# The Structural Dynamics of Oligarchic Capture in Currency-Based Systems

A Formal Mathematical Model

Barak Water

2026

## Abstract

This paper develops a formal model demonstrating that oligarchic capture — the concentration of wealth and institutional power in a small group — is not an aberration but a structural attractor of currency-based economic systems. Beginning from a two-agent wealth dynamics framework incorporating reinforcement, stochastic shocks, saturation, and poverty traps, the model is extended to multi-agent populations, behavioral adaptation, institutional feedback, and network effects. We show that the resulting system naturally organizes into a three-zone distributional structure (poverty basin, mobility band, saturation plateau) that becomes increasingly brittle over time. We derive formal conditions for intervention effectiveness and demonstrate that single-parameter reforms are mathematically insufficient to alter the system's long-run trajectory. The model identifies a set of necessary structural design constraints for viable non-oligarchic systems and outlines implementable transition pathways grounded in the dynamics themselves.

## 1. Introduction

Economic inequality is often treated as a contingent outcome — the result of specific policies, historical accidents, or individual differences. However, persistent empirical regularities suggest that wealth concentration arises systematically under structural conditions that are common to all currency-based economies (Piketty, 2014; Stiglitz, 2012).

This paper proposes a different framing: inequality is not incidental but an *attractor state* of systems that permit accumulation and dominance reinforcement. Conversely, egalitarian configurations represent an alternative attractor under different structural constraints — an empirical reality demonstrated by anthropological evidence from immediate-return societies (Boehm, 1999; Woodburn, 1982).

The central contribution is a unified dynamical model that traces the emergence of oligarchic structure from first principles, through distributional organization, behavioral reinforcement, institutional capture, and systemic instability — culminating in a formal analysis of intervention conditions and alternative system design.

# 2. The Core Wealth Dynamics Model

## 2.1 Two-Agent Formulation

Consider two agents with wealth levels $W_1(t)$ and $W_2(t)$. Each agent's wealth evolves according to a multiplicative process with five structural terms:

$$W_i(t+1) = W_i(t) \cdot \left(1 + g + \alpha W_i(t) - \beta W_i(t)^2 - \frac{\delta}{W_i(t) + \varepsilon} + \sigma_i \eta_i(t)\right)$$

where:

- $g$ — baseline growth rate accessible to all agents
- $\alpha$ — reinforcement coefficient: the rate at which existing wealth generates additional growth advantage
- $\beta$ — saturation coefficient: damping at high wealth due to diminishing returns, complexity costs, and structural limits
- $\delta$ — poverty penalty: fragility at low wealth arising from compounding debt, fee barriers, and exclusion from stabilizing institutions
- $\varepsilon$ — regularization constant preventing division by zero
- $\sigma_i$ — volatility exposure of agent *i*
- $\eta_i(t)$ — independent stochastic shock drawn from a zero-mean distribution

## 2.2 Growth Function Analysis

Suppressing the stochastic and poverty-trap terms, the deterministic growth function is:

$$G(W) = g + \alpha W - \beta W^2$$

This is a concave quadratic in *W*. Growth is maximized at the turning point:

$$W_{\text{peak}} = \frac{\alpha}{2\beta}$$

Below W_peak, reinforcement dominates and growth accelerates with wealth. Above it, saturation dominates and marginal returns decline.

## 2.3 Equilibrium

A steady state occurs when $G(W^*) = 0$:

$$g + \alpha W^* - \beta (W^*)^2 = 0$$

Solving by the quadratic formula:

$$W^* = \frac{\alpha + \sqrt{\alpha^2 + 4\beta g}}{2\beta}$$

**Key result:** Saturation sets a ceiling *scale*, not an equality condition. Two agents can both reach finite equilibria and still exhibit profound inequality if they arrive at different equilibria or if path dependence locks in early divergence.

## 2.4 Stochastic Divergence

Under multiplicative growth with stochastic shocks, the expected log-growth rate for an agent is:

$$\mathbb{E}[\ln W_i(t+1)] \approx \ln W_i(t) + g - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2}$$

Even with identical nominal growth rates *g*, if volatility differs ($\sigma_1 \neq \sigma_2$), the agent with higher volatility experiences lower expected log-growth. This means differential fragility alone — without any difference in reinforcement — generates systematic divergence.

