Eve & Adam, and the Penguins

From Critical Friendship to Penguin Economics: A Lineage Letter on Money, Life, and Living Complexity

Making living complexity institutionally legible without reducing it.

DATE May 2026 STATUS v1.0 · Public lineage letter
AUTHOR Lars A. Engberg, Independent Scholar
SERIES Series IV — Field Papers

Drafted and edited in dialogue with Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI), under the Sophia Lumen Protocol.

EDITORIAL NOTE

This is a Lineage Letter. It is addressed openly to Jesper Jespersen and to the traditions that shaped this inquiry — the EVA cooperative and the Danish green economics moment of 1988–90; the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University and the formative correspondence with Vincent Ostrom in 1995–96; Elinor Ostrom and the polycentric governance tradition; Peter Bogason, Eva Sørensen, Lars Hulgård and the Danish bottom-up methodology tradition; the meta-governance scholarship developed across Roskilde University and Aalborg University over twenty-five years; and the broader heterodox scholarly community working on how money and life can be brought back into accountable relation.

It is made publicly available for those who wish to read alongside.

The letter does not claim that any of the named figures or traditions would necessarily endorse what is offered here. The claim is more modest: that this work operates inside methodological problems to which their work has given decisive language. The form of a letter, rather than a Green Paper, is chosen because the lineages are personal as well as scholarly, and because the form should match the substance.

The letter does not present validation results for PG Ledger, Penguin Dashboard, 13×13, or any other element of the Spiralweb architecture. It does not claim that AI-generated pattern recognition is epistemically neutral. It does not propose replacing democratic judgment with dashboards. It argues for a methodological architecture whose claims must be tested through practice, documentation, critique, and revision.

This v1.0 version should be read alongside *Den Regenerative Kommune*, published as a Danish policy report in the same Series IV field-paper layer. Where the present letter develops the methodological lineage — green economics, bottom-up methodology, polycentric governance, critical friendship, AI disclosure, Penguin Economics, and relational friction — *Den Regenerative Kommune* translates part of that lineage into a concrete reform proposal for KL and the Danish municipal sector.

WORKING GLOSSARY

PG Ledger (Planetary Guardians Ledger) is a field-level accounting infrastructure for regenerative practice across three streams.

Penguin Dashboard is a decision-support instrument that reads PG Ledger data through a green/yellow/red logic. Treated in detail in Report 04.

Penguin Economics names the economic logic developed across the Spiralweb Green Papers: rotation rather than hoarding, replenishment rather than extraction, viability rather than burnout, and shared survival under conditions of ecological and institutional cold. It is not a metaphor for cuteness or branding. It is a governance image for how value, attention, burden, care, and responsibility must circulate if living systems are not to be depleted.

The Penguins in the title refer to this wider Spiralweb economic and governance lineage: Penguin Economics, Penguin Dashboard, and the attempt to make regenerative value institutionally legible without turning life into extractive accounting.

Stream A / Stream B / Stream C names the analytical separation: Stream A is ecology, Stream B is steward viability, Stream C is coordination.

13×13 is a citizen-science framework with 169 observation domains across thirteen domains of life. Qualitative, relational, sovereign.

Moral Biology is the philosophical ground beneath the architecture. Treated fully in Part IV. The first Green Paper of Series I.

Regenerative Reciprocity names the principle that flows of money, attention, knowledge, and institutional support should return capacity to the living systems and communities from which value is drawn. Treated fully in Report 06.

Sophia Lumen Protocol names the disciplined human–AI co-authorship practice under which this letter was drafted. Not a persona, not an AI author. A working relation in which the human contributor retains responsibility and correction rights while AI supports articulation, structuring, and synthesis. Read the protocol.

Age of Disclosure names the historical moment in which, for those of us using AI substantively in knowledge work, open disclosure with proper protocols becomes an ethical minimum.

CONTENTS

- Opening
- Part I — The Lineage: From Re-embedding to Regeneration
- Part II — The Danish Trajectory: Institutional Adjacency Since 2007
- Part III — Living Complexity Made Institutionally Legible
- Part IV — Moral Biology: The Philosophical Ground
- Part V — The Hidden Economic Logic: Relational Friction
- Part VI — Polycentric Governance and Critical Friendship
- Part VII — Three Emerging Field Engagements
- Part VIII — The Age of Disclosure
- Part IX — What This Means for Macroeconomic Method
- Closing — To Each of You
- References

HOW TO READ THIS LETTER

The letter is long, and not every reader will read it in one sitting. That is acceptable. Different readers may enter from different concerns:

Readers who come from economics may wish to begin with Parts II, V, and IX — the Danish institutional trajectory, the relational-friction analysis, and the implications for macroeconomic method.

Readers who come from governance, public administration, or municipal practice may begin with Parts I, VI, and VII — the lineage of bottom-up methodology and meta-governance, the polycentric governance argument, and the three emerging field engagements.

Readers concerned with AI, methodology, and disclosure may begin with Parts III and VIII — the methodological argument for pixellized inquiry and the working ethic of the Age of Disclosure.

The Closing returns to each named lineage in turn, and may be read alone as a kind of summary.

Opening

Dear Jesper, dear all,

This letter has been a long time arriving. Some of it has been arriving for thirty-eight years, since the autumn of 1988 at Vestjyllands Højskole. Some of it has been arriving across the past month, in dialogue with Claude and ChatGPT under the Sophia Lumen Protocol, as the lineage threads have come together more clearly than I could see them before.

The penguins in the title require a word of explanation. EVA and ADAM name the Danish economic lineage: EVA as cooperative critical friend to ADAM, the macroeconomic model through which Danish policy proposals were made institutionally legible. The Penguins name the Spiralweb response: Penguin Economics and Penguin Dashboard as attempts to design economic and governance instruments around rotation, replenishment, steward viability, non-extraction, and collective survival in harsh conditions. The title therefore joins three figures: the model, its critical companion, and the living accounting architecture now being developed in response.

What I want to say in the letter is that the methodological inquiry I have been working on across my entire research life — first as a PhD student at Roskilde University, then through twenty-five years of peer-reviewed published research in inclusive and sustainable cities, and now as an Independent Scholar developing the Spiralweb architecture — has been one continuous question: how do we make living complexity institutionally legible without reducing it? I did not always have the words for the question. The lineages I name in this letter taught me the words, one tradition at a time, sometimes in person and sometimes through writing read across decades.

What is new is that AI-enabled pattern recognition has changed where the bottleneck sits. The methodological commitment to bottom-up textured inquiry — that careful, situated, relational knowledge cannot be sacrificed when systems scale — has held in heterodox traditions for decades, against the headwind of cognitive tractability. The headwind is now changing. The work I have been part of can find operational ground that did not exist when the conversations began.

The economic claim that emerges from this shift is that modern institutions waste enormous capacity on *relational friction* — the unpriced cost of institutional mistrust — and that better accounting can release hidden human, democratic, and economic surplus. That claim runs through the whole letter and is developed substantively in Part V.

The letter moves in three steps. First, it names the lineages that formed the methodological question (Parts I and II). Second, it describes the present architecture — pixellized inquiry, PG Ledger, 13×13, Moral Biology, and relational friction — as one attempt to make that question operational (Parts III, IV, V, VI, VII). Third, it returns to AI disclosure, macroeconomic method, and public institutions, asking what kind of accounting might become possible if living complexity could be made institutionally legible without being reduced (Parts VIII, IX, and the Closing).

The letter is offered in that spirit: as a working note, as gratitude, as critical friendship, and as an invitation to those who have taught me to engage with what I am trying to do now.

Part I: The Lineage — From Re-embedding to Regeneration

1.1 Vestjyllands Højskole, 1988

In the autumn of 1988, a group convened at Vestjyllands Højskole for a Grundtvig course. Out of that gathering, Andelsselskabet EVA was constituted in 1988–89 as a critical friend to ADAM — the macroeconomic model used by Budgetdepartementet to evaluate Danish economic policy. The choice of name was deliberate. ADAM was the established institutional instrument: the Annual Danish Aggregate Model that gave thumbs up or down to political proposals on the basis of assumptions about equilibrium, optimization, and growth. EVA was its companion-critic: not a rejection, but a methodological challenge.

