50 Pieces of Evidence Supporting Jacek Krzysztoń's PaC (Process as the Goal) Model: Proposing a Simple Solution to Humanity's Greatest Building Mysteries.

For centuries, we have faced **monumental mysteries** left behind by our ancestors. Why did the Egyptians devote the entire resources of the state to building the pyramids, whose scale and precision seem **disproportionate to the function of a simple tomb**? Why were the gigantic **Nazca Lines** drawn on the barren Peruvian desert, impossible to view from the ground level?

Traditional answers, focused on religious cult, defense, or the megalomania of rulers, although containing some truth, often appear **incomplete**. They leave the key question unanswered: why was the effort so **disproportionate to the visible result**?

The Foundation of the PaC Model – (Process as the Goal)

To understand the phenomenon of seemingly **disproportionate effort** invested in great megaprojects relative to their visible benefits, it is crucial to distinguish between two fundamentally different levels of social organization and the conditions for its survival: the level of a small, kin-based group and the level of a **vast civilization**. A small group, a tribe, can survive by drawing on local resources without the need for central authority. However, the survival of a civilization—a complex system of thousands of people—is impossible without mass-scale **redistribution**. It is this **problem of scale** that created the need for powerful, centralized managerial tools.

The innovative analytical model **PaC** (**Process as the Goal**), which proposes an answer to the question of what kind of tools these megaprojects were, was created by the Polish economist and entrepreneur, Jacek Krzysztoń. This model radically alters the current narrative, logically explaining how megaprojects served precisely as such tools.

The **PaC thesis** is simple: in the case of many multi-generational megaprojects, their true, fundamental goal was not the material end product (a pyramid, a wall, a geoglyph), but **the process of their creation or construction itself**.

In this view, the process becomes a conscious or intuitive tool in the hands of the central authority, serving to achieve the most important **state-building goals**:

- **Mobilization** of society and large-scale labor organization.
- **Redistribution** of production surpluses, especially food.
- **Stabilization** of the economy and society, for example, by absorbing the workforce during seasons dead for agriculture.
- **Integration** and the creation of a common state or tribal identity.

The visible product—the tomb, temple, or line in the desert—was a pretext. It constituted the necessary ideological justification, a **higher-order goal** that gave meaning to the great, often multi-generational effort. It is also important to emphasize a fundamental difference compared to the logic of modern economies: while they strive to optimize processes for the maximization of financial profit, the PaC model shows that the goals of ancient (and some modern) states were **different and broader**. The long-term process itself **strengthened social hierarchy**, served the **integration of a diverse population**, and **secured the stability of power**.

The Methodology and Assumptions of the PaC Model

The strength of the **PaC model** does not lie solely in its revolutionary thesis, but in the **precise methodology** that allows for the analysis and classification of historical undertakings.

Key Indicator: Surplus Over Function

The fundamental diagnostic tool of the **PaC model** is an indicator that can be termed **Surplus Over Function**. It measures the disproportion between the scale, cost, and time taken to complete a project and its declared, practical purpose. The higher the **surplus**—the more absurdly vast or complex a project seems relative to its utility—the more probable it is that the **process itself was the main goal**.

How to Identify PaC? (In 30 Seconds)

- **Look for the Surplus:** Is the project absurdly large, expensive, or time-consuming in relation to its practical function? (e.g., a pyramid as a tomb).
- **Look for the Pretext:** Is there a strong ideological justification (religion, cult, prestige) that motivated the masses?
- **Look for Traces of the Process:** Does archaeology confirm the existence of **mass logistics**, **standardization**, workers' settlements, and **centralized resource redistribution**?

If the answers are "Yes," you are likely looking at a **PaC-type project**.

The Problem of the Pretext: Convergent Motivation

The **PaC model** does not negate the sincerity of religious or ideological motivations. On the contrary, it introduces the concept of **Convergent Motivation**.

In ancient societies, a powerful ideological goal (e.g., ensuring a ruler's immortality, building a house for a god, maintaining cosmic order like the Egyptian Maat) was often the **only effective justification** capable of mobilizing the entire society.

