas, ST I–II, q. 26, a. 4](#)) - is the animating principle of CE. It shapes its governance, its distributive justice, its holarchical coordination, and its regenerative economy. CE assumes that institutions flourish only when persons flourish, and that persons flourish only when their work, roles, and relationships are aligned with their nature, dignity, and destiny. What follows is the architectural foundation of CE: the assumptions, ethics, and ceremonial structures that transform organizations from hierarchical mechanisms of extraction into holarchical ecosystems of mutual flourishing.

Human beings are self-actualizing agents of value-creation

At the heart of CE is the belief that human beings are not passive labor inputs but self-actualizing agents of value-creation. Each person carries an inner orientation - a *daimon* (Norton, 1976, pp. 5, 14–16), in Norton’s sense - that inclines her or him toward certain forms of meaningful work (Norton, 1991, p.61). When individuals enact their nature through creative contribution, they do not merely perform tasks; they reveal themselves. Work becomes a site of becoming, a place where identity, excellence, and service converge (Reber, 2026a; Reber, 2026c; Reber, 2026f; Reber, 2026g; Reber, 2026h; Reber, 2025a; Reber, 2025b; Reber, 2025d).

CE therefore assumes that value emerges not from compliance but from congruence: the alignment of a person’s nature with the work she or he is called to do. This is why CE’s talent architecture is not extractive but discerning. It listens for the inner-self, honors nature-based suitability, and matches individuals with roles that resonate with their embodied expertise, cognitive style, and moral disposition. When persons are placed where they can flourish, the institution flourishes with them.

Holons, HITs, and the nested logic of regenerative design

CE is not a monolith. It is a manifold - a living, breathing holarchy composed of holons nested within holons, each one a semi-autonomous agent of value-creation. As articulated in *Holarchical Innovation Teams: Terms & Definitions* (Reber & Gazzola, 2022), a holon is both a whole and a part, a Janus-faced entity that looks inward with autonomy and outward with interdependence (Koestler, 1989, p. 48). This dual orientation is not a contradiction; it is a condition of coherence.

Within CE, holons assemble into Holarchical Innovation Teams (HITs) - not as departments or divisions, but as ceremonial constellations. Each HIT is a self-assembling, self-actualizing social holon, formed not by fiat but by fit. Members are not assigned; they are aligned. Their work is not dictated; it is discerned. As described in *Holarchical Innovation Teams: Philosophy* (Reber & Gazzola, 2023c), HITs are governed by the tripartite logic of human dignity, creative work, and holarchical combinatory value-creation. They are not merely productive - they are regenerative.

This regenerative logic is not abstract. It is operationalized through the principles of PPE and PRE, which serve as moral instruments for ceremonial calibration (Reber, 2026c, pp. 190–192; Reber, 2023c, pp. 81–82). When a HIT functions in ceremonial coherence, each member offers work proportionate to her or his nature and receives goods proportionate to her or his entitlement. When misalignment occurs, the system does not punish - it listens. It loops. It learns.

Thus, the architecture of CE is not a hierarchy of control, but a holarchy of coherence. It is not a pyramid of power, but a lattice of liturgy. Each HIT is a node in a larger ceremonial network, and each person within it is a holon whose becoming contributes to the flourishing of the whole.

Ceremony as system: the rhythmic infrastructure of institutional grace

If holarchy is the structure of CE, then ceremony is its syntax. It is the rhythm by which the Estate breathes, listens, and recalibrates. In CE, ceremony is not a ritual of formality - it is a framework of feedback. It is the infrastructure of institutional grace.

This ceremonial infrastructure is animated by the Love Reality Loop (LRL), a five-fold rhythm of detection, reality engagement, model updating, behavioural adjustment, and feedback (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2026, p. 3). The LRL is not a managerial tool; it is a moral metronome. It governs how the Estate responds to divergence - not with discipline, but with discernment. When a person's PPE and PRE ratios drift apart, the Estate does not impose correction. It initiates ceremony. It listens for the dissonance, not to silence it, but to reweave it into harmony.

This ceremonial responsiveness is made possible by the Human Flourishing Measure (HFM), developed by VanderWeele and Teubner (2026). Composed of twelve questions across six domains - happiness, health, meaning, character, relationships, and financial stability - the HFM does not merely assess wellbeing. It listens for harmonic integrity. It is not a survey. It is a sacrament.