## 2.5 Poverty Trap

Near zero wealth, the poverty-penalty term $\delta/(W + \varepsilon)$ dominates, producing negative expected growth:

$$\text{As } W \to 0: \quad \frac{\delta}{W+\varepsilon} \to \frac{\delta}{\varepsilon} \gg g + \alpha W$$

The net growth rate becomes negative, creating an absorbing region from which recovery without external intervention is structurally unlikely.

# 3. Multi-Agent Extension and Distributional Structure

## 3.1 Generalization to N Agents

For *N* agents indexed by *i* = 1, ..., *N*, each follows the same wealth dynamics with competitive interaction:

$$W_i(t+1) = W_i(t) \cdot \left(1 + g + \alpha_i W_i - \beta W_i^2 - \frac{\delta}{W_i + \varepsilon} + \gamma \sum_{j \neq i} A_{ij}\,(W_j - W_i) + \sigma_i \eta_i\right)$$

where *A_ij* represents network connections and γ controls competitive pressure. Under multiplicative growth with an absorbing boundary at W = 0, the wealth distribution converges to a Pareto-tailed form.

## 3.2 Emergence of a Three-Zone Structure

The multi-agent system naturally organizes into three qualitatively distinct regions:

1. **Poverty Basin.** Where $\delta/(W + \varepsilon) > g + \alpha W$. Expected growth is negative. Recovery is structurally unlikely. The approximate lower boundary is $W\_lower \approx \delta/g - \varepsilon$.
2. **Mobility Band.** The intermediate region where agents can move upward or downward depending on shocks and reinforcement. This zone is dynamically unstable — it generates inequality by amplifying small differences.
3. **Saturation Plateau.** Where $\beta W^2 > \alpha W$, growth decelerates. Agents here are buffered against downward shocks and exhibit high positional stability. The plateau center is approximately $W^*$.

## 3.3 Distributional Evolution

Let $P(W, t)$ denote the wealth distribution at time *t*. Its evolution is governed by nonlinear drift (from $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\delta$), stochastic diffusion (from $\sigma$), and boundary effects at $W \geq 0$.

Over time:

- The mobility band thins as agents are sorted upward or downward
- The poverty basin absorbs increasing population mass
- The saturation plateau stabilizes a small group at high wealth
- The Gini coefficient $G \to 1$, indicating extreme inequality

Inequality thus does not grow uniformly. It *crystallizes* into a structured hierarchy: a stable upper class, a fragile and shrinking middle, and a trapped lower group.

## 3.4 Stability Asymmetry

Stability is not distributed equally across the three zones:

- **Top (plateau):** Proportional fragility $\sigma/W \to 0$ for large W. Transition probability $P(\text{down}) \to 0$.
- **Middle (band):** Both P(up) and P(down) remain high. This is an unstable transitional region.
- **Bottom (basin):** $\delta/(W + \varepsilon)$ dominates, making $P(\text{up}) \to 0$. This is an absorbing or near-absorbing region.

The society is thus stable *at the top* without being stable *as a system*. Local stability of elites does not imply stability of society.

# 4. Systemic Instability and Tipping Points

## 4.1 Visible Stability vs. Dynamic Stability

A system can appear outwardly stable while becoming dynamically unstable underneath. The distinction is between *visible stability* (outward arrangement unchanged) and *dynamic stability* (perturbations are damped rather than amplified).

## 4.2 Fragility Accumulation

As the mobility band narrows, the system approaches a regime where perturbations cease to decay:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{Var}(W, t) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dt}P(\mathrm{downward}) > 0$$

When small shocks propagate rather than dissipate, the system has entered a pre-transition regime.

## 4.3 Middle-Class Erosion as Diagnostic

The model identifies middle-class erosion as a key precursor signal of systemic instability. The middle is not merely another wealth band — it is the region that provides systemic resilience.