Furthermore, the ruler might genuinely believe that by pursuing this **transcendent goal**, they were fulfilling their mission on earth "here and now," which would ensure their prosperity in the afterlife or maintain the harmony of the universe.

The ruler, while sincerely pursuing the ideological goal, simultaneously—consciously or intuitively—launched and perfected the **PaC mechanism**, which practically solved the state's most pressing problems (**development, stabilization, redistribution, integration**).

In this way, deep beliefs became the **driving force** for pragmatic state-building actions. These goals were **inextricably linked** and mutually reinforcing.

Two Types of the PaC Model

The model is flexible and distinguishes between two types of projects depending on the relationship between the product and the process:

- **Symbolic PaC** (**Absolute**)**:** This type is characterized by an **extremely high Surplus Over Function**. The final product has negligible or zero utility value (e.g., **Nazca Lines**, **Moai**). In this case, **the process is clearly the main goal**.
- **Pragmatic PaC** (**Utilitarian**)**:** Although the creation process is characterized by high, often exaggerated, expenditures relative to the minimum functional requirements, the final product has a high, obvious utility value (e.g., a **defensive wall**, a **road**). The process is either a co-equal or secondary, but **key goal**. The central authority achieved two goals simultaneously: it gained a strategic product and, through the process of its creation, achieved the same PaC goals.

In both cases, the PaC goal was the **integration of society**, **mobilization of the workforce**, **redistribution of resources**, economic development, **stabilization of the state**, and **control of the population**.

Definition of the "Process" in the PaC Model

The **Process**—in the PaC model—is an integrated management system for the construction or creation of a megaproject, encompassing main and **measurable elements** such as **logistics** (managing resources and their flow), **organization** (mobilization and coordination of the workforce), and **standardization** (unification of methods, tools, or products/semi-products/modules). This process is not a physical monument, but it is a **tool** used to achieve socio-economic goals, and it leaves behind **archeologically examinable traces**.

Key Case Studies: 10 Pieces of Evidence for PaC Universality

The **PaC Model** demonstrates its **universality**, finding application across various eras and cultures. The following selected examples are among the **strongest illustrations of its logic**

---

1. Pyramids of the Egyptian 4th Dynasty (**Symbolic PaC**)

This is the **model archetype** of **PaC**, defined by the key diagnostic indicator: **extreme** "**Surplus Over Function**". The astronomical cost (estimated at hundreds of millions of labor hours) and the legendary scale and precision of execution are in stark disproportion to the declared function, namely a tomb for a single person.

Archaeological evidence confirms that an elaborate, **centralized management system** was built around this pretext. The hard evidence of this process includes gigantic, permanent workers' settlements (such as the "**Workers′ Town**" in Giza), industrial-scale bakeries, and the **Merer Diaries**. The latter are firm proof of bureaucratic **logistics**—precise transport schedules and a **centralized system of food redistribution**. The process itself served key state-building functions: it **stabilized** the agrarian economy (by absorbing labor during the Nile floods or drought), **integrated** Upper and Lower Egypt in a joint effort, and **legitimized** the pharaoh's power, which was measured by his ability to organize this gigantic undertaking.

2. Mit'a of the Incas (**Pragmatic PaC**)

This is the purest, almost **laboratory form of PaC**, where the process was an **explicitly institutionalized goal**. The "surplus" indicator here is not one monumental object, but the **multi-generational system itself** of the tax paid in the form of obligatory public labor (**Mit'a**). The state did not organize a project to mobilize people; it had a **permanent mobilization system** for which it had to find projects (e.g., building roads, agricultural terraces).

The entire imperial system was designed around the **logistics of this process**. The centralized authority managed the rotational relocation of the workforce, relying on an extensive network of roads (**Qhapaq Ñan**) and warehouses (**tambo** and **qullqa**). These served for the **redistribution of goods** (food, *chicha*) to workers during their service. This process was a **fundamental imperial tool**. Its main goal was **integration**—fulfilling the Mit'a obligation built a **common imperial identity**, uniting conquered, often hostile peoples, into a single state organism.