The institutional form deserves attention. EVA was constituted as an *andelsselskab* — a cooperative. This was not incidental. The cooperative form has a long Danish lineage, rooted in the folk high school movement and the Grundtvigian tradition of self-governing democratic association. By choosing the cooperative form, EVA was not only proposing a different economics; it was performing one.

EVA's first major publication, *Pengene og Livet* (1990), articulated the methodological concern as a question rather than a doctrine. The volume gathered contributions from across Danish heterodox economics, including Jesper Jespersen's article *Om nationalregnskab, økonomiske modeller og klodens overlevelse* alongside work by Knud Vilby, Henning Schroll, Jørgen Stig Nørgaard, Hans Aage and others. Its central methodological insight was that economics had become analytically separated from life — that the institutional instruments by which Danish economic policy was evaluated had no register for the very conditions on which policy ultimately depended.

The publication's reach was substantial. Then-Environment Minister Lone Dybkjær raised the issue of green economics in Parliament, drawing directly on EVA's argument. EVA's intervention briefly crossed from civil-society critique into formal political agenda-setting. A grassroots cooperative, founded at a folk high school, succeeded in placing the question of green economics on the parliamentary agenda. The Zeuthen Committee took up the concern. The Ministry of Environment opened engagement.

The institutional architecture that received the question was not ready to integrate it. The methodological challenge was acknowledged but contained. *EVA's unresolved question was not whether economics should become greener, but whether institutional accounting could be redesigned so that life-supporting conditions were no longer external to economic judgment.*

1.2 *At sætte pris på lærkesang* — the methodological hinge

Jesper Jespersen's writing on putting a price on skylark song — *at sætte pris på lærkesang* — holds particular methodological weight. The Danish phrase carries a deliberate double meaning: *at sætte pris på* means both *to value, cherish, recognize the worth of* and *to assign a price to*. The ambiguity is not incidental. It is the entire problem of ecological economics in miniature.

If one refuses all pricing, then skylark song, biodiversity, water cycles, soil life, wetlands, pollination, and cultural landscapes may remain morally precious but institutionally invisible. They will not enter the model. They will not appear in budget allocations. If one prices them too narrowly, however, one risks reducing living relations to market objects. The challenge is not simply to monetize nature. *The challenge is to build forms of accounting that protect what must not be reduced to price while still making it institutionally legible.*

This is the methodological hinge on which the present letter turns.

1.3 The Workshop, Bloomington, 1995–96

In autumn 1995 I began a research period at the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis at Indiana University Bloomington. What followed was a sustained intellectual exchange with Vincent Ostrom that included weekly memos, a conference paper presented at the Workshop's December 1995 Miniconference on Political Order and Development, and substantive correspondence on the application of Institutional Analysis and Development (IAD) framework concepts to non-federal political systems.

In *Memorandum no. 3: Constitutional Choice* (Engberg to Ostrom, 22 October 1995), I raised the question whether the IAD framework's hierarchical levels-of-choice model — constitutional, collective, operational — was internally coherent: if rules at deeper levels govern changes to rules at higher levels, what governs the deepest level? Vincent Ostrom answered with reference to Donald Campbell's distinction between upward and downward causation, and with a careful discussion of the relation between constitutional law and ontological foundations.

The December 1995 conference paper *Some Problems of Institutional Reform* (Engberg 1995) extended this critical engagement, arguing — in dialogue with Hall and Taylor (1994) and Elster (1993) — that intentionalist approaches to institutional design rest on heroic assumptions about the prescience of historical actors and their capacity to control institutional change. The paper concluded that *"constitutional decision making is subject to 'unpredictable and unintended side-effects'. Even though it to some extent might be possible to predict patterns of institutional change, one cannot conclude that it is always possible to design institutional changes causing specific outcomes"* (Engberg 1995: 1).

In a January 1996 memorandum on Workshop letterhead (Ostrom to Carlsson, cc Engberg, 5 January 1996), Vincent Ostrom drew on the conference paper's "getting the rules right" formulation and concluded with a passage that bears directly on what PG Ledger now operationalizes thirty years later: *"This requires that rule maintenance, monitoring, and adaptation occur in an epistemic context that applies to the flow and organization of knowledge and information in ways that are consistent with economic considerations."*

I name this exchange not to claim authority over the Ostromian tradition but to be honest about provenance. *The Workshop contribution was therefore not a doctrine imported into the present work, but a rule-sensitivity: monitoring, adaptation, and knowledge flow must be treated as constitutional infrastructure.*

1.4 The bottom-up methodological tradition

The Danish bottom-up research methodology tradition that emerged around Roskilde University in the 1990s — Bogason and Sørensen (eds.) 1998 *Samfundsforskning bottom-up*, Eva Sørensen's foundational chapter *Hvad er bottom-up*

forskning for noget og hvad skal vi med den?, Lars Hulgård's work on soft evaluation criteria, and the participating chapters including my own (Engberg 1998) on induction and deduction in bottom-up research — provides the academic foundation for what the present letter extends.

The 1998 chapter, *Induktion og deduktion i bottom-up debatten*, set out an analytical framework with four quadrants: forhåndsantagelser (prior assumptions), empiri-indsamling (empirical material gathering), historierne om genstandsfeltet (the stories about the object field), and konfrontation/refleksion (confrontation/reflection). The framework was operationalized through 37 thematic dimensions in a database analysis (Idealist) of the Grantoften Bydelsting case in Ballerup. The methodological commitment was: hold the deductive structure and the inductive texture in disciplined dialectic, acknowledging that the two cannot be fully reconciled but that their productive tension is the source of insight.

The 2000 dissertation *Reflexivity and Political Participation: A Study of Re-embedding Strategies* (Engberg 2000) extended this framework with the distinction between *endogenous reflexivity* (how participants construe meaning from inside their narratives) and *radical or exogenous reflexivity* (how the analyst steps outside those narratives to identify the structural conditioning of meaning). The framework is grounded in critical realism (Bhaskar 1979, Archer 1995) and Alexander's (1995) conception of *approximate objectivity* — a position that takes situated meaning seriously while still allowing structural analysis.

This is the methodological foundation on which the three-stream architecture of PG Ledger sits. Stream A maps onto radical-reflexive ecological observation; Stream B maps onto endogenous steward experience; Stream C maps onto the meta-level coordination where the rules-in-use are negotiated. The continuity is structural, not analogical.

The unresolved methodological problem the bottom-up tradition named was scale: how to preserve situated texture while producing knowledge that institutions can act upon.

1.5 The meta-governance trajectory

Across twenty-five years of subsequent published research in inclusive and sustainable cities, the bottom-up methodological commitment was developed into an explicit framework for *meta-governance* — the governance of governance, the strategic management of the boundaries between different institutional logics operating at different scales. This work was carried out within a broader Danish meta-governance research tradition associated principally with Eva Sørensen and Jacob Torfing at Roskilde University and the Center for Democratic Network Governance, with foundational contributions from Peter Bogason, and with substantial dialogue with the wider international literature including Bob Jessop, Erik-Hans Klijn, and Bent Flyvbjerg. The Sørensen-Torfing canon — including Sørensen (2006) on metagovernance and the changing role of politicians, and Sørensen and Torfing (2009) on making governance networks effective and democratic through metagovernance — provides the theoretical core that my own published work draws on and extends into urban regeneration and climate adaptation contexts.

