Overall Assessment

The framework presented in the note offers an interesting attempt to connect three levels of analysis that are usually treated separately: the logical structure of a paradigm, the empirical interdependence of social and ecological systems, and the historical transformation of paradigms. Its central proposal is that a framework can be rejected not only because one of its empirical predictions is false, but also because its internal structure is incompatible with the type of system it claims to represent.

In its basic form, the argument may be represented as follows:

$$K_i = L_j$$

where K_i and L_j are two components that are assumed to be conjuncturally or inherently co-determined. A unilateral maximization procedure applied to one component produces

$$\max K_i \quad \text{while } L_j \text{ is treated as independent, fixed, or external}$$

and thereby generates

$$K_i \neq L_j.$$

The resulting difference is interpreted as a structural or sustainability gap:

$$SG = |K_i - L_j| > 0.$$

The important conceptual contribution is not the arithmetic identity itself. The significant claim is that a paradigm may be structurally inadequate when it represents a co-determined system as though its components were separable and independently optimizable.

That is a potentially valuable extension of falsification theory, but it requires stronger formalization before it can be regarded as a general theorem in the mathematical or philosophical sense. At present, it is best described as a proposed structural-falsification framework or a methodological theory of paradigm assessment.

The Core Logical Structure

The framework can be reconstructed as a sequence of propositions.

Assume a system has two components, K_i and L_j. The conjunctural condition is:

$$C_{ij} : K_i = L_j.$$

The equality may be interpreted in several different ways. It may mean numerical equality, functional equivalence, equality of constraints, equality of sustainability status, or equality between two corresponding system conditions. These interpretations must not be conflated.

Suppose the system is governed by a coupling relation:

$$L_j = f(K_i)$$

or, more generally,

$$F(K_i, L_j) = 0.$$

If the coupling relation requires equality, then:

$$F(K_i, L_j) = K_i - L_j = 0.$$

A paradigm that maximizes K_i without simultaneously transforming L_j is applying an operation of the form:

$$T(K_i, L_j) = (K_i', L_j)$$

with

$$K_i' \neq K_i.$$

The transformed state no longer satisfies the conjunctural condition:

$$K_i' - L_j \neq 0.$$

The structural gap is therefore:

$$SG(K_i', L_j) = d(K_i', L_j),$$

where the simplest distance is:

$$d(K_i', L_j) = |K_i' - L_j|.$$

Under this reconstruction, the structural-falsification claim is conditional:

$$[C_{ij} : K_i = L_j] \wedge [T(K_i, L_j) = (K_i', L_j),\ K_i' \neq K_i] \Rightarrow [K_i' \neq L_j]\,.$$

This implication is logically valid if the premises hold. However, the crucial empirical and theoretical question is whether the system genuinely requires $K_i = L_j$. That cannot be established merely by naming two components or asserting that they are interdependent.

A Set-Theoretic Reformulation

A set-theoretic formulation could make the framework substantially more precise.

Let a paradigm be represented by a set of admissible states:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{x \in X : \Phi_{\mathcal{P}}(x)\},$$

where X is the state space and $\Phi_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the set of constraints, assumptions, mechanisms, and permissible transformations associated with the paradigm.

Let the two relevant components be sets:

$$K_i \subseteq U_K, \qquad L_j \subseteq U_L.$$

If they belong to different universes, literal equality is not mathematically meaningful unless a common coding or correspondence function is defined. A more rigorous representation would therefore use a mapping:

$$\phi_{ij} : K_i \to L_j$$

and define conjunctural compatibility as:

$$\phi_{ij}(K_i) = L_j.$$

Alternatively, if both components are represented in a common universe U, one can write:

$$K_i, L_j \subseteq U$$

and define exact conjunctural equality as:

$$K_i = L_j.$$

The degree of structural discrepancy can then be measured using the symmetric difference:

$$K_i \triangle L_j = (K_i \setminus L_j) \cup (L_j \setminus K_i).$$

The corresponding gap is:

$$SG_{ij} = \mu(K_i \triangle L_j),$$

where μ is a measure. In finite systems, μ may be cardinality:

$$SG_{ij} = |K_i \triangle L_j|.$$

For normalized comparison, one could use the Jaccard distance:

$$SG_{ij}^J = 1 - \frac{\mu(K_i \cap L_j)}{\mu(K_i \cup L_j)}.$$

This is more informative than $|K_i - L_j|$ when K_i and L_j are multidimensional sets rather than scalar quantities. It distinguishes complete overlap from partial overlap and avoids pretending that social, economic, and environmental states are naturally measured on the same numerical scale.