3. Moai of Easter Island (Symbolic PaC)

This is a **tragic example of Symbolic PaC** that spiraled out of control, leading to system collapse. The key **PaC indicator** here is absolute: the gigantic **Moai statues** had **zero utilitarian value**, meaning the entire social and economic value must have resided in the process of their creation.

It should be noted that PaC was the driving mechanism here, interacting with other factors such as the unique ecological conditions of the island and **fierce clan rivalry**. It was this rivalry for prestige that served as the **ideological pretext** powering the process of building and transport. The entire point lay in the ability of a given clan to **mobilize resources** and organize labor. This system, lacking checks and balances and restricted by the island's limited resources, ultimately led to **ecological and social catastrophe**.

4. Nazca Lines (Symbolic PaC)

This is the **model form of PaC**, characterized by **extreme** "**Surplus Over Function**". The utility value of the product—the gigantic **geoglyphs**—is **zero**, as they are impossible to see from the ground level. Therefore, the entire value must have resided in **the process of their creation**.

The logistics of this process were relatively simple (involving the removal of dark stones to expose the lighter subsoil). However, **social organization** was crucial—the ability to coordinate work groups to create coherent and precise, gigantic images. The **PaC model** does not exclude other hypotheses (e.g., astronomical or ritual ones), but provides an organizational framework. It explains how and why the community mobilized for this long-term effort: the goal was the **integration and coherence of the community itself**, achieved through a joint, ritualistic process.

5. The Great Wall of China (Pragmatic PaC)

This is the **archetype of Pragmatic PaC**, functioning as a **permanent, multi-generational state mechanism**. The key "surplus" indicator here is the sheer **continuity of the process** (construction, maintenance, and garrisoning) and the project's scale, which far exceeded immediate defensive needs, thereby undermining its purely military function.

Logistics and **standardization** were of fundamental importance, constituting hard traces of the process. This system required standardized watchtowers, constant grain supply routes, and the capability for mass quartering of the workforce in distant peripheries.

The **continuous process** of construction, **repairs**, and permanent garrisoning was essentially a **tool for managing the population** on the empire's frontiers. Simultaneously, the state's prestige was directly measured by its ability to sustain this gigantic, unceasing administrative and logistical process.

6. Angkor – The Khmer Empire (Pragmatic and Symbolic PaC)

This is a **classic example of PaC** that operated on two mutually connected levels: **Pragmatic** (hydraulics) and **Symbolic** (temples). The key "surplus" indicator here is the scale of the gigantic reservoirs (**barays**), as well as the monumental temples and their excessively time-consuming and detailed carvings, which exceeded basic agricultural or religious needs.

The entire system was based on **logistics**—the process of building and controlling the canals gave the ruler a monopoly over the **standardization of rice redistribution**, which formed the basis of the economy.

The prestige of the **God-King** (**Devaraja**) was directly linked to his ability to control this **pragmatic water management process**. It was this capability, and not the temples themselves, that truly **legitimized his divine power**.

7. Terracotta Army (Symbolic PaC)

This is a model example of **PaC** as an act of **ideological consolidation**. The key "**Surplus Over Function**" indicator here is **absurd**: eight thousand life-sized, unique figures of soldiers, created only to be hidden underground.

The project is, above all, a model example of **standardization**. Traces of the process are visible in the **logistics of state workshops**, which relied on the **mass, modular production** of parts (hands, legs, torsos, weapons) that were then assembled. In this view, the prestige of the **First Emperor** was manifested not in the figures themselves (the product), but in the **process of unifying the state's productive force**. It was a tangible act of **imposing a single standard** and a demonstration of **total administrative control**.

8. New Deal – USA (Pragmatic PaC)

This is an excellent, modern example of **secular PaC**. The "surplus" indicator (or rather, the priority of the process) was explicit and defined directly by the economist **John Maynard Keynes**. He noted that during a crisis, what is being built (the ideological pretext—dams, roads, parks) is less important than **the process of employment itself**.