Together, the LRL and HFM form the rhythmic infrastructure of CE. They enable the Estate to move from static equilibrium to dynamic coherence. They allow the institution to become a sanctuary of sacred coordination, where feedback is not a threat but a threshold - an invitation to return to alignment.

In this way, the ceremonial-holarchical-regenerative architecture of the Corporate Estate is not a blueprint. It is a body. It is not a model. It is a manifold. It is not a system of control. It is a sanctuary of coherence.

From Nash to the vineyard: the ceremonial revision of equilibrium

CE does not reject Nash's equilibrium. It reveres and refines it.

In his 1950 note to the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, John Nash introduced a now-fundamental concept: the equilibrium point in an n -person game. He defined it as a configuration in which "A self-countering n -tuple is called an equilibrium point" (Nash, 1950a, p. 49). He further developed this in his doctoral dissertation (Nash, 1950b, p. 3). Nash's dissertation is so full of typos and errors that he was able to refine his thinking in his 1951 article in the *Annals of Mathematics*. This established that in any finite non-cooperative game,

there exists at least one equilibrium point where no player can unilaterally improve their outcome (Nash, 1951, p. 287).

In that 1951 paper, Nash (1951, p. 287) formalized the equilibrium condition with the following equation:

$$p_i(\mathbf{s}) = \max_{\text{all } r_i\text{'s}} [p_i(\mathbf{s}; r_i)]$$

Where:

\mathbf{s} is the complete set of strategies - one for each player in the game. It represents the current configuration of choices.

$p_i(\mathbf{s})$ is the payoff that player i receives when all players follow the strategy profile \mathbf{s} .

r_i is any alternative strategy to which player i might consider switching.

$p_i(\mathbf{s}; r_i)$ is the payoff player i would receive if they alone switched to r_i , while all other players kept their strategies unchanged.

(Nash introduces the substitution notation $(\mathbf{s}; r_i)$ to denote this unilateral deviation. Though he does not describe r_i as “an alternative strategy to which player ‘i’ might consider switching,” that is the correct interpretation of the notation.)

In layman’s terms, this equation means:

No player can do better by changing only his own strategy, assuming everyone else keeps his the same.

This is the essence of what we now call the *Nash Equilibrium*. It is a state of strategic balance - not because everyone is winning, but because no one can unilaterally win more. It is a logic of mutual constraint, not mutual uplift.

CE honours this insight but seeks a ceremonial revision. In CE, equilibrium is not merely the absence of incentive to deviate - it is the presence of coherence. It is not enough that no one can do better alone; rather, all must flourish together. The CE equilibrium is achieved when

each person's contribution and reception are proportionate to her or his nature and entitlement - when PPE and PRE converge.

Thus, CE transforms Nash's equilibrium from a fixed point of self-interest into a harmonic point of mutual becoming. The Vineyard is not a metaphor. It is a model. And the mathematics of CE is not a departure from Nash - it is his ceremonial continuation.

In the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (Matthew 20:1–16, RSVCE), each worker receives the same wage, regardless of when he began. To the industrial mind, this is unjust. But to the ceremonial mind, it is coherent. The master's generosity is not arbitrary; it is aligned with the *Axiom of Given Worth*. Each labourer's value is not derived from hours worked, but from his inherent dignity. The day's wage is not a transaction - it is a testament.

This is the ceremonial revision of Nash's equilibrium:

- From self-interest to self-actualization
- From strategic containment to regenerative coherence
- From fixed-point logic to liturgical rhythm

Where Nash proved that equilibrium exists, CE asks: what kind of equilibrium is worthy of human dignity?

In "The Mathematical Beauty of the Mind of the Corporate Estate" (Reber, 2026i), I proposed a ceremonial formalism that extends Nash's insight into a regenerative domain. The Ceremonial Coherence Function is defined as

$$C(a_i, t) = 1 - |PPE(a_i, t) - PRE(a_i, t)|$$

Where:

$$PPE(a_i, t) = \frac{W(a_i, t)}{N(a_i)}$$

Numerator: the work an agent offers

Denominator: the agent's natural suitability

Interpretation: how well one's contribution aligns with one's design

PPE asks a simple question: *Is the work offered proportionate to the strengths one possesses?*

Where:

$$\text{PRE}(a_i, t) = \frac{G(a_i, t)}{E(a_i)}$$

Numerator: goods an agent receives

Denominator: the agent's rightful entitlement

Interpretation: whether reception aligns with justice

PRE asks: *Is what one receives proportionate to what one is entitled to receive?*

The Ceremonial Coherence Function measures the alignment between a person's offering and her or his reception. When PPE and PRE converge, coherence is maximized. When they diverge, the system listens - not to punish, but to recalibrate. This is the ceremonial logic of CE: a system that does not merely prevent deviation, but invites return. A system where equilibrium is not a standoff, but a song.