A general structural validity condition could therefore be defined as:

$$V_{ij}(\mathcal{P}) \iff SG_{ij}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \varepsilon,$$

where ε is an admissible tolerance. Exact equality is often unrealistic in open systems, so a tolerance-based condition may be more scientifically defensible than requiring:

$$SG_{ij} = 0.$$

Structural Falsification Versus Empirical Falsification

The proposed theory should be distinguished carefully from Popperian empirical falsification.

In ordinary empirical falsification, a paradigm P produces a prediction y_P under conditions x. An observation y_{obs} conflicts with that prediction:

$$y_{\text{obs}} \notin \mathcal{A}_P(x),$$

where $\mathcal{A}_P(x)$ is the set of outcomes allowed by the paradigm. The paradigm is then empirically challenged.

Structural falsification occurs at a different level. It concerns whether the paradigm's architecture can represent the relevant system without violating a necessary relation. Let:

$$R \subseteq X \times X$$

be the system's required coupling relation, and let:

$$R_{\mathcal{P}}$$

be the relation encoded by the paradigm. Structural falsification can be expressed as:

$$R \not\subseteq R_{\mathcal{P}}$$

or, more strongly, as the existence of a state x such that:

$$x \in R \quad \text{but} \quad x \notin R_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

This means that the paradigm excludes or misrepresents states that are structurally possible or necessary in the actual system.

The distinction can be summarized conceptually. Empirical falsification says that the world did not behave as the paradigm predicted. Structural falsification says that the paradigm's representation of the world is inadequate before, or independently of, a particular failed prediction.

However, structural falsification must not become a purely deductive label applied whenever a framework appears morally or conceptually incomplete. It requires an independently justified structural premise, such as demonstrated co-determination, conservation, constraint dependence, causal feedback, or an empirically supported impossibility of treating the components as independent.

The Relationship to Popper

The proposed framework can extend Popper in three ways.

First, it adds a pre-empirical screening stage. Before testing a paradigm's predictions, researchers can examine whether its assumptions are structurally compatible with the system domain. A paradigm that assumes separability where strong coupling is unavoidable may be rejected as structurally defective.

Second, it broadens the object of falsification. Instead of testing only propositions such as:

$$H : x \to y,$$

one can test structural propositions such as:

$$H_s : \text{the components } K_i \text{ and } L_j \text{ are independently optimizable.}$$

If the data establish that changes in K_i systematically alter the feasible values of L_j, then the independence assumption is falsified.

Third, it provides a formal interpretation of accumulated negative consequences. If repeated application of a paradigm produces a growing gap:

$$SG_t > SG_{t-1}$$

over time, then the gap can be treated as evidence that the paradigm's transformation rules are systematically incompatible with the coupled system.

The Popperian extension is strongest when the framework formulates risky structural hypotheses. For example:

$$H_0 : \frac{\partial L_j}{\partial K_i} = 0$$

represents independence, while:

$$H_1 : \frac{\partial L_j}{\partial K_i} \neq 0$$

represents interdependence. A researcher can estimate the relationship empirically and test whether the independence assumption is defensible.

The framework is weaker if "interdependence" is simply assumed from the beginning and then used to declare a paradigm falsified. In that form, the argument risks circularity:

$$K_i = L_j$$

is assumed as a premise, unilateral maximization creates $K_i \neq L_j$, and the latter is then treated as proof that the original paradigm was invalid. The independent evidence must establish the conjunctural relation, not merely the resulting gap.

