

THE EMBEDDED CAPABILITY PRINCIPLE

FIRST EDITION · 2026

Published for reference

PREAMBLE

Recognising that every civilisation rests on productive capability, the capacity to understand, design, build, operate, maintain, and improve the systems on which life depends; and that civilisations have differed less in whether they held such capability than in how they distributed it between their institutions and their people;

Acknowledging that industrialisation concentrated productive capability in institutions and specialised organisations, drawn by the logic of specialisation, standardisation, scale, and the efficient allocation of capital and labour; that this concentration produced extraordinary gains in efficiency, safety, affordability, and reliability; and that it remains indispensable wherever large-scale coordination is required and is not to be reversed;

Recognising further that technological progress has since lowered the cost of capability itself, that affordable computing, engineering software, simulation, digital manufacture, automation, open technical knowledge, distributed supply chains, and increasingly capable tools allow a competent person to conceive, design, analyse, build, operate, and maintain systems of previously unattainable complexity, and that it is therefore practical to distribute meaningful productive capability widely while retaining what concentration achieved;

Noting that the prevailing commercial logic moves in the contrary direction, favouring solutions that minimise customer participation, concentrate expertise within organisations, and package capability as products and services to be consumed rather than developed; and that the broader shift from ownership toward subscription, managed services, and continuous dependence on providers creates value by insulating people from complexity rather than by enabling them to master systems, so that convenience becomes the working measure of progress while understanding, stewardship, and productive involvement become optional;

Mindful that periods of strain, whether of supply, infrastructure, economy, or security, repeatedly demonstrate the difference between the two configurations: that capacity concentrated in institutions propagates failure when the institutions are degraded, while capability distributed among a population persists where its holders stand, adapts, and improvises, and achieves at modest cost effects that concentrated capacity does not reach;

Considering that distribution yields more than endurance under strain: that a population holding capability participates productively rather than only consuming, innovates from positions no institution occupies, adapts without waiting to be provisioned, contributes voluntarily where contribution is needed, and exercises to some effect the agency it already holds in principle;

Observing that these forces pull in opposite directions, technology moving capability toward the individual and the prevailing commercial and institutional logic moving it away, so that the distribution of productive capability in a society is today set by that logic operating on default rather than by any deliberate decision about what a society should retain in its people;

Accordingly, the following principle is declared.

The distribution of productive capability shall be set by deliberate decision and not by default; and the capability embedded in individuals shall be recognised, preserved, and developed as a fundamental societal asset alongside financial capital, infrastructure, institutional capacity, and natural resources.

The articles that follow define the terms, state the case for distribution, describe the asset and the manner of its formation and loss, set the parties in their relation, and give the tests in which its content is stated most precisely. Observance is voluntary; the tests carry that content; the text governs.

ARTICLE 1

Definitions

Productive capability. The capacity to understand, design, build, operate, maintain, repair, improve, and responsibly manage the systems a society depends on. It is held by institutions and by individuals in proportions that differ between societies and change over time.

Distribution. The apportionment of productive capability between institutions and individuals across a society, together with its spread among the individuals who hold it. Distribution is a property of the whole, and it is set by the accumulation of many separate decisions about who may do what.

Embedded capability. Productive capability held in persons rather than in institutional structures: what a society's people can do from their own basis, held in them and their equipment across a territory, travelling with the persons who hold it, and exercisable without dependence on the continued functioning of any institution. Embedded capability is the mechanism through which distributed capability exists.

Held capability. The same capability seen in the single person: knowledge, practical skill, judgement, systems understanding, the tools and resources to act, and the willingness to assume responsibility where doing so creates lasting

capability. It is not formal education and not employment skill; it is what the person can do with the resources available to them.

Capability project. A foundational domain of life, among them mobility, housing, energy, and food, conducted as a lifelong undertaking rather than consumed as a product or a service. The project is the succession of decisions, acquisitions, work, operation, maintenance, and improvement through which the person meets the domain over time.

Participation spectrum. The continuous range of positions available within any activity of a project: to perform it personally, to delegate it, to automate it, or to procure it, in any combination and changed at any time. Participation is calibrated, not binary; no position on the spectrum is disqualifying and none is compulsory.

Capability composition. The conduct of a project by its manager, the individual, who combines knowledge, personal effort, technology, goods, markets, professional services, institutions, and collaboration toward objectives of their own setting. Composition is the act through which participation becomes capability.