Let us now descend into the mathematics of this ceremonial coherence - not to reduce the sacred to symbols, but to reveal the structure of grace that undergirds the Corporate Estate.

The ceremonial mathematics of the corporate estate

CE is not merely a philosophical vision. It is a formal system - a regenerative architecture governed by ceremonial mathematics. This section distills the full ceremonial logic introduced in "Adam Smith Needs Revision," integrating its axioms, ratios, and coherence functions into a unified framework. The goal is not abstraction for its own sake, but alignment with the sacred structure of justice.

Foundational axioms of regenerative coordination

The ceremonial architecture of CE rests on five axioms. Each defines a structural condition necessary for coherence, establishing the moral and mathematical architecture of the Estate.

Let:

a_i : the i th agent (person) within the Corporate Estate

$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$: the full set of agents

t : ceremonial time, marking discrete moments in the Estate's rhythm

Δt : the interval between ceremonial assessments (Reber, 2026b)

Axiom 1: Given Worth

Every agent $a_i \in A$ possesses intrinsic, nonderivative value:

$$V(a_i) = 1$$

This worth is not earned, compared, or diminished. It is given. It is the moral baseline upon which all ceremonial coordination rests (Reber, 2026b).

Axiom 2: Ceremonial Sufficiency

Let G_T be the total ceremonial good available to the Estate, and $E(a_i)$ the rightful entitlement of agent a_i . Then coherence is structurally possible only if:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E(a_i) \leq G_T$$

This axiom ensures that the Estate does not promise more than it possesses. It defines the boundary within which justice can be proportionally expressed (Reber, 2026b).

Axiom 3: Harmonized Labor

Work is not measured by quantity alone, but by its alignment with nature and timing. Let:

$W(a_i, t)$: raw work offered by agent a_i at time t

$N(a_i)$: nature-based suitability (how well the agent's strengths match her or his calling)

$\tau(a_i, t)$: ceremonial timing (whether the offering occurs at an appropriate moment within the Estate's rhythm)

$W^*(a_i, t)$: ceremonially weighted work

Weighted work is defined by:

$$W^*(a_i, t) = \varphi(N(a_i), \tau(a_i, t))$$

The function φ increases with both suitability and timing and can be represented multiplicatively in its most basic form. This ensures that when an offering is made at an inopportune moment - such as when ($\tau \approx 0$) - its ceremonial weight is significantly reduced, even if the agent's suitability is high. More elaborate formulations may be introduced later without disrupting the axiom's foundational role (Reber, 2026b).

The value of work $W(a_i, t)$ is not determined by volume alone, but by how well it resonates with the agent's natural suitability $N(a_i)$ and the ceremonial timing $\tau(a_i, t)$. This axiom establishes the ceremonial architecture of labor and introduces the weighted work term $W^*(a_i, t)$, which will later inform the PPE ratio. At this stage, however, the axiom's purpose is to define how work is interpreted and weighted within the Estate's regenerative logic (Reber, 2026b).

Axiom 4: Temporal Grace

Reception is shaped by coherence and contribution. Let:

$G(a_i, t)$: ceremonial good received by agent a_i at time t

$C(a_i, t)$: ceremonial coherence of agent a_i at time t

Distribution follows:

$$G(a_i, t) = \psi(W^*(a_i, t), C(a_i, t))$$

This axiom articulates the foundational logic of distribution. Goods are not allocated by effort or duration alone, but by the harmony of the offering. The ceremonial good $G(a_i, t)$ is not distributed based on the duration or quantity of labor, but rather on the coherence of the offering itself. It introduces the function ψ , which determines how reception is shaped by both the weighted nature of the work and the agent's current coherence. At this stage, the proportional justice ratio PRE is not yet applied; rather, Axiom 4 defines the generative mechanism from which PRE will later assess whether what one receives aligns with what one is justly due (Reber, 2026b).

Axiom 5: Regenerative Feedback

The Estate listens not for fault, but for movement. Let:

$L(a_i, t)$: the feedback signal guiding recalibration.