The logistics of this process were gigantic: federal agencies (such as the **WPA** or **CCC**) centrally managed projects, accommodation in labor camps, and the **redistribution of wages** on a nationwide scale. Prestige here was purely political. The goal of the process was not the product's profitability, but the **stabilization of the state**—the very act of construction was proof that the central authority was capable of **overcoming the Great Depression**.

9. Magnitogorsk / DnieproGES – USSR (Pragmatic / Totalitarian PaC)

This is a model example of **Totalitarian PaC**. The key "surplus" indicator here is the building of giant industrial cities from scratch "**in the middle of nowhere**". The project was motivated by pure ideology (the pretext of "**building socialism**"), and not by any logic or economic efficiency.

The **logistics** and **standardization** of this process were **total**, with the state controlling every aspect of the workers' lives, from accommodation in barracks to draconian labor norms. The construction process itself was a tool for **total mobilization**, **forced collectivization**, and the **imposition of absolute control** over society, aimed at building a new, totalitarian state. Success was measured not by the product's efficiency, but by the **effectiveness of the control process**.

10. Versailles – France (Political PaC)

This is a pure example of **Political PaC**. The "**Surplus Over Function**" manifests here in the absurdly opulent scale of the palace, which did not serve as a practical home but as a **political tool**—a "**golden cage**" for the aristocracy.

The **true PaC process** here did not consist of construction, but of the constant, time-consuming, and costly court life and complicated etiquette. The logistics of this process were purely **political**: they involved creating a system capable of permanently housing and controlling thousands of aristocrats. This process, based on prestige and rivalry, effectively **neutralized the nobility** (financially ruining them) and **cemented the absolute power** of King Louis XIV.

How to Distinguish PaC from a Typical Practical Project

To ensure the **PaC model is falsifiable**, we must define not only what it is but also what it is not. The best way is to juxtapose a project with a **maximum surplus** (**Symbolic PaC**) with a project with a **minimum surplus** (**Non-PaC Practical Project**).

Example 1: Symbolic PaC (Pyramids of the 4th Dynasty)

Let's take the **Pyramid of Khufu**. Conservative estimates suggest **20,000 skilled and auxiliary workers** labored for **20 years**. This yields an order of magnitude of hundreds of millions (and perhaps even a billion) of labor-hours. The declared function (the pretext)? Sepulchral, meaning a burial place for a single person. The disproportion between the cost (**the process**) and the function (**the product**) is **astronomical**. This is precisely the measurable "**Surplus Over Function**".

Counter-Example 2: Non-PaC Practical Project (Tombs of the Valley of the Kings)

Let's compare this with the tombs of the New Kingdom. The goal there was **high functionality**: discretion, protection of the mummy and treasures from robbers. The tombs were hidden, and the **surplus over function was minimal**—they were exactly as large as the ritual required. The building process was handled by a small, **specialized group of artisans** (from the village of **Deir el-Medina**), and not the entire society. There are **no traces of mass redistribution** or economic stabilization here. The goal was clear: a **practical product** (a safe tomb), and not a long-term process.

Research Checklist: What to Look for in the Field

The **PaC model** is not just a theory, but also a **prognostic tool**. If a given megaproject was carried out using the PaC model, archaeologists should find a specific set of **material traces** in the field, different from the traces of a purely utilitarian project.

Archaeological Indicator	Expectations for PaC (High Surplus)	Expectations for Practical Project (No PaC)
Logistics	Traces of **mass, centralized redistribution** (e.g., gigantic bakeries, grain magazines).	Local, ad-hoc logistics, proportional to the project scale.
Standardization	**High standardization** of tools, methods, food ration containers, and even **modules** (e.g., **Terracotta Army**).	Low level of standardization, greater diversity of local techniques.