Standards floor. The level of restriction genuinely required for the safety of persons other than the one exercising capability and for the protection of the public. The floor is met as a matter of course; the principle operates at and above it.

ARTICLE 2

Distribution

Every society distributes productive capability somehow, and few societies have chosen the distribution they have. It accumulates from decisions taken for other reasons: a certification written to manage liability, a product sealed to protect a service revenue, a trade reserved to a profession, a curriculum built around examination. Each decision is defensible on its own ground. The distribution they produce together is nobody's decision and appears in no account.

Industrialisation concentrated capability deliberately and to great effect. Bringing expertise together inside organisations, standardising method, and allocating capital and labour at scale delivered safety, affordability, and reliability that dispersed practice had never reached and could not have reached. This is not a period to be regretted or a settlement to be undone. Concentration remains the correct configuration wherever coordination at scale is what the task requires, and a society needs its institutional capacity in full.

What has changed is that concentration is no longer the only configuration in which serious work can be done. When the tools of analysis, design, manufacture, and knowledge were themselves institutional assets, capability could be held only where those assets were. They are now within individual reach. The question of how a society distributes its productive capability,

dormant while the answer was fixed by cost, is therefore live again, and it is being answered by default.

The principle sets the objective precisely. It is to diversify the distribution of productive capability through a society, not to maximise the independence of individuals within it. Independence maximisation would be a different claim: it would rank the positions on the participation spectrum, treat procurement as a lesser condition than personal performance, and spend institutional capacity to buy individual autonomy. The principle does none of these. It asks that capability exist in more places and in more forms than one, and it is satisfied by a society in which institutions are strong and individuals are capable at once.

The distribution of capability differs in kind from the distribution of wealth, and the difference determines what the principle is able to ask for. Wealth, land, and physical capital are rival. Allocated to one party they are not simultaneously available to another, and any change in their distribution takes from someone. Capability is not rival. A person who becomes able to do something removes nothing from anyone else who is able to do it, and a society's stock of capability grows by addition rather than by transfer. The principle therefore proposes no reallocation and identifies no party who must hold less. It takes no position on the distribution of wealth. What it examines is whether the conditions under which capability forms are open, and those conditions are constrained more often by permission than by scarcity. Permission withheld beyond what protection requires costs nothing to grant.

A person who holds productive capability is a productive nucleus: a point at which a society can act without first being provisioned. Nuclei do not compete with institutions; they are where institutions recruit, where enterprises begin, where local knowledge is generated, and where response arrives before the institutional one. A civilisation with many such nuclei is denser in capacity than its institutional inventory records, and the density is what distribution builds.

ARTICLE 3

The Asset

A society measures its progress in output, wealth, institutional capacity, and educational attainment. These measures are indispensable and incomplete. They record what a society holds and produces; they do not record what its people remain able to do. Embedded capability is the missing measure: the capacity to create, sustain, adapt, and recover that resides in the population itself.

The asset has properties the other assets do not. It is distributed: located wherever its holders are, available in conditions no institution was designed to serve. It is resilient: it does not propagate institutional failure, because it is not part of the institutional dependency structure. It is diversified: held by many in many forms, it has no common failure mode and cannot be lost at once, and the variety of methods it keeps alive is a society's hedge against the error of any single standard solution, an insurance no central provider can write. It is generative: capable people carry their capability into every institution that

employs them and every enterprise they begin. And it is silent in the accounts: no ledger carries it, so no ledger records its loss.

Resilience is the property most easily seen, and it is an emergent one rather than the object of the exercise. A society does not distribute capability in order to withstand strain; it distributes capability, and withstanding strain is among the things that follow. The other consequences operate in ordinary conditions and are the larger part of the case. Capable people participate productively rather than only consuming. They innovate from positions no institution occupies, because they work on cases no institution has reason to take up. They adapt at the speed of their own decisions. They contribute where contribution is needed, voluntarily and without being organised to do so. And they exercise to some effect the agency they already hold in principle, which is otherwise held and not used.

The asset also carries its own relief. A person who holds capability and assumes responsibility provides for themselves what would otherwise be provided to them, and in need provides for others: the neighbour before the agency, the first response before the institutional one. Each increment of embedded capability is a subtraction from the net demand placed on centralised welfare, safety, and security systems, made without reducing anyone's entitlement to them; the systems remain in place and arrive to find less to do. The relief is not a claim against those who depend on provision. It is the aggregate effect of capability wherever it stands.