The Relationship to Kuhn

The Kuhnian connection is also promising but should be formulated with care.

Kuhn described normal science as operating within a paradigm that defines legitimate problems, methods, standards, and solutions. Anomalies accumulate when observations resist the paradigm's expectations. A crisis may then create conditions for a paradigm shift.

The structural-falsification framework adds a distinction between ordinary anomalies and architecture-level anomalies. An ordinary anomaly is a failed prediction within a framework that remains structurally adequate. A structural anomaly indicates that the framework's basic decomposition, independence assumptions, or optimization logic cannot accommodate the system's actual relations.

Let the anomaly set at time t be:

$$A_t(\mathcal{P}) = \{x \in X : x \text{ conflicts with predictions or constraints of } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Let the structural-gap set be:

$$G_t(\mathcal{P}) = \{x \in X : SG_{ij}(x) > \varepsilon\}.$$

A Kuhnian crisis could then be modeled as a condition in which the structural anomalies become persistent, cumulative, and resistant to internal adjustment:

$$\mu(A_t \cap G_t) \to \text{large}$$

and no admissible internal transformation $T_{\mathcal{P}}$ can reduce the gap below tolerance:

$$\forall T \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}}, \qquad SG_{ij}(T(x)) > \varepsilon.$$

A paradigm shift becomes necessary when the old paradigm cannot repair the structural defect using its own permissible operations. A successor paradigm $\mathcal{P}'$ would be preferable if:

$$\mathcal{P}' \supseteq R$$

and there exists a transformation $T_{\mathcal{P}'}$ such that:

$$SG_{ij}(T_{\mathcal{P}'}(x)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

This gives Kuhnian paradigm change a formal structural dimension. The shift is not merely a change in vocabulary or consensus. It is a change in the system of admissible relations and transformations.

Nevertheless, the framework should avoid claiming that Popper and Kuhn simply "missed" structural falsification without qualification. Popper was primarily concerned with the logical status of scientific claims and their exposure to refutation. Kuhn analyzed historically situated scientific communities, exemplars, normal science, crisis, and conceptual change. Structural falsification could be presented as a complementary level of analysis rather than as a replacement or definitive correction of either thinker.

A More General Structural Falsification Theorem

A stronger theorem could be stated in the following form.

Let a system be represented by a state space X, two component functions

$$K_i : X \to \mathbb{R} \qquad \text{and} \qquad L_j : X \to \mathbb{R},$$

and a necessary coupling condition

$$C_{ij}(x) : K_i(x) = L_j(x).$$

Let a paradigm $\mathcal{P}$ authorize a unilateral transformation T_K satisfying:

$$K_i(T_K x) \neq K_i(x), \qquad L_j(T_K x) = L_j(x).$$

Then, for any state x satisfying $K_i(x) = L_j(x)$, the transformed state $T_K x$ violates the coupling condition:

$$K_i(T_K x) \neq L_j(T_K x).$$

Consequently:

$$SG_{ij}(T_K x) = |K_i(T_K x) - L_j(T_K x)| > 0.$$

This is a valid conditional theorem. It proves that unilateral change breaks equality under the specified assumptions.

A more general version should replace equality with an arbitrary compatibility relation:

$$C_{ij}(x) = 0.$$

Suppose the paradigm's transformation T changes only one coordinate:

$$T(x_K, x_L) = (T_K(x_K), x_L).$$

Structural falsification occurs if:

$$C_{ij}(T(x)) \neq 0$$

for some admissible x satisfying:

$$C_{ij}(x) = 0.$$

This formulation is preferable because real sustainability systems rarely require literal equality. They may require balance, bounded disparity, feasibility, resilience, or nonnegative stocks rather than exact identity.

Sustainability Gap Theory

The sustainability-gap component can become scientifically useful if it is defined as a distance between actual system states and a justified sustainability set.