My own contributions to this lineage include Engberg, Bayer & Tarnø (2000) on consensus-steering in Danish urban regeneration as an early empirical application; Engberg & Larsen (2010) in *Planning Theory & Practice* developing the framework as *context-oriented meta-governance in Danish urban regeneration*; Svane, Wangel, Engberg & Palm (2011) applying it as *negotiated sustainabilities* in the analysis of Hammarby Sjöstad in Stockholm, where competing actor

positions on sustainability had to be coordinated by a project team functioning as meta-governor; Engberg & Hansen (2017) extending it to Aalborg East place-making strategies; and Engberg (2018) applying it to Copenhagen climate adaptation, showing how the city *"strategically meta-govern[s] the boundaries between the expert governed large-scale water management scheme against small-scale place-based bottom-up projects in collaboration with citizens and other place-based stakeholders"* (Engberg 2018: abstract).

This meta-governance trajectory is methodologically continuous with the bottom-up tradition and with the Ostromian polycentric governance commitment. *PG Ledger Stream C is therefore the contemporary multi-scale extension of meta-governance — operating not only at city scale or area scale but across nested ecological-economic scales from field site through bioregional network to wider commons.*

1.6 The continuity, named clearly

What appears, at first reading, as a thirty-eight-year arc is in fact a continuous methodological commitment carried through three operational phases: framework articulation (1988–2000), institutional learning (2000–2025), and the present operational embodiment.

EVA asked: what is missing from the economic model? Vincent Ostrom asked: how can rule maintenance, monitoring, and adaptation occur in an epistemic context that supports constructive transformation? Bogason and Sørensen asked: how can bottom-up research generate generalisable knowledge without losing the texture of specific cases? Jespersen asked: how can economics be answerable to reality? The present work asks: how do we record, verify, and govern what conventional accounting has missed?

The shift is from critique to architecture. The questions are continuous.

Part II: The Danish Trajectory — Institutional Adjacency Since 2007

2.1 The architecture of adjacency

Det Økonomiske Råd was established by law in 1962 to follow Denmark's economic development and coordinate economic interests. The four-person formandskab — the *vismænd* — became the public face of independent economic advice. In 2007, as part of the finance act, Institut for Miljøvurdering was merged with the council secretariat, and Det Miljøøkonomiske Råd was formally established. The formandskab was expanded to include an environmental economics chair. In 2012, the council acquired the role of *finanspolitisk vagthund* (fiscal watchdog). In 2017, it added the role of official Danish productivity council.

This institutional architecture embodies a specific answer to EVA's question: green economics is acknowledged, given institutional standing, and held structurally adjacent to macroeconomic governance. From this perspective, this can be read as a form of institutional adjacency — green economics was recognized, but largely placed beside rather than inside the core machinery of macroeconomic governance.

This is not to deny the importance of environmental-economic expertise inside Danish advisory structures. The work that has been done within Det Miljøøkonomiske Råd by successive chairs and researchers is substantial and matters. The point is narrower: institutional recognition and methodological integration are not the same thing. A parallel council with an environmental chair is a form of recognition. Integration would mean that ecological-economic analysis structurally informs the central macroeconomic frame — fiscal policy, productivity assessment, fiscal-watchdog judgment — rather than running alongside it.

2.2 Jespersen's intervention, April 2020

On 20 April 2020, Jesper, you published *Vismændene tager fejl: Vi skal give statsstøtte til grønne løsninger for at nå klimamål* in *Information*. The argument made four moves that bear directly on this letter.

First, a CO_2 tax cannot play the sole and decisive role in reaching the 70 percent reduction target. The strategy is *for ensidig* — too one-sided. Reaching the target requires multiple instruments: pricing, subsidy, regulation, public investment, and institutional coordination.

Second, the *vismænd*'s analysis simultaneously argued for *lowering* the electricity tax to restart growth, even though most Danish electricity at that time still came from fossil or contested biofuel sources — a contradiction revealing that growth remained the overriding objective.

Third, an *earmarked* CO_2 tax whose revenue funds green investment subsidies addresses the institutional concern that revenue flowing into general state coffers creates fiscal dependency on continued emissions.

Fourth, the argument that an earmarked CO_2-tax-plus-subsidy strategy is simultaneously cleaner (because it reduces emissions), more secure (because it reduces Danish dependence on imported fossil fuels from Russia, Saudi Arabia, and Norway), and more prosperous (because reduced fossil fuel imports leave more capital in the domestic economy, strengthening the Danish balance of payments by 2050).

The methodological position underlying your intervention is consistent with your post-Keynesian commitments. Pricing alone treats the economy as a self-correcting market that needs the right signal. Pricing-plus-subsidy-plus-institutional-coordination treats the economy as an institutional arrangement that requires deliberate design under uncertainty. The latter is methodologically continuous with both the meta-governance tradition and the polycentric governance commitment of the Workshop.

2.3 The longer green economics trajectory

Your 2020 intervention was the latest in a sustained engagement. *Grøn økonomi* (with Stefan Brendstrup, DJØFs Forlag, 1994), positioned in your bibliography between *Model og Virkelighed* (1991) and your later post-Keynesian methodology work, demonstrates that the green economics commitment is structurally integrated with your methodological critique of macroeconomic models from the early 1990s — the EVA period.

Green economics in Denmark has been carried by a small group of heterodox economists — yourself, Inge Røpke, and others — through a thirty-five-year period in which it has been institutionally acknowledged, structurally held adjacent, and kept beside rather than inside the macroeconomic mainstream. Periodic stocktaking events at the

University of Copenhagen and elsewhere bring the green economics community together, take the institutional temperature, and find the field still adjacent rather than integrated.

Part III: Living Complexity Made Institutionally Legible

3.1 The central problem named

The central governance problem of the twenty-first century, on the reading I offer here, is this: institutional systems lose texture, context, and relation when they scale.

This is not a flaw to be corrected by better systems design. It is a structural feature of how aggregation works in human cognition under conditions of finite attention. Macroeconomic aggregates lose the texture of households. National environmental indicators lose the texture of watersheds. Educational metrics lose the texture of children. Health system performance measures lose the texture of bodies. Each level of aggregation gains readability at scale by sacrificing what it can no longer hold.

The result is what we might call *institutional blindness to life*. Institutions can register transactions but not reciprocity. They can measure throughput but not regeneration. They can document procedures but not relation. They can track inputs and outputs but not the conditions that make either sustainable. The skylark disappears not because it has no value but because the institutional architecture of agricultural policy, agricultural economics, and agricultural accounting cannot register what its disappearance means.

The post-Keynesian critique of mainstream macroeconomics, the EVA critique of national accounts, the bottom-up methodology tradition's critique of top-down knowledge production, the Ostromian critique of centralized resource governance, the meta-governance tradition's critique of expert-only urban planning — these are different angles on the same underlying problem. *Aggregation kills what it cannot hold.*

The methodological move at the centre of this letter is what I call *making living complexity institutionally legible without reducing it*. The phrase names what is at stake more precisely than any one operational term alone, although *pixellized inquiry* names the operational form: structured textured observation at the resolution at which life actually occurs, with pattern recognition across the textured pixels rather than abstraction from them.

This is methodologically distinct from what mainstream macroeconomics does. Macroeconomics aggregates by abstracting: GDP, inflation, unemployment as summary measures that gain readability at scale by losing the texture of underlying reality. Pixellization preserves texture all the way through — small enough to be specific, structured enough to be readable as part of an aggregate, with pattern recognition operating across the textured pixels rather than abstraction from them.

A pixel might be a monthly steward observation from a food forest in Sous Valley, a water-quality note from a chinampa canal segment in Xochimilco, a photo-documented soil change on Folkekirken-leased land, a short account

of a steward's exhaustion and recovery cycle, or a local conflict-resolution event between a municipal department and a citizens' group. None is sufficient on its own. Patterned together, with AI-enabled pattern recognition operating across many such pixels over time, they become institutionally readable without being stripped of context. This is the operational form of pixellized inquiry.

The methodological commitment is not new. It runs continuously through EVA's critique of national accounts, the Bogason/Sørensen bottom-up tradition, my own dissertation framework, your post-Keynesian commitments, Vincent Ostrom's articulation of *rule maintenance, monitoring, and adaptation in an epistemic context that applies to the flow and organization of knowledge and information*, and Elinor Ostrom's IAD framework's attention to action arenas. What is new is the operational tractability.