Workforce	Evidence of large, **organized workers' settlements** (permanent or seasonal).	No permanent settlements; workforce organized locally.
Origin of Workers	Traces of population mixing from various regions of the state (e.g., isotopic evidence).	Workforce primarily local.
Duration	Evidence of **multi-generational continuity** of work or a planned sequence of subsequent projects.	Traces of quick project completion for immediate use.

Conclusion

Jacek Krzysztoń's **PaC model** offers a coherent theoretical framework that resolves **multi-generational mysteries**. It allows us to stop viewing ancient builders as irrational megalomaniacs and start seeing them as **pragmatic political and economic leaders** who intuitively understood the power of an **organized process**.

The PaC model also explains the apparent paradox of efficiency: states maintained the process not by artificially slowing down one project, but by planning a **sequence of subsequent undertakings**, which reconciled **micro-efficiency** with the **macro-goal of stabilization**.

The phenomenon of this model lies in a simple yet profound shift in perspective. It reveals that in many cases, the true goal was not the material product we admire today in museums or on World Heritage lists, but **the process itself**—the act of building or creating that **united, organized, and stabilized entire civilizations**.

The Resilience Test: Addressing Key Doubts Regarding the PaC Model

Every theory that challenges deeply entrenched paradigms naturally faces criticism. The **PaC Model** (**Process as the Goal**) is no exception. Below, we present a set of responses to potential objections, demonstrating the **internal consistency** and **logic** of the model in its universal application.

Doubt 1: The Anachronism Objection (Did the Ancients Think Like Modern Economists?)

Objection: The **PaC model** is **anachronistic** because it attributes modern, pragmatic economic thinking (e.g., in the style of **Keynes**) to ancient rulers. This is a methodological abuse, as ancient managers did not think in terms of "**absorbing surplus labor**".

Response: The **PaC theory** does not claim that the ancients knew 20th-century concepts. It merely asserts that they **discovered and applied** the same universal social and economic **mechanisms in practice** because they were effective. A ruler who intuitively or through experience (drawing on the knowledge of predecessors or other civilizations) noticed that a large public project ensures **social stability** and **integrates the state** replicated this mechanism. References to modern theories are exclusively a **heuristic tool**, a sort of "**flashlight**" that helps us, modern observers, to name and understand these **timeless processes**.

Doubt 2: False Dichotomy (Ideology versus Economy)

Objection: The model marginalizes the key role of religion, ancestor worship, or state ideology. It creates a **false dichotomy** between the "**ideological goal**" and the "**economic goal**" that did not exist in ancient (or totalitarian) societies.

Response: PaC does not create a dichotomy; instead, it proposes a new **hierarchy of causality**, based on the concept of **convergent motivation**. The model does not marginalize ideology; on the contrary, it assigns it an **absolutely crucial role**—it was the "**operating system**" of the entire project. Without a powerful, **transcendent pretext** (religious, state, ideological), any **mobilization on such a scale** would have been impossible.

Furthermore, the PaC model allows for, and even assumes, that rulers may have deeply believed in the ideological goal being realized (e.g., fulfilling a divine mission, ensuring cosmic order, achieving salvation). The question posed by PaC theory is not: "**WAS ideology important?**" (because it was crucial), nor "**Did the ruler believe in the pretext?**" (because they may have believed), but: "**WHAT WAS this powerful force**—both as the ruler's conviction and a tool for mass mobilization — **PRACTICALLY USED FOR by the state builders?**" The answer is: it was used to initiate and sustain the **PaC process**.

The Role of the Pretext in the PaC Model

The Pretext (religion, cult, ideology) is the "**operating system**" of the **PaC project**.

- **Motivates:** It is the only force capable of **mobilizing the masses** for a multi-generational effort.
- **Legitimizes:** It gives meaning to the actions and justifies the **centralization of resources**.
- **Enables:** It allows the ruler to achieve **pragmatic PaC goals** (**stabilization, redistribution**) under the guise of realizing a **higher-order goal**.

The Pretext and the Process are **two sides of the same coin** (**Convergent Motivation**).