Let:

$$\mathcal{S} \subseteq X$$

be the set of states satisfying specified ecological, social, and economic sustainability constraints. Given an observed state x_t , define:

$$SG(x_t) = \inf_{s \in \mathcal{S}} d(x_t, s).$$

This measures the distance from the actual state to the nearest sustainable state. If the system includes multiple dimensions, a weighted metric may be used:

$$SG(x_t) = \left[\sum_{r=1}^{n} w_r \left(\frac{x_{r,t} - s_r^*}{\sigma_r} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2},$$

where w_r represents the importance of dimension r , σ_r standardizes units, and s_r^* is the relevant sustainability threshold or target.

A structural gap is different from an ordinary performance gap. A performance gap means that the system is currently below a target. A structural gap means that the rules used to generate or manage the system systematically reproduce the deviation. One possible test is:

$$SG_{t+1} > SG_t$$

under repeated application of the paradigm's recommended policy rule, even after reasonable corrective adjustments.

That would suggest that the problem is not merely insufficient implementation. It may indicate that the paradigm's optimization target is incompatible with the coupled sustainability constraints.

Necessary Qualifications

The equality condition $K_i = L_j$ is the most important assumption requiring clarification. Interdependence does not automatically imply equality. Two variables may be causally connected while remaining unequal:

$$K_i \neq L_j$$

can hold in a perfectly coherent system. For example, energy consumption and ecological carrying capacity are interdependent, but they are not naturally equal quantities.

The framework should therefore distinguish at least four relations:

$$K_i = L_j$$

for exact equality,

$$K_i \approx L_j$$

for approximate balance,

$$K_i \leq L_j$$

for a carrying-capacity constraint, and

$$F(K_i, L_j) = 0$$

for a general functional relationship.

This distinction would prevent the theory from overgeneralizing from a useful special case.

The notion of unilateral maximization also requires precision. A model may maximize one objective while imposing constraints on all others. Multi-objective optimization does not necessarily require equalizing the objectives. A more accurate criticism is directed at optimization models that maximize one component while treating coupled constraints as externalities or independent background conditions.

Finally, structural falsification should be separated from ethical criticism. A framework can be structurally incomplete without every policy generated by it being empirically unsuccessful. Conversely, a framework can produce good short-term results while remaining structurally unstable over a longer time horizon. Time dependence should therefore be explicit:

$$SG_{ij}(t)$$

and the theory should examine not only the level of the gap but also its trajectory:

$$\frac{dSG_{ij}}{dt}, \qquad \frac{d^2 SG_{ij}}{dt^2}.$$

Practical Research Procedure

A rigorous application of the framework can proceed step by step.

Define the Paradigm

Represent the paradigm as a formal object:

$$\mathcal{P} = \langle X, \Theta, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{O} \rangle,$$

where X is the state space, Θ is the set of assumptions, $\mathcal{A}$ is the objective function, $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of permitted transformations, and $\mathcal{O}$ is the set of observable outcomes.

For an economic-growth framework, for example, the objective might be:

$$\max B(x)$$

subject to weak or absent constraints on social and environmental variables.

Identify the Coupled Components

Define the allegedly conjunctural components operationally. For example:

$$K_i = \text{material throughput}$$

and

$$L_j = \text{ecological regeneration capacity.}$$

Do not merely assert that they are coupled. Specify the causal mechanism linking them.

Test the Independence Assumption

Estimate whether changes in one component affect the other. A basic model might be:

$$L_{j,t} = \alpha + \beta K_{i,t} + \gamma Z_t + \varepsilon_t,$$

where Z_t contains controls. Evidence that $\beta \neq 0$, especially with theoretically consistent temporal or causal structure, challenges the assumption of independence.

Panel, time-series, quasi-experimental, or process-tracing methods may be used depending on the case.

Define the Structural Constraint

Specify whether the required relation is equality, an inequality, a feasible region, or a dynamic equation. For example:

$$K_{i,t} \leq L_{j,t}$$

may be more appropriate than $K_{i,t} = L_{j,t}$ if ecological regeneration defines an upper bound on resource use.