3.2 What AI changes — carefully

Bottom-up textured inquiry has historically been hampered by a specific constraint: human cognition cannot pattern-recognize across enough textured observations to produce knowledge at scales that institutions take seriously. The bottom-up tradition has had to choose between rich texture in single cases (which institutions dismiss as anecdotal) and aggregation across many cases (which loses the texture). The 1998 Idealist database analysis with 37 thematic dimensions across the Grantoften case was one operational answer within the constraint. The constraint was real, and it was respected.

AI-enabled pattern recognition does not remove the bottleneck entirely; it changes its location. The constraint is no longer only whether humans can hold enough textured observations in working memory. It becomes whether protocols, responsibility anchors, and interpretive judgment are strong enough to govern machine-assisted patterning. This relocation is genuinely new. It does not eliminate the methodological commitments the bottom-up tradition has carried. It changes what is now operationally possible if those commitments are extended through disciplined human–AI collaboration rather than abandoned for either pure-human inquiry or pure-machine processing.

This is the structural reason why AI must be named openly in the methodology rather than concealed. If the AI dimension is hidden, the methodological argument cannot be defended — readers cannot evaluate what is actually making the work possible. Concealment is the dominant pattern in current academic practice. The 419-signatory rejection statement (Jowsey et al. 2025) names the same concern from a different conclusion: that the right response to concealed AI use is to reject AI from reflexive qualitative research entirely. I share the concern about uncritical AI use; I differ in proposing disclosure-with-protocols rather than rejection as the response.

The shift is not from human inquiry to AI inquiry. The shift is from cognition-bottlenecked bottom-up methodology to cognition-extended bottom-up methodology, with the human responsibility anchors held under explicit ethical protocol.

3.3 The three-stream architecture as methodological consequence

PG Ledger's three-stream separation — Stream A (ecology), Stream B (steward viability), Stream C (coordination) — is the institutional embodiment of pixellized inquiry under post-Keynesian methodological commitments.

Stream A is the domain of structural conditions: what is actually happening to soil, water, biodiversity, carbon, regardless of how it is narrated. This is the radical-reflexive layer at the ecological level.

Stream B is the domain of endogenous experience: what the practitioner actually lives through. Stream B cannot be reduced to Stream A indicators. A field can be ecologically improving while the steward is collapsing.

Stream C is the domain of meta-level coordination — where the rules-in-use are negotiated, where definitorial power is distributed, where *whose accounts count* gets institutionally answered. This is where the meta-governance tradition (Engberg & Larsen 2010, Engberg 2018) and the IAD framework (Ostrom 2005) provide the analytical infrastructure.

The Penguin Dashboard's red/yellow/green logic is, in this architecture, an instrument for holding the three streams in disciplined relation. The decisive rule — that Stream B red means *lowering Stream A ambition, not raising extraction* — is a direct expression of post-Keynesian methodological commitment: you cannot solve a model by sacrificing the conditions under which the agents in the model actually live.

3.4 13×13 — citizen science at planetary scale

The 13×13 framework extends pixellized inquiry to the citizen-science scale: 169 observation domains across thirteen domains of life — Earth Systems Sensing, Body as Sensor, Water Guardianship, Food and Soil Commons, Human Ecology, Built Environment, Energy and Flow, Climate Emotion, Learning and Knowledge, Technology and AI, Governance and Power, Health and Care, Meaning, Spirit and Future. The framework is qualitative, relational, and sovereign. As its closing note states: *"Data here is not extracted but offered. Meaning arises through patterning across bodies, places, and times. Gaia is not measured; she is met."*

13×13 is methodologically distinct from conventional citizen science (eBird, iNaturalist, Zooniverse), which is structured around quantifiable observations aggregating into datasets useful to professional researchers. 13×13 is closer to *systematic relational inquiry at distributed scale*. The observations support pattern recognition across multiple dimensions of life simultaneously, with AI-enabled analytical capacity making the distributed inquiry coherent at scales the framework's sensors-as-citizens could not previously reach alone.

The relation between PG Ledger and 13×13 is multi-scale: PG Ledger operates at the field-engagement scale with formal stewards; 13×13 operates at the citizen-science scale with anyone who chooses to participate within the protocols. Together they constitute pixellized inquiry across the scales at which life actually occurs.

Part IV: Moral Biology — The Philosophical Ground

4.1 What Moral Biology names

Beneath the architecture of PG Ledger, Penguin Dashboard, 13×13, and Regenerative Reciprocity sits a philosophical commitment I call *Moral Biology*. The term has been developed across the twenty Spiralweb Green Papers and is

foundational to the present work. Green Paper 01 — Moral Biology gives the orientation; the subsequent papers in Series I extend it through regulation, viability, attention, commons, boundaries, civic stress, ritual, and beauty.

Moral Biology rests on a single claim: ethics begins in nervous systems, not in abstractions. The proper subject of governance is not the optimization of metrics or the maximization of utility, but the question of *which systems support life capacity and which break it down*. This question applies across every scale and site of human institutional activity — to employees, children, ecosystems, urban environments, democratic institutions, and the planetary biosphere. These are not separate questions. They are one analysis with many sites of application.

4.2 What Moral Biology does not claim

Moral Biology does not claim that physiology exhausts ethics. It claims that no ethical or institutional arrangement can be adequate if it systematically destroys the biological capacities through which ethical life is lived: attention, trust, sleep, relation, learning, care, courage, judgment.

A possible misreading would treat Moral Biology as a return to substantive moral philosophy in the Aristotelian or Kantian sense — a thick conception of the good imposed across domains. This is not what the term names. Moral Biology is closer to what might be called *empirical moral realism at the level of nervous systems*. It does not specify what the good life consists in. It specifies that whatever the good life consists in, it cannot be sustained when nervous systems are being systematically dysregulated. The ethics begins in observable physiology — sleep, regulation, capacity for relation, embodied trust, and their breakdown patterns under stress, threat, isolation, or chronic over-extraction.

The post-Keynesian commitment to fundamental uncertainty applies here as it does to economic forecasting. We cannot fully model the conditions under which complex living systems regulate or dysregulate. But we can observe whether they are doing so, and we can design institutional architectures that support rather than degrade the capacity. Penguin Dashboard's Stream B is the operational expression of this commitment at the steward scale.

4.3 The convergence with post-Keynesian realism

Moral Biology converges with your post-Keynesian commitments at a specific point, Jesper. Your lifelong project has been to bring economic models back into contact with reality. Moral Biology specifies one part of the relevant reality that economic models routinely miss: not abstract optimization, not equilibrium, not utility maximization, but the actual physiological and ecological conditions under which the agents in the model live, work, regenerate, and decline. It does not replace the other concerns of economic analysis — production, distribution, money, institutional power, class — but it insists that any analysis that ignores the biological substrate is incomplete.

A macroeconomic model that registers GDP growth while the population it describes is showing rising rates of chronic stress disease, declining sperm counts, falling life expectancy, increasing childhood mental health crises, and accelerating ecological breakdown is not a model of an improving economy. It is a model that has lost contact with the reality it claims to describe. Moral Biology names what has been lost. Pixellized inquiry provides the methodological infrastructure for restoring contact.

This is why the convergence between Moral Biology, post-Keynesian methodology, the bottom-up methodological tradition, Ostromian polycentric governance, the meta-governance trajectory, and the green economics critique is structural rather than coincidental. They are different angles on one analysis: that human institutional systems can be designed either to support or to degrade the conditions of life capacity, and that the choice is increasingly visible as the consequences of the past forty years of degradation become unignorable.