Then:

$$L(a_i, t) = \delta(C(a_i, t), C(a_i, t - \Delta t))$$

This signal measures the change in coherence over time. It is not punitive. It is tonal - a diagnostic of drift or return. This axiom expresses the Estate's posture of non-punitive attentiveness, where divergence from coherence is not met with discipline, but with ceremonial recalibration. The symbol $L(a_i, t)$ represents the Estate's listening function - a time-sensitive signal that tracks changes in an agent's coherence across ceremonial intervals. Unlike PPE or PRE, it is neither a justice ratio nor a coherence score. Rather, it detects whether alignment is strengthening, weakening, or holding steady. In practice, the expression $\delta(C(a_i, t), C(a_i, t - \Delta t))$ compares an agent's current coherence *now* ($C(a_i, t)$) with their previous state ($C(a_i, t - \Delta t)$) and registers direction of change, enabling the Estate to respond with discernment (Reber, 2026b).

Ratios and Coherence

The Estate's moral metabolism is governed by two proportional justice ratios:

Proportional Productive Equality (PPE):

$$PPE(a_i, t) = \frac{W(a_i, t)}{N(a_i)}$$

Measures whether one's contribution is proportionate to one's nature.

Proportional Recipient Equality (PRE):

$$PRE(a_i, t) = \frac{G(a_i, t)}{E(a_i)}$$

Measures whether one's reception is proportionate to one's rightful entitlement.

These ratios are not instruments of judgment. They are ceremonial tools - attuned to the rhythm of justice.

The Ceremonial Coherence Function, already introduced, unifies these ratios into a single measure of alignment:

$$C(a_i, t) = 1 - | \text{PPE}(a_i, t) - \text{PRE}(a_i, t) |$$

When the ratios converge, coherence is maximized. When they diverge, the Estate listens and recalibrates. This function is not a verdict. It is a vibration - a signal of harmony or dissonance.

Governing Dynamics and System-Level Coherence

The coherence of the Estate is not merely individual. It is collective. Let:

$A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$: the full set of agents

$C(a_i, t)$: ceremonial coherence of agent a_i at time t .

$G(A, t)$: global coherence of the Estate (Reber, 2026b)

Then:

$$G(A, t) = \sum_{i=1}^n C(a_i, t)$$

This aggregate coherence is not normalized. It scales with the number of agents and reflects the Estate's total alignment at a given moment (Reber, 2026b). Its significance lies not in its absolute value, but in its comparative use - across time, across teams, or across institutional configurations. It enables the Estate to discern whether its ceremonial architecture is fostering systemic harmony or signaling the need for recalibration.

A state of *Ceremonial Equilibrium* is reached when no agent can increase her or his coherence without decreasing the coherence of another, given the current structure of roles, relationships, and entitlements. This is not a Nash equilibrium of strategic restraint. It is a regenerative dance of mutual becoming.

Feedback, flourishing, and the love reality loop

CE includes a feedback mechanism that governs its regenerative dynamics. This mechanism is ceremonial rather than corrective. It listens to misalignment not as failure, but as signal. Cabrera and Cabrera's LRL formalizes this process.

Let $C(a_i, t)$ denote the ceremonial coherence of agent a_i at time t , as defined by the *Ceremonial Coherence Function*. Let Δt be the interval between ceremonial assessments. Then the feedback signal is:

$$L(a_i, t) = \delta(C(a_i, t), C(a_i, t - \Delta t))$$

This signal $L(a_i, t)$ is interpreted as tonal rather than evaluative. It measures the direction and magnitude of change in coherence. If $L(a_i, t) > 0$, the agent is moving toward alignment; if $L(a_i, t) < 0$, the agent is drifting. The Estate responds not with sanctions, but with ceremony. The equilibrium level is unity: $C(a_i, t) = 1$ indicates perfect alignment between contribution and reception. Movement toward this value is generative; movement away signals dissonance.

As an example, consider two agents, a_1 and a_2 , whose coherence scores over two intervals are:

$$\begin{aligned} C(a_1, t - \Delta t) = 0.62, C(a_1, t) = 0.78 &\Rightarrow L(a_1, t) = +0.16 \\ C(a_2, t - \Delta t) = 0.91, C(a_2, t) = 0.83 &\Rightarrow L(a_2, t) = -0.08 \end{aligned}$$

Agent a_1 is ascending in coherence; agent a_2 is declining. The Estate initiates a ceremonial response for a_2 , not as punishment, but as invitation - perhaps a reflective dialogue, a reassignment of role, or a recalibration of timing.