Doubt 3: The Paradox of Utility, Efficiency, and Scale

Objection: The **PaC model** is internally contradictory. Firstly, archaeological evidence often points to **maximum efficiency** (logistics), which contradicts the thesis of "**process prolongation**". Secondly, the model seems to ignore the fact that many projects (**walls, palaces, roads**) were **highly utilitarian**, which contradicts the thesis that the goal was *only* the process.

Response: This objection results from confusing levels of analysis and the false assumption that **PaC excludes utility**.

1. **Efficiency** (**Micro**) **vs. Continuity** (**Macro**)

Operational efficiency (logistics, work organization) was a **necessary condition for success**. The process had to be efficient in order to last. However, the strategic goal (**Macro**) was the **continuity of the process**, achieved by planning a **sequence of subsequent** grand projects.

2. **Utility versus** "**Surplus Over Function**"

PaC does not depend on the product's **uselessness**. The model works even when the product is **100% functional** (e.g., a defensive wall, temple, or palace). The key is the indicator of "**Surplus Over Function**". This surplus manifests itself not only in a potentially **exaggerated scale** relative to minimal functional requirements but also very often in **excessive detail and precision of execution**.

Exceptional accuracy, intricate carvings, or the use of **redundantly massive materials**, whose practical utility (beyond manifesting prestige and power) is negligible or zero, are in essence **excellent PaC tools**. Such elements consume an enormous amount of time and resources (**prolonging and intensifying the process**), while simultaneously raising the ideological standing of the pretext.

Doubt 4: Argument from Silence (Lack of Written Sources)

Objection: If the socio-economic goal (e.g., integration, stabilization) was so crucial, why are there no inscriptions that state it directly (e.g., "We are building this monument to unite the country and give the people work")?

Response: This objection assumes that ancient rulers communicated their **strategic goals** in the same literal manner as we do today. In reality, they used the only language capable of mobilizing society—the **language of pretext** (ideology, religion, cult). Pragmatic goals (e.g., **state stabilization**) or even real utilitarian goals (such as defense in the case of the **Great Wall of China**) remained in the **strategic sphere**, not the public one. Expecting inscriptions stating "We are building to unite the country" is an error. Furthermore, announcing the true, hidden goals of PaC (e.g., "We are building the Wall for population control and grain redistribution") instead of the acceptable pretext ("We are defending against the enemy") would have led to the **immediate collapse of the project**.

Doubt 5: The Measurability Problem (Abstraction versus Data)

Objection: In economic analysis, abstract profit ("social stability") cannot justify **astronomical material losses**. Concepts such as "**integration**" are **unmeasurable**.

Response: The **PaC model** agrees that abstractions cannot be measured directly. Therefore, it examines their "**material, quantifiable traces**". The theory does not measure "**stability**," but measures "**the flow of goods** that ensured it"—i.e., "**daily food rations, the standardization of containers, and delivery schedules**". It does not measure "**integration**," but proposes examining **archaeological traces** indicating the **mixing of populations** (e.g., isotopic evidence in remains). This shifts the analysis from philosophy to **hard archaeological data**.

Doubt 6: Explaining Changes (Why Does the System Decline or Evolve?)

Objection: If the **PaC system** was so crucial for stability, why do we observe its **decline or scale reduction** in many cases (e.g., the abandonment of Nazca, smaller pyramids built by successors)?

Response: The decline or scale reduction of a project is not evidence of the model's failure. On the contrary, it is often **logical proof of its success and evolution**.

1. **Mission Accomplished:** The PaC tool may have fulfilled its primary function (e.g., integrating a young state or overcoming a crisis).
2. **Evolution of Tools:** Pragmatic rulers adjusted the tool to new conditions, optimizing it or replacing it with other forms of PaC. It is worth studying the direction this evolution took (e.g., in Egypt, gigantic pyramids evolved into long-term, modular temple construction programs).

3. **Lack of Conditions for Evolution:** On the other hand, the tragic example of the **Moai** of Easter Island is evidence that the PaC system (based on rivalry) lacked the conditions for evolution (e.g., due to the island's limited resources or other unexplored constraints), which led to its **collapse**.