Model the Paradigm's Transformation

Write the policy or decision rule explicitly:

$$x_{t+1} = T_{\mathcal{P}}(x_t).$$

Then identify whether the rule changes one component while holding another fixed:

$$T_{\mathcal{P}}(K_i, L_j) = (T_K(K_i), L_j).$$

If so, calculate the resulting structural discrepancy.

Measure the Sustainability Gap

Use a transparent metric such as:

$$SG_t = d(x_t, \mathcal{S})$$

or, for two scalar components:

$$SG_{ij,t} = |K_{i,t} - L_{j,t}|.$$

Report units, normalization, weights, uncertainty, and the sensitivity of the result to alternative definitions.

Compare Alternative Paradigms

Construct a successor framework that uses joint optimization:

$$\max_x \left[U_K(K_i(x)) + U_L(L_j(x))\right]$$

subject to:

$$F(K_i, L_j) \leq 0.$$

Alternatively, use a Pareto formulation:

$$\max\,(U_K, U_L)$$

with no solution accepted if it violates essential ecological or social thresholds.

The key test is not whether the alternative produces a rhetorically attractive outcome. It is whether it reduces the structural gap while preserving or improving relevant system functions.

Experimental and Applied Case Studies

Case Study: Electricity Expansion and Ecological Capacity

Consider a region seeking to maximize electricity generation through fossil-fuel expansion. Let:

$$K_i = \text{electricity generation capacity}$$

and

$$L_j = \text{atmospheric and ecological absorption capacity}.$$

A conventional unilateral model may use:

$$\max K_i$$

while treating emissions as a secondary external cost. The structural relation is not literal equality but a feasibility condition:

$$E(K_i) \le C_j,$$

where $E(K_i)$ is emissions produced by generation capacity and C_j is the relevant ecological or regulatory capacity.

The structural-gap measure can be defined as:

$$SG_t = \max\{0, E_t - C_{j,t}\}.$$

The empirical procedure is straightforward. First, estimate the relationship between additional generation and emissions. Second, estimate the absorption or allowable-emissions boundary. Third, simulate the policy rule that expands generation. Fourth, compare it with a joint optimization rule involving efficiency, renewable generation, storage, and demand management.

If the unilateral rule repeatedly produces:

$$E_t > C_{j,t}$$

while the joint rule maintains:

$$E_t \le C_{j,t},$$

then the evidence supports the claim that the original policy structure is incompatible with the ecological constraint. The result would be a structural critique of the optimization architecture, not merely a report that emissions happened to be high.

Case Study: Agricultural Output and Water Regeneration

Let:

$$K_i = \text{agricultural output}$$

and

$$L_j = \text{renewable water availability}.$$

A production-maximizing paradigm may choose:

$$\max K_i$$

with irrigation treated as an input whose long-term depletion is not fully incorporated into the production objective.

The relevant constraint is:

$$W_{\text{withdrawal},t} \le W_{\text{recharge},t} + W_{\text{permitted depletion}}.$$

The structural gap can be calculated as:

$$SG_t = \max\{0, W_{\text{withdrawal},t} - W_{\text{recharge},t}\}.$$

The practical experiment would compare farms or regions adopting different decision rules. One group could follow yield maximization, while another uses a constrained rule that jointly optimizes yield, soil quality, and water stocks. Outcomes would be measured over multiple seasons, because a short-run increase in output may conceal a long-run decline in aquifer capacity.

The structural-falsification claim would be supported if the output-maximization rule systematically increases the gap and the gap persists despite ordinary technical adjustments. It would be weakened if technological substitution, pricing, or institutional changes allowed the paradigm to maintain output without violating the water constraint.

Case Study: Urban Mobility and Public Health

Let:

$$K_i = \text{vehicle throughput or travel speed}$$

and

$$L_j = \text{public-health and environmental capacity.}$$

A transport paradigm that maximizes road throughput may improve one performance indicator while increasing air pollution, noise, injury risk, and land consumption.