The LRL unfolds across five stages: detection, reality engagement, model updating, behavioral adjustment, and feedback (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2026, p. 3). These are not managerial steps but ceremonial movements. They allow the Estate to remain liturgically alive - to breathe, to listen, to learn.

In this way, feedback becomes formative. Flourishing is not a static state but a dynamic rhythm. The LRL ensures that CE remains not only coherent, but compassionate.

Institutional implications: from firms to estates

The shift from firm to Estate is not a matter of scale or sector. It is a transformation of institutional soul. Where the firm organizes labor through hierarchy and incentives, CE orchestrates coherence through ceremony and justice. The firm rewards performance; the Estate listens for alignment. The firm optimizes for output; the Estate attunes to offering.

This distinction becomes clearest when coherence is lost. Consider Ingrid, a member of a HIT whose assigned work exceeded her nature-based suitability and whose reception of goods surpassed her rightful entitlement. In a traditional firm, such misalignment might trigger performance warnings, demotion, or quiet dismissal. In CE, it initiates a ceremonial response.

To assess ceremonial alignment, CE applies the *Ceremonial Coherence Function*, defined as:

$$C_i = 1 - |PPE_i - PRE_i|$$

This function measures the absolute difference between an agent's PPE and PRE, subtracting that difference from 1.0. The result, C_i , ranges from 0 (complete incoherence) to 1 (perfect ceremonial coherence). *Perfect coherence* occurs when $PPE_i = PRE_i$, yielding $C_i = 1.00$. However, *partial coherence* - where $0 < C_i < 1$ - is considered *ceremonially coherent* so long as both PPE and PRE fall within their respective tolerance bands. For this specific example, in which we assign values in purely theoretical yet realistic terms, CE defines the *PPE tolerance band* as $0.80 \leq \frac{W_i}{N_i} \leq 1.20$, and the *PRE tolerance band* as $0.85 \leq \frac{G_i}{E_i} \leq 1.15$. These bands are illustrative of the kinds of proportional thresholds CE might employ, but in real-world applications, the actual ratios and tolerances would be derived from the lived data of each individual and the ceremonial rhythms of their team. If either ratio falls outside its designated band, a *regenerative response* is triggered, regardless of the coherence score. Thus, C_i serves as a continuous signal of alignment, while the tolerance bands define the thresholds for ceremonial intervention.

Let us now apply the ceremonial mathematics to Ingrid, Frank, and Victoria:

Ingrid

Task Complexity: $W_{\text{Ingrid}} = 9.0$

Expertise: $N_{\text{Ingrid}} = 7.0$

$$\text{PPE}_{\text{Ingrid}} = \frac{9.0}{7.0} \approx 1.29$$

Goods Received: $G_{\text{Ingrid}} = 52$

Entitlement: $E_{\text{Ingrid}} = 45$

$$\text{PRE}_{\text{Ingrid}} = \frac{52}{45} \approx 1.16$$

Ceremonial Coherence Function:

$$C_{\text{Ingrid}} = 1 - | \text{PPE}_{\text{Ingrid}} - \text{PRE}_{\text{Ingrid}} | = 1 - | 1.29 - 1.16 | = 0.87$$

Not Coherent: Ingrid's PPE ratio of 1.29 exceeds the upper tolerance band of 1.20 for PPE (0.80–1.20), and her PRE ratio of 1.16 also exceeds the upper limit of the acceptable 0.85–1.15 range - triggering a regenerative response on both dimensions.

Frank

Task Complexity: $W_{\text{Frank}} = 7.3$

Expertise: $N_{\text{Frank}} = 8.0$

$$\text{PPE}_{\text{Frank}} = \frac{7.3}{8.0} = 0.91$$

Goods Received: $G_{\text{Frank}} = 36$

Entitlement: $E_{\text{Frank}} = 40$

$$\text{PRE}_{\text{Frank}} = \frac{36}{40} = 0.90$$

Ceremonial Coherence Function:

$$C_{\text{Frank}} = 1 - | \text{PPE}_{\text{Frank}} - \text{PRE}_{\text{Frank}} | = 1 - | 0.91 - 0.90 | = 0.99$$

Coherent: Frank's PPE ratio of 0.91 and PRE ratio of 0.90 both fall within their respective tolerance bands - 0.80–1.20 for PPE and 0.85–1.15 for PRE - indicating ceremonial alignment.