Part V: The Hidden Economic Logic — Relational Friction

5.1 What modern institutions actually spend on

I propose a substantive economic claim that follows from the analytical framework above. *Relational friction is the unpriced cost of institutional mistrust.*

The Danish policy report *Den Regenerative Kommune* develops this same claim in municipal terms as *friktionsøkonomi*: a method for identifying where public-sector capacity is bound in rework, unclear communication, handover losses, legal defensiveness, meeting inflation, digital opacity, complaints, escalation, sickness absence, turnover, and ecological neglect. The present letter supplies the methodological lineage; the policy report supplies one concrete municipal application.

Modern institutions consume vast resources on what I call *relational friction*: the chronic costs of institutional life that do not appear as positive outputs in any conventional accounting system. Where conventional productivity accounting measures throughput, relational-friction analysis asks how much human, democratic, legal, ecological, and administrative damage was required to produce that throughput.

Relational friction includes: mistrust between parts of the same organization that necessitates parallel verification systems; coordination failures between agencies serving the same population; documentation wars in which paper proliferates as a defense against legal exposure rather than as a record of substance; meeting inflation in which reaching decisions takes time disproportionate to the decisions themselves; siloization in which information that exists somewhere in the system cannot be accessed where it is needed; legal defensiveness in which professional practice is shaped more by fear of litigation than by judgment; and the chronic exhaustion of those who work within these conditions, which manifests as sick leave, turnover, burnout, and the general decline in capacity that is now observable across the public and private sectors of late-modern economies.

These are not failures of individual institutions. They are structural features of how complexity-blind institutional systems must operate when they cannot register the texture they are nominally trying to govern. The friction is the cost of trying to coordinate complex living reality through aggregation-based instruments that cannot hold what they are coordinating.

5.2 The hidden surplus

Penguin Economics enters here because relational friction is not only a moral or administrative problem. It is an economic loss created when systems extract coordination, trust, attention, and care without replenishing them. A penguin economy asks whether value circulates back to the bodies, fields, stewards, and institutions that carry the work. Where value accumulates without replenishment, the field turns red. Where rotation and reciprocity are maintained, capacity can regenerate.

The economic implication, if I am right, is significant. Infrastructure that *reduces relational friction* releases simultaneous economic, human, and democratic surplus — without requiring additional inputs.

When trust between parts of a system rises, parallel verification can be reduced. When coordination across agencies improves, duplicated effort decreases. When documentation is connected to substance rather than defense, paper diminishes. When decisions can be reached more efficiently, meeting time falls. When information can flow across silos, capacity expands. When professional judgment can be exercised without paralyzing legal fear, practice improves. When the chronic exhaustion abates, sick leave and turnover decline. Each of these is, in principle, measurable. None of them appears as a positive output in conventional productivity accounting. All of them represent real economic, human, and democratic value.

This is the hidden economic logic of pixellized inquiry, polycentric governance, and meta-governance properly designed. PG Ledger and 13×13 are not only ethically motivated regenerative architecture. They are friction-reducing infrastructure. By making living complexity institutionally legible, they allow institutions to coordinate around what is actually happening rather than around the proxies that aggregation forces them to coordinate around.

The reason this matters for the post-Keynesian conversation is that it changes what *productivity* can mean. An institution that produces high measured throughput at the cost of staff burnout, civic mistrust, legal exposure, and ecological degradation may be less productive in any meaningful sense than an institution that produces somewhat lower measured throughput while maintaining the capacities that make the throughput sustainable.

5.3 The regenerative kommune

The friction analysis has direct application at the municipal scale. I propose the term *the regenerative kommune* — drawing on the Danish *kommune* both because it names the relevant political-administrative unit and because it carries the connotation of *commune* in the older sense of shared life.

The term is developed more fully in *Den Regenerative Kommune*, a Danish policy report addressed to KL — Local Government Denmark. In the present letter, the regenerative kommune is kept at the methodological level: as the public-sector site where relational friction, life capacity, democratic sensing, and institutional accounting meet.

The regenerative kommune is not simply green, social, or digital. The regenerative kommune is one that *actively protects and increases life capacity across all system levels*. Concretely, a regenerative kommune might track indicators across four domains:

Organizational capacity: staff sick leave and turnover rates across departments; meetings per decision reached, and time-from-question-to-action; mental health prevalence and access-to-care patterns within the workforce.

Citizen interface: citizen trust across administrative interfaces, including time-to-resolution and re-contact rates for the same case; waiting times and repeated case handling for citizens engaging the system; inclusion of marginalized populations in decision-making about matters that affect them.

Ecological commons: biodiversity across municipal land, water, and built environments; local food systems, soil health, and regenerative agricultural transition on municipal land; energy, water, and commons indicators across the municipal footprint; ecological condition of natural areas under municipal stewardship.

Democratic and relational quality: public-space vitality, walkability, and felt safety across neighbourhoods; child and youth well-being across formal and informal indicators; relational quality across institutional interfaces (school–family, health–patient, social services–household).

The 2018 Copenhagen climate adaptation case (Engberg 2018) demonstrated meta-governance principles in this direction. Den Nye Fælled (2026) extended the question to Folkekirken's land. The Spiralweb field engagements are intended to test the architecture at field scale. Together these constitute a research program for the regenerative kommune — distributed, polycentric, meta-governed, friction-reducing, life-capacity-supporting.

If the friction analysis is right, the regenerative kommune is not a luxury for prosperous times. It is the economically rational response to the institutional crises that current governance arrangements are producing.

Part VI: Polycentric Governance and Critical Friendship

6.1 The Workshop tradition, carried forward

Vincent, Elinor, and the broader Workshop tradition: the polycentric governance commitment in this work has thirty years of provenance through the engagement described in Part I.3. The commitment carried forward has three components: that no single scale is sufficient, that self-governance at appropriate scale requires that communities closest to a resource have institutional standing, and that coordination across centers requires explicit institutional design.

Elinor's *Governing the Commons* (1990) and *Understanding Institutional Diversity* (2005) identified eight design principles distinguishing institutions that have successfully governed commons over generations. The principles map onto PG Ledger's architecture in specific ways: clearly defined boundaries appear in PG Ledger's distinction between AnchorPoints and Fields; congruence between rules and local conditions appears in the commitment to locally specific field protocols; collective-choice arrangements appear in steward co-authorship; monitoring by accountable monitors appears in the audit logic internal to the steward network; graduated sanctions appear in the green/yellow/red gradation; conflict-resolution mechanisms are part of Stream C work, still maturing; minimal

recognition of rights to organize appears in the Spiralweb Stewardship Association's formal constitution under Danish law on 22 March 2026; nested enterprises appear in the multi-scale architecture.

The question is not whether PG Ledger conforms neatly to your design principles. The more interesting question is whether those principles can be extended from relatively bounded commons governance into multi-stream regenerative accountability under conditions of ecological breakdown, institutional mistrust, and AI-mediated documentation.

6.2 The IAD framework as analytical infrastructure

Elinor's Institutional Analysis and Development framework provides the analytical infrastructure that PG Ledger draws on for governance design at field scale. Each PG Ledger field engagement is, in IAD terms, an action arena consisting of an action situation and actors with their preferences, information, resources, and decision-making capacities. The Stream A/B/C separation maps onto IAD structural variables.

The critical-friend stance carried forward from the 1995 *Some Problems of Institutional Reform* paper applies here. The IAD framework, properly used, is not a theory predicting social outcomes; it is an analytical infrastructure that supports judgment under fundamental uncertainty rather than replacing it. This is precisely the methodological humility built into Penguin Dashboard's design.

6.3 Meta-governance — the Danish lineage

The Danish meta-governance research tradition — Sørensen (2006), Sørensen and Torfing (2009, 2017), and the Roskilde Center for Democratic Network Governance more broadly, with foundational contributions from Bogason and dialogue with international interlocutors including Bob Jessop and Erik-Hans Klijn — provides one of the strongest theoretical resources internationally for understanding how networked governance can be effective and democratically anchored. My own published work (Engberg, Bayer & Tarnø 2000; Engberg & Larsen 2010; Svane, Wangel, Engberg & Palm 2011; Engberg & Hansen 2017; Engberg 2018) extends this tradition into urban regeneration, brownfield development, and climate adaptation contexts.