A multidimensional sustainability set might be defined as:

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ x : \begin{array}{r} \mathrm{NO}_2(x) \le \tau_1, \\ \mathrm{PM}_{2.5}(x) \le \tau_2, \\ \text{traffic fatalities}(x) \le \tau_3, \\ \text{accessibility}(x) \ge \tau_4 \end{array} \right\}.$$

The gap is then the distance between the observed urban state and this feasible set. The comparison would involve road expansion, public transport, walking, cycling, congestion pricing, and land-use integration.

This case illustrates why set theory is useful. There is no single scalar “environmental component” that can naturally be equated with traffic throughput. Instead, the system is defined by the intersection of several constraint sets:

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\text{health}} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\text{safety}} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\text{accessibility}} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\text{ecology}}.$$

A paradigm is structurally deficient when its admissible policy space lies largely outside this intersection.

What Would Make the Framework Stronger

The framework would gain considerable scientific strength through a formal distinction between three claims. The first claim is a mathematical proposition:

$$K_i = L_j \wedge T_K(K_i, L_j) = (K_i', L_j) \wedge K_i' \neq K_i \Rightarrow K_i' \neq L_j.$$

This proposition is straightforward and valid under its assumptions.

The second claim is a systems proposition: certain real-world components are sufficiently coupled that unilateral treatment is descriptively inadequate. This requires empirical evidence, causal mechanisms, and domain-specific operationalization.

The third claim is a methodological proposition: a paradigm that violates a necessary coupling relation should be called structurally falsified. This requires a clear criterion distinguishing essential structural constraints from desirable balances, policy preferences, or contingent correlations.

The most promising development would be to replace the universal equality formulation with a hierarchy of structural relations:

independence,weak dependence,functional coupling,hard feasibility constraint,conjunctural equality.

Each level would require a different falsification test. This would prevent the theory from treating all forms of interdependence as mathematically identical.

Conclusion

The framework's strongest idea is that paradigm evaluation should include the architecture of representation, not only the truth or falsity of isolated predictions. When a system is genuinely co-determined, a model that maximizes one component while treating the others as independent externalities can generate persistent structural gaps. This offers a potentially useful bridge between philosophy of science, sustainability analysis, systems theory, and policy evaluation.

Its relationship to Popper is best understood as an extension from empirical falsification to structural model adequacy. Its relationship to Kuhn is best understood as an account of how persistent structural anomalies can contribute to crisis and paradigm transformation. Set theory can provide the formal language for admissible states, coupled relations, intersections, complements, and symmetric differences. Sustainability-gap theory can provide the empirical language for measuring the distance between actual trajectories and coupled sustainability conditions.

The central research task is therefore not simply to repeat:

$$K_i = L_j \Rightarrow SG > 0$$

after unilateral change. It is to demonstrate, for a specified domain, that the relation between K_i and L_j is necessary or empirically indispensable, that the paradigm actually assumes separability, that its transformation rules reproduce the gap, and that an alternative conjunctural paradigm reduces the gap under transparent and reproducible tests. When these conditions are met, structural falsification becomes more than a metaphor: it becomes a potentially rigorous method for diagnosing paradigm-level failure.

REFERENCES

- Popper, K. R. (1959). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson & Co. (This foundational text defines the standard falsificationist criterion for scientific demarcation, which the proposed framework seeks to extend to structural conditions.)
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (This seminal work provides the framework for normal science, anomalies, crises, and paradigm shifts that the proposed theory reinterprets through the lens of structural structural sustainability gaps.)
- IPCC (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Chapter 10: Transport). Cambridge University Press. (This report documents the systemic interdependencies between urban form, transport efficiency, and emissions, providing the empirical basis for assessing unilateral versus joint-optimization paradigms in urban mobility.)
- UNESCO/UN-Water (2024). *The United Nations World Water Development Report 2024: Water for prosperity and peace*. Paris, UNESCO. (This comprehensive report analyzes the co-determined relationships between water security, agricultural production, and economic development, offering evidence for the structural gaps created when water management is decoupled from broader sustainability goals.)