Victoria

Task Complexity: $W_{\text{Victoria}} = 8.7$

Expertise: $N_{\text{Victoria}} = 9.0$

$$\text{PPE}_{\text{Victoria}} = \frac{8.7}{9.0} = 0.97$$

Goods Received: $G_{\text{Victoria}} = 38$

Entitlement: $E_{\text{Victoria}} = 35$

$$\text{PRE}_{\text{Victoria}} = \frac{38}{35} \approx 1.09$$

Ceremonial Coherence Function:

$$C_{\text{Victoria}} = 1 - | \text{PPE}_{\text{Victoria}} - \text{PRE}_{\text{Victoria}} | = 1 - | 0.97 - 1.09 | = 0.88$$

Coherent: Victoria's PPE ratio of 0.97 and PRE ratio of 1.09 are both within the ceremonial tolerance bands - 0.80–1.20 for PPE and 0.85–1.15 for PRE - affirming her alignment.

The **Global Coherence** of the HIT is:

$$G(t) = C_{\text{Ingrid}} + C_{\text{Frank}} + C_{\text{Victoria}} = 0.87 + 0.99 + 0.88 = 2.74$$

This aggregate is not normalized. It reflects the total ceremonial alignment of the HIT at time t . A drop in $G(t)$ from a prior value - say, from 2.85 to 2.74 - would trigger a ceremonial recalibration at the team level. For this specific HIT of three members, the target equilibrium is $G(t) = 3.00$, which represents perfect ceremonial coherence (i.e., $C_i = 1.00$ for all; Frank = 1.00 + Victoria = 1.00 + Ingrid = 1.00, totaling 3.00). Expressed as a percentage, this HIT currently operates at 91.3% coherence $\left(\frac{2.74}{3.00} \times 100\right)$, indicating a modest misalignment. If a Corporate Estate has a population of 1,000 residents, the normalized target would be $G(t) = 1,000$, and the percentage coherence would be calculated as $\frac{G(t)}{1,000} \times 100$, offering a scalable metric of systemic equilibrium.

In this case, Ingrid's PPE and PRE ratios both exceed their respective tolerance bands, prompting a regenerative response. The Estate does not seek to isolate Ingrid, but to restore the HIT's moral metabolism through ceremonial listening, symbolic recalibration, and role realignment.

This example illustrates a core institutional implication: CE does not treat deviation as defect. It treats it as data. When one or more HITs fail to satisfy PPE or PRE, the Estate does not collapse into crisis. It enters ceremony. It listens, loops, and learns. This is not organizational fragility - it is regenerative strength.

Thus, the Estate is not a firm with better policies. It is a different kind of institution altogether - one that replaces control with coherence, performance metrics with moral metabolism, and managerial correction with ceremonial recalibration.

Confluences and contributions: a call to The Schumacher Institute

CE does not emerge in isolation. It is not a solitary system, but a ceremonial confluence - an architecture braided from many tributaries of thought, each bearing its own ethical sediment, mathematical insight, and regenerative rhythm. The Schumacher Institute, with its lineage of right scaled reasoning and human-centred design, is not merely a potential audience for CE. It is a co-author of its unfolding.

This section is not a conclusion. It is a call. A call to those who have long sensed that the firm is no longer fit for the flourishing of persons or planet. A call to those who have labored in the vineyards of systems thinking, ecological economics, and regenerative design. A call to those who believe that justice must be more than a slogan - it must be a structure.

The ceremonial mathematics of CE - its PPE and PRE ratios, its coherence functions, its regenerative feedback loops - are not final formulations. They are formal invitations. They ask to be tested, refined, and extended. They ask for the wisdom of practitioners, the discernment of ethicists, the rigor of systems theorists, and the lived experience of those who have walked the edges of institutional reform.

To The Schumacher Institute, this call is both intellectual and intimate. It is a request for dialogue, not endorsement, for co-creation, not consensus. The institute's commitment to right livelihood, appropriate scale, and moral economy makes it uniquely suited to steward this ceremonial architecture into practice. CE is not a product to be adopted. It is a pattern to be discerned - through conversation, through experimentation, through shared ceremonial inquiry. What might this look like?