Once recognised, the asset reads back on the systems that produce it. Educational attainment records what a system delivered; embedded capability records what its people retained and can exercise on their own basis, and the two diverge. A system may raise attainment while leaving little capability behind it, and the divergence appears only where the second is measured. Institutions admit the same reading. An institution may be examined not only by the service it provides but by whether the population it serves grows more capable or more dependent for having been served, which is the difference between provision that multiplies capability and provision that replaces it.

The asset is distributional by construction, and its spread is a dimension of opportunity that measures of income, wealth, and attainment do not capture. Because formation requires no particular class, wealth, or credential, capability is reachable from positions from which other advantages are not. The principle proposes no index and adopts none. It holds that any account of how a society's advantages are distributed remains incomplete while capability is absent from it.

Wealth measures what a society possesses. Embedded capability measures what it can still make, maintain, adapt, and recover when conditions change. A society that cultivates the second alongside the first is more resilient, more adaptable, and more able to shape its own course.

ARTICLE 4

Formation

Capability forms in the conduct of projects. The person engages the substance of a domain directly, works with its technologies and practices, and accumulates competence through repeated engagement until they act from their own basis. Formation requires no particular class, wealth, or credential; it requires the engagement itself and the conditions that permit it.

Formation proceeds by composition. The person assembles a project from knowledge, personal effort, technology, goods, markets, professional services, institutions, and collaboration, in whatever combination meets the objective they have set. To build or to buy, to learn or to hire, to maintain or to contract are adjustable variables within a project, not opposing philosophies to which a person belongs. Each is correct in some conditions and wrong in others, and the competence being formed is partly the judgement of which is which.

Formation follows the participation spectrum. Capability accumulates at every position on it: the person who performs the work gains one competence, the person who specifies, procures, and supervises it gains another, and informed movement along the spectrum is itself a competence. The principle does not prescribe where on the spectrum a person should stand. It asks that the position be occupied by decision rather than assigned by default, so that participation becomes an intentional design variable rather than a predetermined social role, and that the movement remain open in both directions.

Some projects contain phases in which the spectrum is not available. Where an activity proceeds beyond the reach of provision, whether because no other party can reach the operation, because the time available to act is shorter than the time provision would take to arrive, or because contact with others is severed, delegation and procurement cannot be exercised however the person would choose them. The position is then occupied by necessity rather than by decision or by default. In such phases composition is anterior: what the person holds when the phase begins is the whole of what the activity can draw on, and responsibility for the outcome is not assumed but structural, because no other party is present to carry it. This ranks no position above another. It records that the activity has removed the alternatives.

Formation is served by supply. Tools, materials, knowledge, education, and professional services are the means the person composes; where industry supplies them in forms a person can engage, understand, and build upon, formation compounds. Professional expertise multiplies formation where it teaches and enables; it arrests formation where it substitutes.

The opportunity to conduct a capability project of consequence was until recently narrow. Serious work in a technical domain required institutional employment, institutional capital, or the founding of an enterprise, and a person who wanted none of the three had no third position to occupy. Technology has widened the opening, and the pursuit of a substantial project on one's own account is now available to many for whom it was formerly out of reach. The claim is not that people should become inventors or industrialists. It is that a path exists between consumption, employment, and enterprise, and that its existence is worth protecting for those who take it.

Formation has an upper reach. A person who engages a domain far enough begins to produce knowledge within it rather than only to apply what is known: measuring what has not been measured, testing what has been assumed, recording what the institutions of the domain have no reason to record. Inquiry conducted on a person's own account is the mature form of held capability, and what it finds returns to the common stock. It carries a discipline of its own kind. Inquiry is distinguished from opinion by method, by evidence, and by results stated so that others may verify or refute them, and nothing in the principle credits private conviction formed against expertise. The claim is for the person who does the work to the standard the work requires.

The one condition formation cannot do without is liberty in the negative sense: the absence of structural obstacles. The path need not be subsidised, programmed, or organised. It must not be foreclosed.

ARTICLE 5

Erosion

The asset is lost the way it is built: gradually, activity by activity, without announcement.

It erodes where technology is designed against engagement: sealed, undocumented, unserviceable by its owner, dependent on the supplier for every intervention across its life.