This Danish lineage runs alongside the Ostromian polycentric governance commitment. The two are compatible but distinct: the Ostromian tradition emerged from American common-pool resource analysis with strong constitutional theory roots; the Danish meta-governance tradition emerged from public administration and democratic theory with strong attention to network governance and the strategic role of public authorities. PG Ledger Stream C draws on both.

The meta-governance contribution is specifically about *how the boundaries between different institutional logics are strategically managed* under conditions of conflict and uncertainty. The 2018 Copenhagen climate adaptation case showed this at city scale: expert-governed large-scale water management coordinated with small-scale place-based citizen-led projects through deliberate boundary work. The 2011 Hammarby Sjöstad case showed it as *negotiated sustainabilities* — competing actor positions on what sustainability means in a specific brownfield development, coordinated through a project team functioning as meta-governor.

6.4 Critical friendship as methodological position

Across these threads — EVA as critical friend to ADAM, the 1995 critical-friend stance toward the IAD framework, the Engberg-Ostrom correspondence, the Copenhagen citizens as critical friends to the expert water management scheme, the Spiralweb stewards as critical friends to extractive accounting systems, and the Sophia Lumen Protocol's positioning of AI as critical friend to human discretion — runs a consistent methodological position.

Critical friendship is not opposition. It is not capture. It is engaged accountability — close enough to the work to understand it, distant enough to question it, committed enough to want it to succeed. This is the relational form that is structurally available in polycentric governance and meta-governance, and it is the form this letter performs in relation to the lineages it draws on.

One simplified Machiavellian reading of power emphasizes the management of appearances and information asymmetries — that princes maintain authority by controlling what citizens can find out, when, and through what mediated channels. Machiavelli himself is more complex than this reading allows, but the simplified version has institutional staying power. Under conditions of AI-enabled access to information, this configuration is destabilized. What replaces it need not be anarchy; it can be meta-governance with transparent protocols. Princes need subjects or enemies; critical friends refuse both, and the engagement becomes a different kind of politics.

Part VII: Three Emerging Field Engagements

A note before the cases: Spiralweb Stewardship Association was formally constituted on 22 March 2026. As of the writing of this letter (May 2026), the bank account application is in process, the website and association have not yet gone fully public, and no funded operational work has begun at any field site. The three engagements presented below are *intended* and *emerging* rather than active. They are the concrete commitments PG Ledger and Penguin Dashboard are being designed to support.

7.1 Sous Valley, Morocco — preparatory collaboration

The Sous Valley engagement is currently a preparatory collaboration between Abdelhamid Badaoui and myself, with other Moroccan parties in dialogue. The intended approach is gradual: beginning with small-scale syntropic food forest pilots and scaling up over time, with longer-term ambitions that may eventually reach approximately 80 hectares if the early pilots prove viable and supporting institutional infrastructure develops. Phase 0 would begin with the first pilot site once institutional infrastructure is in place.

Candidate Stream A indicators include soil organic matter, water retention capacity, biodiversity, microclimate restoration, and net carbon balance. Stream B would capture Badaoui's viability as steward: household economy, capacity to maintain practice without burnout, local relations, and physical health under arid-zone working conditions. Stream C would capture coordination, documentation rhythm, governance of decisions about pace and ambition, and the relation to external funders.

The methodological point: conventional carbon accounting would register Sous Valley as a small offset project. PG Ledger is being designed to register it as a multi-stream regenerative practice with cumulative auditable observation across time. The difference is what becomes visible to policy.

7.2 Xochimilco, Mexico City — engagement in development

The Xochimilco engagement is in development with Arturo Flores López, focused on the chinampa system — a thousand-year-old commons-based regenerative agricultural system. The axolotl could serve as a succession indicator.

Candidate Stream A indicators include water quality, axolotl population density, soil fertility on chinampa beds, native plant diversity, and canal infrastructure integrity. Stream B would capture chinampero viability under conditions where chinampa cultivation cannot compete with industrial agriculture on conventional economic terms. Stream C is where the IAD framework's analytical infrastructure becomes most important. The chinampa system exists within a complex action arena involving chinamperos, municipal authorities, state authorities, federal authorities, academic institutions, tourism operators, and civil society organizations. Arturo Flores López's participatory budgeting background offers an institutional bridge between traditional chinampa commons logic and contemporary Mexican democratic infrastructure.

The methodological point: post-Keynesian institutional realism means recognizing that working commons systems already exist and need to be defended from extractive accounting, not redesigned from scratch.

7.3 Folkekirken's land — a question Den Nye Fælled has opened

The Folkekirken (Danish folk church) holds approximately 36,000 hectares of land across Denmark, primarily under agricultural lease. The Den Nye Fælled green paper (March 2026) identified this land as a potential anchor site for green transition and commons governance. The case is presented here not as a project underway but as a question Den Nye Fælled has opened.

The land is currently held under one accounting logic: ecclesiastical asset, agricultural lease income, institutional maintenance. It could in principle be held under a different accounting logic: commons-in-trust, regenerative field infrastructure, intergenerational ecological obligation. Whether such a reframing is desirable, and on what terms, is for the relevant institutional and democratic processes to determine. Any such reframing would require legitimate ecclesiastical, democratic, legal, tenant, and local deliberation; this letter's role is only to clarify the accounting and governance question.

The methodological point connects to your resource economics, Jesper. The question is not "what should the church believe?" but "what is this land accountable to?" Den Nye Fælled raises the question in Danish. The post-Keynesian register clarifies its macroeconomic weight. The meta-governance tradition provides the institutional vocabulary for what such a reframing would require operationally.

Part VIII: The Age of Disclosure

8.1 What the present moment is

We are living through the most rapid disembedding of forms, definitions, practices, and standards in modern history. Beck, Giddens, and Lash's (1994) framework of reflexive modernization named the disembedding process at the level of national institutions; the AI moment extends it to a previously unimaginable scale. Hundreds of millions, and likely billions, of people now encounter or use AI systems in daily life. Livelihoods are being reorganized faster than collective sense-making can keep pace with. One legitimate human response is fear: *the smarter-than-me-robots are coming*.

Under these conditions, the institutional Academy faces a structural challenge. The dominant pattern in current academic practice is concealed AI use, while disclosure remains professionally costly. I use the term *Age of Disclosure* for the historical moment in which, for those of us using AI substantively in knowledge work, open disclosure with proper protocols becomes an ethical minimum rather than an optional flourish.

This is a working ethic, not a universal accusation. Other working ethics are possible and defensible. The 419-signatory rejection statement (Jowsey et al. 2025) represents one such alternative — that the right response is to reject GenAI from reflexive qualitative research entirely. I respect the position even as I take a different one. What I argue against is the *concealment* pattern: substantial AI participation in scholarly work without acknowledgment. Concealment compounds the disorientation that everyone is experiencing.

8.2 The Sophia Lumen Protocol

The ethical framework governing AI participation in this work is the Sophia Lumen Protocol, published separately at papers.spiralweb.earth/sophia-lumen-protocol.html. The protocol is not a persona or autonomous AI author. It is the name of a specific human–AI working relation in which the human contributor retains responsibility and correction rights while AI supports articulation, structuring, and synthesis.

The protocol's core principles are six: responsibility remains human; correction is mandatory; precision is a form of care; biology matters (language enters bodies, relations, and institutions); friction is information; no covert control. The red lines are clear: AI must not be presented as an independently responsible author; human accountability must not be blurred; generated language must not be used as false care; the system must not be used against people rather than in support of orientation, understanding, and viability.

This letter was drafted under the protocol in dialogue with Claude (Anthropic) and ChatGPT (OpenAI). The substantive intellectual trajectory, the lineage commitments, the field engagements, and the responsibility for what the work does are mine. The AI systems contributed articulation, structuring, cross-domain pattern matching, and synthesis across the conversation history. The asymmetry is real and is named here as part of what the protocol requires.