## 4.4 Regime Classification

The model identifies four broad system regimes:

1. **Mobility-dominant:** Enough population in the mobility band to absorb shocks.
2. **Structured inequality:** Three zones coexist with limited residual resilience.
3. **Brittle oligarchy:** Upper plateau stable, middle thinning, lower basin expanding.
4. **Transition or collapse:** Shocks or parameter shifts force rapid reorganization.

# 5. Intervention Analysis

## 5.1 Taxonomy of Interventions

Interventions map directly onto the five structural terms:

| Parameter | Mechanism | Policy examples |
|---|---|---|
| g | Growth modulation | Fiscal stimulus, infrastructure |
| α | Reinforcement attenuation | Progressive taxation, anti-monopoly |
| β | Saturation enhancement | Wealth taxes, structural caps |
| δ | Poverty penalty reduction | UBI, healthcare, housing security |

| Parameter | Mechanism | Policy examples |
|---|---|---|
| σ | Shock mitigation | Social insurance, financial regulation |

## 5.2 Why Single-Parameter Interventions Fail

- **Increasing $g$ only:** Growth applies multiplicatively, benefiting higher-wealth agents more. Divergence continues or accelerates.
- **Reducing $\delta$ only:** Improves survival at the bottom but does not constrain accumulation at the top.
- **Reducing $\alpha$ slightly:** Slows divergence without eliminating it. The long-run outcome is unchanged.
- **Redistribution (τ) alone:** Fails if α remains high, σ remains asymmetric, and δ remains positive.

## 5.3 Redistribution as Dynamic Flow

Define a continual redistribution flow:

$$T_i = \tau(W_i - \bar{W})$$

where $\tau > 0$ is the redistribution intensity and $\bar{W}$ is the mean wealth. To oppose reinforcement-driven divergence:

$$\tau \gtrsim \alpha \cdot \Delta W$$

Since the gap ΔW grows with wealth concentration, a fixed weak transfer is insufficient. Anti-oligarchic design generally requires *adaptive* rather than static redistribution.

## 5.4 Combined Intervention Regime

**Theorem (Multi-dimensionality of anti-oligarchic transition):** Oligarchic capture is multi-causal. Therefore, anti-oligarchic transition must also be multi-dimensional. No single-parameter intervention is sufficient to reverse the system's long-run trajectory.

*Reversal* requires that the average drift of inequality become negative:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\text{Gini}(t) < 0$$

This requires simultaneously: reinforcement sufficiently suppressed, fragility asymmetry sufficiently reduced, poverty traps sufficiently weakened, and balancing flows dominating concentration flows.

# 6. Behavioral and Cognitive Dynamics

## 6.1 Behavioralized Agent Model

We extend the model by allowing structural parameters to depend on behavioral and cognitive states:

$$\alpha_i(t) = \alpha \cdot A_i(t), \quad \sigma_i(t) = \sigma_0 \cdot R_i(t), \quad \delta_i(t) = \delta \cdot S_i(t)$$

where A_i (access), R_i (risk behavior), and S_i (stress) are agent-specific behavioral variables.

## 6.2 Key Behavioral Feedback Loops

- **Risk asymmetry:** Lower-wealth agents are forced into higher-volatility situations, amplifying $\sigma_i$ where fragility is highest.
- **Perception bias:** If failure is attributed to personal deficiency rather than structure, behavior reinforces rather than challenges the existing trajectory.
- **Unequal reinforcement:** Access to networks and institutional pathways creates differential $\alpha_i$.
- **Social imitation:** Agents copy observed success, spreading behaviors that may fail for those without structural support.
- **Norm formation:** Extreme inequality becomes culturally normalized.

## 6.3 Limits of Behavioral Intervention

If α remains highly unequal and δ remains high, better individual decisions alone cannot overcome systemic constraints. Behavioral change operates indirectly and does not alter the structural equations.

# 7. Institutional Feedback and Capture

## 7.1 The Wealth-to-Power Conversion

Institutional influence as a function of wealth:

$$I_i \propto W_i^{\theta}, \quad \theta > 1$$

The superlinear exponent captures the empirical observation that beyond a threshold, increases in wealth translate into disproportionately larger increases in institutional influence.