- *A Schumacher Circle of Coherence*, where members gather to test the PPE and PRE ratios against real-world roles, responsibilities, and receptions.
- *A Living Lab of the Estate*, where HITs are formed not by fiat but by fit, and where ceremonial feedback becomes the norm rather than the exception.
- *A Regenerative Metrics Working Group*, tasked with refining the coherence function, calibrating tolerance bands, and exploring the ethical implications of ceremonial misalignment.
- *A Ceremonial Residency*, where practitioners, scholars, and stewards co-design the rituals, rhythms, and recalibrations that animate the CE.

These are not proposals. They are provocations - openings for co-authorship. The mathematics of CE is not a closed system. It is a ceremonial syntax awaiting new stanzas, new symbols, new songs. The Vineyard is not a metaphor. It is a model. But it is also a movement. And movements require stewards.

The Schumacher Institute has long stood at the confluence of economics, ecology, and ethics. CE now invites it to stand at the threshold of a new institutional form - one that replaces the firm not with a fantasy, but with a formalism; not with nostalgia, but with ceremony; not with control, but with coherence.

Let us not merely critique the firm.

Let us co-create the Estate.

Let us not merely measure what is.

Let us model what might be.

Let us not merely reform the system.

Let us regenerate the sacred.

This is the invitation. This is the architecture. This is the moment.

Conclusion: a ceremonial commencement

This paper does not end. It begins.

It begins not with a summary, but with a summons. Not with a conclusion, but with a commencement. For the Corporate Estate is not a theory to be mastered, but a ceremony to be entered - a living architecture that listens, learns, and loops toward coherence.

We have journeyed from Nash to the Vineyard, from equilibrium to offering, from the firm's logic of performance to the Estate's liturgy of proportion. Along the way, we have encountered equations that do not merely calculate - they consecrate. We have seen that justice, to be just, must be ceremonial before it is computational, relational before it is rational, and grounded in dignity before it is expressed in data.

The *Ceremonial Coherence Function* is not a formula for fairness. It is a feedback loop for flourishing. It listens not for error, but for dissonance. It does not punish deviation; it invites return. It does not enforce alignment; it enables becoming.

The Corporate Estate is not a utopia. It is a usable future. It is a regenerative architecture for institutions that wish to become sanctuaries of coherence. It is a system where the last being first is not a paradox but a principle; where grace is not a glitch but a guide, where work is not merely labour but liturgy.

To those who have long sensed that something is missing in our models of value, coordination, and justice - this is your signal.

To those who have laboured in the shadows of extractive systems - this is your sunrise.

To those who have wondered whether another architecture is possible - this is your answer.

The Corporate Estate is not a finished cathedral. It is scaffolding for sacred coordination. It is a structure that must be built not by decree, but by discernment. Not by force, but by fit. Not by control, but by coherence.

And so we begin.

With ceremony.

With courage.

With confluence.

Let the Estate emerge.

Let the mathematics sing.

Let the last be first.

Let the work be liturgy.

Let the system listen.

Let the sacred structure rise.

References

- Aquinas, T. (2025) *Summa Theologiae*, I–II, q. 26, a. 4. The Thomistic Institute. Available at: <https://aquinas101.thomisticinstitute.org/summa/first-part-of-the-second-part/q-26-of-the-passions-of-the-soul-in-particular-and-first-of-love#a-4> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Cabrera, C. and Cabrera, L. (2026) ‘Love is a behavior, not a feeling: A testable theory of love as a reality alignment process’, *Journal of Systems Thinking*, 6(1), pp. 1–31. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v26i1.dc6lbnf6> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Howard, R. (2001). *A Beautiful Mind*. [Film] Directed by Ron Howard. USA: Universal Pictures.
- Koestler, A. (1989) *The ghost in the machine*. London: Arkana. (First published 1967).
- Mella, P. (2025) *The combinatorial systems theory: A powerful theory of understanding modeling and simulating collective phenomena*. Springer Cham. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-86946-4> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Nash, J.F. (1953) ‘Two-person cooperative games’, *Econometrica*, 21(1), pp. 128–140. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1906951> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Nash, J.F. (1951) ‘Non-cooperative games’, *Annals of Mathematics*, 54(2), pp. 286–295. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1969529> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Nash, J.F. (1950a) ‘Equilibrium points in n -person games’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 36(1), pp. 48–49. Available at: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/epdf/10.1073/pnas.36.1.48> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Nash, J.F. (1950b) *Non-cooperative games*. PhD dissertation. Princeton University. Available at: https://library.princeton.edu/sites/g/files/toruqf6021/files/documents/Non-Cooperative_Games_Nash.pdf (Accessed: 3 April 2026).