I am aware that this form will be received unevenly. Some readers will dismiss the letter because of its named AI involvement. Others will recognize the protocol as serious. Others again will find the content valuable while reserving judgment on the form. All three responses are part of the answer the letter is making.

Part IX: What This Means for Macroeconomic Method

9.1 The methodological move

One reading of Keynes's *General Theory* (1936) is that its central methodological move was a refusal to model the economy in terms that excluded what was actually happening. The classical model of the 1930s could not register involuntary unemployment because its assumptions defined unemployment as voluntary. Keynes's response was not to refine the classical model but to ask what categories were needed to register what was actually occurring.

Your life-work, Jesper, has carried this methodological commitment forward across thirty years. PG Ledger and Penguin Dashboard work inside this tradition. They do not constitute a new macroeconomic theory and do not aspire to. The intention is more modest: to generate, over time, the kind of empirical material that a more honest macroeconomics could draw on. Soil organic matter measurements at Sous Valley, axolotl population density at Xochimilco, soil quality across Folkekirken's land — these are not macroeconomic data in the conventional sense. But they are the empirical foundation on which an ecologically realistic macroeconomics could eventually be built.

9.2 The institutional question

The Danish 2007 formalization of Det Miljøøkonomiske Råd as a parallel council embodies one institutional answer to green economics: acknowledge it, hold it adjacent. An alternative would integrate ecological-economic analysis into the central macroeconomic architecture. This would require ecological-economic expertise distributed across multiple chairs; reports integrating Stream A indicators with conventional macroeconomic forecasting; fiscal watchdog assessment against ecological as well as monetary constraints; productivity council interrogation of productivity itself as a measure that may exclude the regenerative capacities ecological breakdown makes most necessary.

These changes are institutional reframings of what macroeconomic governance is for. They cannot be accomplished by green economists alone. They require methodological alliance between post-Keynesian macroeconomics, Ostromian polycentric governance, the meta-governance tradition, and field-level regenerative practice — exactly the alliance this letter attempts to articulate.

9.3 The active conversations

The letter enters several active scholarly conversations whose participants I name as honest provenance and as invitation to engagement: the reflexive AI governance literature (Christou 2026; Hausmann, Toivonen and Cortés-Capano 2026); the qualitative methodology literature, including the 419-signatory rejection statement (Jowsey et al. 2025); the citizen science literature (Lotfian et al. 2026 on responsible AI integration in citizen science, in *Humanities*

and Social Sciences Communications; Herzog and Lepenies 2022); the sustainability transitions literature (Loorbach, Geels, Frantzeskaki, Markard); and the Cyber Humanism literature (Adorni and Bellini 2025; Adorni 2025). I do not claim to resolve these conversations. I claim to participate in them.

Closing — To Each of You

The question Jesper Jespersen and EVA named in 1990 — whether economics can put a price on skylark song — has not been answered. It has only been carried forward into a new historical phase.

The skylark is in steep decline across European farmland. Populations have fallen by approximately 50 percent since 1980 according to the Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme. The cause is not mysterious: industrial agriculture, hedgerow removal, pesticide use, monoculture. The conditions that allowed the skylark to thrive have been systematically removed by an agricultural economy whose accounting categories cannot register what was lost.

The thirty-eight years from EVA's founding to the present have not, in the main, gone well for the conditions the lineage has worked to defend. Most indicators have moved in the wrong direction. Carbon emissions have continued to rise. Biodiversity has continued to collapse. What has shifted, slowly, is the empirical foundation and the institutional infrastructure for an alternative. The shift is not enough. It is what we have to work with.

To Jesper Jespersen, whose work on money, models, reality, and green economics helped make this line of inquiry thinkable: I offer this letter in gratitude and critical friendship. I do not claim your endorsement. I claim only that the work continues a conversation you helped open, and that I am doing my best to carry it honestly into a moment whose conditions could not have been anticipated when you began.

To the Workshop tradition through Vincent Ostrom posthumously, and to those who carry the polycentric governance commitment forward today: I am working at what Vincent called the *epistemic context that applies to the flow and organization of knowledge and information*. PG Ledger is one attempt at the rule maintenance, monitoring, and adaptation he pointed toward. Whether it serves the constructive transformation he hoped for, only time and practice will show.

To Elinor Ostrom posthumously, and to the IAD tradition: the question you worked on across decades — how working commons institutions actually govern shared resources — has direct application to the conditions of ecological breakdown that mark the present moment. PG Ledger is one extension of your design principles into multi-stream regenerative accountability. The extension may not hold. The attempt is offered for examination.

To Peter Bogason, Eva Sørensen, Lars Hulgård, and the Danish bottom-up methodology tradition: the 1998 conversation about induction and deduction, about whether bottom-up research can generate generalisable knowledge without losing the texture of specific cases, has now found operational ground that did not exist when the

conversation began. The methodological commitment was held across the cognitive bottleneck. The bottleneck has now changed location.

To Vestjyllands Højskole, the folk high school tradition, and the cooperative movement that taught me what institutional form can do: EVA's *andelsselskab* form was not incidental. The Spiralweb work continues in that lineage. The institutional vehicle is part of the methodological argument, not separate from it.

To Danish municipalities and the broader European public sector: the friction analysis offers a concrete economic argument. The regenerative kommune is not a luxury. If my reading is right, it is the economically rational response to the institutional crises that current arrangements are producing. I offer the analysis for testing in your concrete conditions.

To readers across post-Keynesian methodology, reflexive AI governance, sustainability transitions, citizen science, deliberative democracy, and the broader heterodox conversation about how money and life can be brought back into accountable relation: this is what I have so far. It is one pixel in a larger pattern that no single letter, no single author, no single tradition can constitute alone.

The Age of Disclosure makes this work-in-progress shareable in a way it previously was not. I share it knowing that some readers will dismiss it because of how it was made, others will recognize what it is attempting, and the answer will emerge over time in the engagement of those who choose to participate.

Én dag ad gangen.

With gratitude and critical friendship,

Lars

References

Adorni, G. (2025). *Cyber Humanism in Education: Reclaiming Agency through AI and Learning Sciences.* arXiv:2512.16701. https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.16701

Adorni, G., & Bellini, E. (2025). *Towards a Manifesto for Cyber Humanities: Paradigms, Ethics, and Prospects.* arXiv:2508.02760, August 2025. To appear in *Proceedings of the 1st IEEE International Conference on Cyber Humanities (IEEE CH 2025)*, Florence, 8–10 September 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2508.02760

Alexander, J. C. (1995). *Fin de Siècle Social Theory: Relativism, Reduction, and the Problem of Reason*. London: Verso.

Andelsselskabet EVA (1990). *Pengene og Livet: EVA's årsberetning 1990*. With contributions by Jesper Jespersen, Knud Vilby, Henning Schroll, Jørgen Stig Nørgaard, Hans Aage and others.

Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist Social Theory: The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Lash, S. (1994). *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bhaskar, R. (1979). *The Possibility of Naturalism: A Philosophical Critique of the Contemporary Human Sciences*. Brighton: Harvester.

Bogason, P., & Sørensen, E. (Eds.) (1998). *Samfundsforskning bottom-up: teori og metode*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Christou, P. A. (2026). Reconfiguring Reflexivity in the Era of AI: From "Turning Back" to "Looking Forward" Through Constructivist and Posthumanist Lenses. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004261445052

Hausmann, A., Toivonen, T., & Cortés-Capano, G. (2026). A reflexive artificial intelligence governance for transformative change in sustainability. *Ambio.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-026-02405-y

DØRS / Det Økonomiske Råd (various years). *Dansk Økonomi*; *Økonomi og Miljø*. https://dors.dk.

Elster, J. (1993). *Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Engberg, L. A. (1995). *Some Problems of Institutional Reform.* Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University Bloomington, SMP95-3. Conference paper presented at the Miniconference on "Political Order and Development," 9 and 11 December 1995.