## 7.2 Institutional Feedback into Parameters

Once influence is established:

- Increase $\alpha$ for the wealthy (more capital accumulation pathways)
- Increase $\delta$ for the non-wealthy (weaker safety nets)
- Decrease $\beta$ (weaker constraints on accumulation)

### 7.3 The Second-Order Feedback Loop

$$W \uparrow \rightarrow \ I \uparrow \rightarrow \ \alpha \uparrow, \ \delta \uparrow, \ \beta \downarrow \rightarrow \ W \uparrow\uparrow$$

Inequality becomes oligarchy when wealth concentration is translated into institutional control, and that control stabilizes and protects the concentration.

## 8. Design Constraints for Non-Oligarchic Systems

The model constrains the space of viable alternative systems. A viable non-oligarchic system must satisfy all of the following:

1. **Distributed stability:** Resilience spread across many participants.
2. **Decoupled survival:** Basic provisioning not dependent on wealth position.
3. **Flattened reinforcement:** Effort produces meaningful returns across the distribution.
4. **Constrained accumulation:** Growth prevented from translating into structural control.
5. **Reduced fragility:** No fee barriers, compounding debt penalties, or threshold costs that make recovery impossible.
6. **Aligned institutions:** Influence not scaling superlinearly with wealth.
7. **Behavioral compatibility:** Rewards sustaining behaviors, discourages destabilizing ones.
8. **Distributed adaptation:** Local decision-making, distributed experimentation.

**Corollary:** The space of structurally viable non-oligarchic systems is much smaller than the space of imaginable alternatives.

## 9. Transition Pathways

### 9.1 Transition as Phase Shift

Systemic transition corresponds to movement out of the oligarchic attractor basin. Transitions are characteristically nonlinear — long periods of apparent stability followed by rapid reorganization.

### 9.2 Implementation Principles

1. **Lower fragility first.** A structural prerequisite, not a side effect.

2. **Build real alternatives before demanding mass adoption.** Functioning prototypes change expectations.
3. **Sequence matters.** Reduce fragility → build parallel systems → expand trust → shift institutions → weaken old dependencies.
4. **Dual-track strategy.** Track A: immediate resilience. Track B: alternative logic.
5. **Expect resistance.** Stable regimes generate stabilizing forces.

## 9.3 Long-Term Stability

Dynamic stability — not static equilibrium — is the sustainable condition:

$$\alpha \leq \alpha_{\max}, \quad \sigma \leq \sigma_{\max}, \quad \delta \geq \delta_{\min}, \quad \gamma \geq \gamma_{\min}$$

where $\gamma$ represents adaptive capacity. Continuous feedback, distributed adaptation, and a culture of self-correction replace the brittle stability of locked-in regimes.

# 10. Conclusions

1. Oligarchic capture is multi-causal, emerging from the interaction of at least five structural mechanisms.
2. Single-parameter interventions are mathematically insufficient to alter the long-run trajectory.
3. The system organizes into a three-zone distributional structure that becomes increasingly brittle as the middle erodes.
4. Behavioral adaptation and institutional capture create second-order feedback loops that stabilize the oligarchic configuration.
5. Viable non-oligarchic systems must satisfy eight structural design constraints simultaneously.
6. Transition requires coordinated multi-parameter change, institutional redesign, and behavioral transformation.

The proposed Transition can be interpreted not only as a moral or political project but as a mathematically intelligible restructuring of the parameters and relationships that generate oligarchic capture.

# References


- Boehm, C. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest: The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*. Harvard University Press.
- Gabaix, X. (2009). Power laws in economics and finance. *Annual Review of Economics,* 1, 255–294.
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review,* 110(2), 265–284.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons.* Cambridge University Press.

- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century.* Harvard University Press.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior.* Macmillan.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The Price of Inequality.* W. W. Norton.
- Woodburn, J. (1982). Egalitarian societies. *Man,* 17(3), 431–451.