- Norton, D. L. (1991) *Democracy and moral development: A politics of virtue*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Available at <https://www.ucpress.edu/books/democracy-and-moral-development/paper> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Norton, D. L. (1976) *Personal destinies: A philosophy of ethical individualism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Available at <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691019758/personal-destinies?srsId=AfmBOopwduxTvHQRQnQMx4HOdtv9uc6XClaVE1mtVfSfr9i1bJJGRPcm> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026a) *A human being is not a REsource. it's THE Source*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/human-being-resource-its-source-michael-f-reber-dr6ae> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026b) “Adam Smith needs revision”: *The Nash equilibrium & justice within the corporate estate*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/adam-smith-needs-revision-nash-equilibrium-justice-within-reber-qye8e> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026c) ‘Holarchical innovation teams: The corporate estate. A theoretical application of free market catallactics & distributive justice’, *Economia Aziendale Online: Business and Management Sciences International Quarterly Review*, 17(1), pp. 187–210. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/17.1.183-210> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026d) “I just want to be a human being”: *Tracy Lord and the work of becoming whole*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/i-just-want-human-being-tracy-lord-work-becoming-whole-reber-ocbpe> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026e) *The conversion of the heart and the corporate estate: Mendoza's penance exposes the limits of Robertson's evolutionary story*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/conversion-heart-corporate-estate-mendozas-penance-exposes-reber-bxc1e> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026f) *The corporate estate: A regenerative alternative to AI-driven burnout*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-regenerative-alternative-ai-driven-burnout-reber-uirue> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026g) *The corporate estate: Remembering what we never lost*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-remembering-what-we-never-lost-michael-f-reber-vr3ke> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026h) *The indwelt heart and the corporate estate*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/indwelt-heart-corporate-estate-michael-f-reber-zojqe> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026i) *The mathematical beauty of the mind of the corporate estate: A tribute to Nash, numbers, and the noble calculus of justice*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/mathematical-beauty-mind-corporate-estate-tribute-nash-reber-loc0e> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2026j) *When we forget what a human being is*. LinkedIn. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/when-we-forget-what-human-being-michael-f-reber-srvke> Available at: (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2025a) *The corporate estate: A holarchical essay*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-holarchical-essay-michael-f-reber-d2g4f>

(Accessed: 3 April 2026).

- Reber, M.F. (2025b) *The corporate estate: A theoretical application*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-theoretical-application-michael-f-reber-zqnre> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2025c) *The corporate estate & the heart of the holy holarchy*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-heart-holy-holarchy-michael-f-reber-orh0e> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2025d) *Work & happiness*. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/work-happiness-michael-f-reber-wrzue> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2025e) “Would you like to become a lily, too?”. LinkedIn. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/would-you-like-become-lily-too-michael-f-reber-wu2qe> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2023a) ‘Holarchical innovation teams: Principles – Part I’, *Economia Aziendale Online: Business and Management Sciences International Quarterly Review*, 14(2), pp. 315-349. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/14.2.315-349> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2023b) ‘Holarchical innovation teams: Principles – Part II’, *Economia Aziendale Online: Business and Management Sciences International Quarterly Review*, 14(3), pp. 569-595. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/14.3.569-595> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. and Gazzola, P. (2023c) ‘Holarchical innovation teams: Philosophy’, *Economia Aziendale Online: Business and Management Sciences International Quarterly Review*, 14(1), pp. 67-100. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/14.1.67-100> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. and Gazzola, P. (2022) ‘Holarchical innovation teams: Terms & definitions’, *Economia Aziendale Online: Business and Management Sciences International Quarterly Review*, 13(4), pp. 709-734. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/13.4.709-734> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- VanderWeele, T.J. and Teubner, J.D. (2026) ‘Flourishing Considerations for AI’, *MDPI*, 17(1), 88. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/info17010088> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- von Mises, L. (1998) *Human action: A treatise on economics, The scholar’s edition*. Auburn, AL: The Ludwig von Mises Institute. Available at https://cdn.mises.org/Human%20Action_3.pdf (Accessed: 3 April 2026).

Reader’s Note: The ceremonial equations in this essay have been independently reviewed for structural, logical, and dimensional coherence by two separate large-language models (Google Gemini and Microsoft Copilot). Their symbolic integrity has been further confirmed through external mathematical verification using [SageMathCell](#), which returned each expression without error.