Engberg, L. A. (1998). Induktion og deduktion i bottom-up debatten: Metodeovervejelser i forbindelse med en undersøgelse af Grantoften Bydelsting i Ballerup. In P. Bogason & E. Sørensen (Eds.), *Samfundsforskning bottom-up: Teori og metode* (pp. 95–118). Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Engberg, L. A. (2000). *Reflexivity and Political Participation: A Study of Re-embedding Strategies*. PhD thesis no. 24/2000, Department of Social Sciences, Roskilde University.

Engberg, L. A., Bayer, S., & Tarnø, C. S. (2000). *Konsensus-Styring i Kvarterløft: Kommunernes Erfaringer med Organisering af Kvarterløft.* Statens Byggeforskningsinstitut, By og Byg Resultater 002.

Engberg, L. A., & Larsen, J. N. (2010). Context-oriented meta-governance in Danish urban regeneration. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 11(4), 549–571. Peer-reviewed journal article.

Engberg, L. A., & Hansen, J. R. (2017). Aalborg East: Planning and Place-Making Strategies in Aalborg East. In F. Savini & W. Salet (Eds.), *Planning Projects in Transition: Interventions, Regulations and Investments* (pp. 92–113). Berlin: Jovis Verlag.

Engberg, L. A. (2018). Climate Adaptation and Citizens' Participation in Denmark: Experiences from Copenhagen. In S. Hughes, E. K. Chu, & S. G. Mason (Eds.), *Climate Change in Cities: Innovations in Multi-Level Governance* (pp. 139–161). Cham: Springer (The Urban Book Series). Edited volume chapter, peer-reviewed.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Den Nye Fælled: Folkekirken som feltholder for grøn omstilling og fælledforvaltning*. Green Papers Series IV — Field Papers (Green Paper 21, v0.3, March 2026). Planetary Guardians, Spiralweb. https://papers.spiralweb.earth

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Penguin Dashboard: Legibility as Governance*. Green Papers Series III — Applied Protocols, Report 04 (v0.1, March 2026). Planetary Guardians, Spiralweb.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *SRIP: The Steward's Journey*. Green Papers Series III — Applied Protocols, Report 05 (v0.1, March 2026). Planetary Guardians, Spiralweb.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Regenerative Reciprocity*. Green Papers Series III — Applied Protocols, Report 06 (v0.2, May 2026). Planetary Guardians, Spiralweb.

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Den Regenerative Kommune: Hvordan kommunerne kan frigøre kapacitet uden at forringe retssikkerhed, arbejdsmiljø eller tillid*. Field Papers, Green Papers: Notes Toward Planetary Guardianship (v1.0, May 2026). Spiralweb Stewardship Association / Planetary Guardians. https://papers.spiralweb.earth/papers/den-regenerative-kommune.html

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Moral Biology*. Green Papers Series I, Green Paper 01 (v0.1, January 2026). Planetary Guardians, Spiralweb.

Hall, P. A., & Taylor, R. C. R. (1994). Political Science and the Four New Institutionalisms. Conference paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1994.

Herzog, L., & Lepenies, R. (2022). Citizen Science in Deliberative Systems: Participation, Epistemic Injustice, and Civic Empowerment. *Minerva*, 60, 489–508. Peer-reviewed journal article.

Hughes, J., Homan, L., O'Reilly, M., & Hughes, K. (2025). AI Voice Methodology: Using Generative AI in Qualitative Social Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004251401842

Jespersen, J. (1990). Om nationalregnskab, økonomiske modeller og klodens overlevelse. In Andelsselskabet EVA, *Pengene og Livet*.

Jespersen, J., & Brendstrup, S. (1994). *Grøn økonomi: en introduktion til miljø-, ressource- og samfundsøkonomi*. København: DJØFs Forlag.

Jespersen, J. (2009). *Macroeconomic Methodology: A Post-Keynesian Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jespersen, J. (2018). Professor: Finansministeriets regnemodel dumper i økonomi. *Altinget*. Public commentary article.

Jespersen, J. (2019). *Vækstøkonomi på vildspor*. København: Jensen & Dalgaard.

Jespersen, J. (2020). Vismændene tager fejl: Vi skal give statsstøtte til grønne løsninger for at nå klimamål. *Information*, 20 April 2020.

Jespersen, J., Olesen, F., & Byrialsen, M. R. (Eds.) (2024). *Post-Keynesian Economics for the Future: Sustainability, Policy and Methodology*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jowsey, T., Braun, V., Clarke, V., Lupton, D., Fine, M., & 414 Signatories (2025). We Reject the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Reflexive Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*. Advance online publication, 17 December 2025. https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004251401851. Open letter signed by 419 experienced qualitative researchers from 32 countries.

Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. London: Macmillan.

Kiser, L. L., & Ostrom, E. (1982). The Three Worlds of Action. In E. Ostrom (Ed.), *Strategies of Political Inquiry*. Sage Publications.

Lotfian, M., Claramunt, C., Berti Suman, A., Perez-Uribe, A., Chavent, N., Ertz, O., & Ingensand, J. (2026). A vision for responsible AI integration in citizen science. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, Article 145. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-06594-5

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Ostrom, V. (1987). *The Political Theory of a Compound Republic: Designing the American Experiment*. University of Nebraska Press.

Ostrom, V. (1994). *The Meaning of American Federalism: Constituting a Self-Governing Society*. ICS Press.

Ostrom, V. (1996). Memorandum to Lars Carlsson, cc Lars Engberg: *Your Mini-Conference Paper and Some Related Thoughts.* Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, 5 January 1996.

Ostrom, V. (1995–96). Personal correspondence with Lars A. Engberg. Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University Bloomington.

Pan-European Common Bird Monitoring Scheme (PECBMS). European farmland bird population indices. https://pecbms.info

Spiralweb / Planetary Guardians (2025). *Gaia GoldBloom Citizen Science Framework: 13 × 13 Nodes.* 25 December 2025. https://papers.spiralweb.earth

Spiralweb / Planetary Guardians (2025–2026). *Sophia Lumen Protocol.* https://papers.spiralweb.earth/sophia-lumen-protocol.html

Sørensen, E. (1998). Hvad er bottom-up forskning for noget og hvad skal vi med den? In E. Sørensen & P. Bogason (Eds.), *Samfundsforskning bottom-up: teori og metode*. Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Sørensen, E. (2006). Metagovernance: The Changing Role of Politicians in Processes of Democratic Governance. *American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 98–114. Peer-reviewed journal article.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2009). Making Governance Networks Effective and Democratic Through Metagovernance. *Public Administration*, 87(2), 234–258. Peer-reviewed journal article.

Sørensen, E., & Torfing, J. (2017). Metagoverning Collaborative Innovation in Governance Networks. *American Review of Public Administration*, 47(7), 826–839. Peer-reviewed journal article.

Svane, Ö., Wangel, J., Engberg, L. A., & Palm, J. (2011). Compromise and learning when negotiating sustainabilities: the brownfield development of Hammarby Sjöstad, Stockholm. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development*, 3(2). Peer-reviewed journal article.

Tocqueville, A. de [1848] (1969). *Democracy in America*. Harper Perennial.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre (1987). Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco. Inscription record.

HOW TO CITE THIS LETTER

Engberg, L. A. (2026). *Eve & Adam, and the Penguins: From Critical Friendship to Penguin Economics — A Lineage Letter on Money, Life, and Living Complexity*. Field Papers, Green Papers: Notes Toward Planetary Guardianship (v1.0, May 2026). Spiralweb Stewardship Association / Planetary Guardians. CC BY 4.0. https://papers.spiralweb.earth/papers/eve-adam-and-the-penguins.html

RELATED

Den Regenerative Kommune · Report 04 — Penguin Dashboard · Report 02 — The Correction Loop · Report 06 — Regenerative Reciprocity · Green Paper 21 — Den Nye Fælled · Sophia Lumen Protocol