It erodes where restriction exceeds its justification: where the boundary of what a person may do is drawn past the safety of third parties, into territory that serves the commercial interest of incumbent suppliers rather than the safety of the population.

It erodes where delegation is made compulsory: where activities a person could perform are reserved to institutions or professions without a protective reason, and the participation spectrum is cut down to its consuming end.

It erodes where the means of formation are fenced: where tools, parts, documentation, and knowledge are priced, licensed, or withheld beyond what any protective purpose requires.

And it erodes in the accounts: because no framework measures the asset, every erosion registers as something else, as efficiency, as professionalisation, as consumer convenience, and the loss is never billed to the decision that caused it. This is why the distribution of a society's productive capability can shift substantially without any party having decided that it should.

ARTICLE 6

The Parties

Three parties produce a society's productive capacity, and the principle sets them as complements, not competitors.

The individual is the manager of the capability project: the party who sets its objectives, calibrates participation, composes capability from the available means, and holds the result.

Institutions coordinate at scale, hold standards, and manage complexity no individual can. Nothing in the principle reduces them. A society needs its institutional capacity in full; the principle claims only that institutional capacity and embedded capability are different assets, and that the first is no substitute for the second.

Industry stands between them, and the principle names its role precisely: not only a producer of finished products to be consumed whole, but a supplier of modular capabilities the individual orchestrates. Materials, tools, components, technology, instruction, and professional services are modules of capability. Industry serves the principle where it supplies them in composable form, and profits durably from doing so, because a capable customer is a deeper and longer market than a dependent one.

The two parties reach available technology on different schedules. Industrial supply must clear thresholds before it delivers: a market large enough to justify development, then tooling, certification, distribution, and support sustained across a product life. These thresholds are what allow industry to serve many people well, and they impose a passage the technology itself does not require. A person who can compose applies a technology when it becomes available rather than when it becomes a product, and reaches productive use ahead of the supply that will eventually package it. Where demand does not aggregate the schedules never converge at all: a need particular to one place, one operation, or one person may never reach the threshold at which a product is made for it, and for that need composition is not the shorter path but the only one. This is no fault of industry. Serving the aggregate is what industry does well, and the aggregate is not the whole of what a society needs done.

The complementarity holds in knowledge as it holds in provision. Institutional research sustains what no individual can: instruments of national scale, programmes carried across decades, and communities of specialists dense enough to check one another. Individual inquiry occupies ground institutions cannot reach by their own construction, because a funded programme must establish the value of the work before it begins, and the value of curiosity-driven inquiry is characteristically established only after. Distributed inquiry also carries no common failure mode: it does not stand or fall with a budget cycle, an institutional priority, or a prevailing view. Neither form substitutes for the other, and the principle claims no more for the second than that a society which retains it is never left holding only the first.

The boundary between what a person composes and what a person buys is not fixed. Engineering tools, digital manufacture, distributed knowledge, and affordable computation move it continuously toward the individual. The principle takes no position on where the boundary should rest in any domain; it requires that the boundary be set by capability and safety, not by the interest of any party in keeping it where it is.

ARTICLE 7

The Tests

The articles state the principle in general terms. The following tests state it specifically. They are what the principle amounts to when it meets a particular regulation, technology, institution, curriculum, or incentive, and they are the shortest statement of its content. They are not a compliance instrument and yield no score. Each is a question that can be put to a measure and answered from evidence, and any answer given under them stands or falls on the evidence and reasoning shown for it.

T1 *Distribution*. Does the measure concentrate productive capability or distribute it, and was that effect decided or inherited?

T2 *Capability*. Does the measure expand or reduce what a person can do from their own basis?

T3 *Necessity*. Where the measure assigns an activity to an institution or a profession, does a protective purpose require the assignment, or could the person compose the activity themselves?

T4 *Proportionality*. Where the measure restricts individual work, does the restriction extend no further than the safety of third parties and the protection of the public require?

T5 *Spectrum*. Does the measure preserve movement along the participation spectrum, or does it lock the person into a single position, in either direction? Where a phase of the activity places the spectrum beyond reach, the test asks instead whether the measure permits the person to enter the phase equipped.

T6 *Lifecycle yield*. Does the technology or service deliver capability relative to the total cost of implementing, understanding, maintaining, and evolving it across its life?

T7 *Multiplication*. Does the professional service multiply the person's capability or replace it with dependence?

A measure may answer badly to these questions and still be right. There are reasons to concentrate capability, and the principle does not ask that they never prevail. It asks that the answer be known when the decision is taken, weighed against what it costs, and recorded. What the principle sets itself against is the silent trade: capability surrendered without the surrender being named.

ARTICLE 8

Scope and Limits

The principle asserts an option, not an obligation. It requires that the path to capability remain open; it requires no one to take it. It prescribes no way of living, ranks no position on the participation spectrum above another, and attaches no virtue to personal performance over informed procurement.

Agency is not the principle's primary objective. Individuals hold agency in principle already, and the principle adds nothing to that holding. What it addresses is whether the agency can be exercised to any effect: capability is what determines that, and responsibility is what legitimises the exercise. A person free to act, able to act, and answerable for acting is the condition the principle serves. Freedom alone is the condition it finds insufficient.

Self-sufficiency is neither the principle's object nor its embarrassment. Where circumstances are adverse and provision does not arrive, or where the activity itself places provision beyond reach, capability held by a person becomes self-sufficiency because nothing else is available, and that is one manifestation of distributed capability rather than a doctrine to be pursued or disowned. In the second case it is not occasional but structural for the duration of the phase, and it follows from the activity rather than from any preference of the person conducting it. In ordinary conditions the same capability manifests as participation, contribution, and informed procurement. The principle neither recommends self-sufficiency as a way of living nor treats it as a distortion of what it proposes.

The principle is not a case against institutions, professions, industry, or markets. Each is indispensable, and the account given here depends on all of them functioning well. What the principle proposes is complementary: that the capability distributed through a population be cultivated alongside the capacity concentrated in organisations, and that neither be spent to purchase the other without the trade being named.

The principle preserves the standards floor without reservation. Some systems cannot be opened to individual work without unacceptable risk to others, and no claim in this document reaches across that line.

The principle is compatible with political traditions that differ on much else, because it fixes a condition rather than a doctrine. Traditions will answer differently the question the principle raises: what distribution of productive capability between individuals and institutions best serves a society. The principle requires only that the question be asked with the asset on the table.

ARTICLE 9

Observance

Observance of the principle is voluntary. The principle is published for reference in the design and evaluation of regulation, technology, education, procurement, and institutional practice, and for adoption by any party at its own responsibility.

Observance requires no declaration and no notice. A party may take the principle into its own reasoning, put its tests to its own decisions, and say nothing to anyone. That is the ordinary case.

No party interprets the principle on behalf of others, and none certifies conformance to it. The tests are published so that any party may apply them, and any examination made under them may be disputed by anyone able to apply

them in turn. A conclusion drawn from the tests holds by the evidence and reasoning shown for it and by nothing else.

The principle is referable. A document, a design philosophy, a standard, or a proposal may declare observance of the principle, cite its articles and tests, and be examined against them. Sector instantiations, design philosophies derived from the principle for a particular domain, carry the principle's tests into the domain's own terms and remain examinable against the parent text.

The principle admits tailoring. Jurisdictions differ in law, institutional structure, and the present position of their capability boundary. Proposals for amendment of a jurisdiction's rules may be drafted against the principle's tests and addressed to the jurisdiction in its own terms.

ARTICLE 10

Origin and Status

The principle was generalised from findings in a single domain. The generalisation rests on the reasoning set out here and on the evidence of those findings, and it is not asserted beyond them. Examination in other domains is invited and has not been conducted. The originating domain and the findings drawn from it are set out in the explanatory memorandum published alongside this text.

This document is the text of ECP-2026, first edition. Derivative statements do not amend it. A revision is issued as a further edition under its own identifier, superseding this one for the purpose of citation without withdrawing it.

This edition is published for reference. Any party may cite it, examine a measure against its tests, instantiate the principle in a domain, and draft proposals from it. A work that does so identifies the principle and this edition, so that a reader of that work can reach the principle directly and judge for themselves what it says. Derivative work carries its own authorship and is not endorsed by the fact of its derivation.

No undertaking is given to maintain, revise, or continue publication of any edition. The text is issued by the Embedded Capability Initiative, established by Flight Constructive Ltd. No authority over observance attaches to that issue, no interpretation is given on behalf of others, and no finding is made on the conformance of any party.

ECP-2026, first edition · Published for reference

© 2026 Flight Constructive Ltd. All rights reserved. Reproduction of the text by permission.