Doubt 7: Positive Outcomes of Megaprojects (Conscious Goal or Side Effect?)

Objection: The **PaC Model** describes impressive, functional consequences of megaprojects (**stabilization, integration**). But where is the certainty that these were the **conscious goals** of the rulers, and not merely a **beneficial side effect** of actions undertaken for entirely different (e.g., purely ideological) reasons? The "smoking gun"—proof of conscious PaC planning—is missing.

Response (The Investigative Approach): This objection rightly points to the historian′s fundamental problem: the impossibility of definitively "proving" the internal intentions of historical figures. The **PaC Model**, like criminalistics in a circumstantial evidence process, does not rely on "mind reading," but on the **analysis of observable facts and patterns**:

1. Analysis of Actions (What Was Done?)

Archaeology provides hard evidence of the existence of an **organized process**—traces of **mass logistics**, **standardization**, and workers′ settlements. These actions required enormous, **conscious organizational effort** on the part of the authorities. They were not random occurrences.

2. Analysis of Benefits (Who Gained?)

The functional consequences of the PaC process—**economic stabilization**, **social integration**, strengthening of control, and **legitimization of power** —yielded **direct and measurable benefits** precisely to the **central authority**. The systematic repetition of actions that brought such benefits strongly suggests a cause-and-effect relationship.

3. Inference about Motive (Proof of Repeatability)

The strongest piece of circumstantial evidence is the **independent emergence of the same PaC mechanism across vastly different historical and cultural contexts**—from ancient Egypt, through China, the Inca Empire, up to modern USA and the USSR. These rulers did not know each other, did not exchange views, and operated in different eras, religions, and political systems. Yet, **independently**, they resorted to the same tool because it was **objectively effective** in solving the fundamental problems of managing civilization (stabilization, integration, control). Even if the strategy was initially intuitive, the process of political elite learning—the observation that "it works"—could have made it a **conscious and replicated state policy** over time. Although rulers did not articulate the PaC theory explicitly in theoretical language, they applied it practically.

4. Communication Analysis (The Necessity of the Pretext)

As indicated in the response to Doubt 4, rulers communicated with society using the language of a motivating **pretext** (ideology, religion, cult), and not the language of pragmatic managerial goals. Announcing the true, pragmatic PaC goals or hidden intentions (e.g., "we are building for control and redistribution") would have been **risky**, demotivating, and potentially leading to project collapse. Therefore, the lack of explicit declarations about pragmatic goals is not an argument against their existence, but a natural consequence of the PaC logic of action. The analysis of intent must rely on actions and outcomes, not on the expectation of finding public statements about managerial goals.

Conclusion: The **PaC Model** does not claim to have insight into the mind of the Pharaoh. It merely asserts that the analysis of actions, benefits, and—most crucially—the **independent repeatability of the same pattern** across different civilizations, allows for the high probability inference that the PaC process was more than just a **beneficial side effect**. It was a **universal, functional state-building tool** whose effectiveness was discovered and purposefully utilized time and again by the builders of nations throughout history.

Glossary of Key Concepts

The following terms are defined in the specific context of the **PaC** (**Process as the Goal**) **model**.

- **Central Authority:** The institution (e.g., king, priestly apparatus, government) holding a monopoly on making strategic decisions and managing **resource redistribution** on the scale of the entire civilization.
- **Civilization:** A complex social system characterized by a large population scale, urbanization, and state structures, which requires **centralized management** and **resource redistribution** for survival (in contrast to small human groups).
- **Integration:** The process of building **social cohesion**, common identity (e.g., state, tribal), and strengthening ties between different population groups through their engagement in a **joint, long-term undertaking**.
- **Legibility:** A term (borrowed from J.C. Scott) describing actions by the central authority aimed at making society and territory "**legible**" to the administration—easy to count, categorize, tax, and control. **Standardization** and **registration** are key tools of legibility in the **PaC process**.
- **Legitimization:** The process by which the central authority gains social acceptance and recognition of its legitimacy. The ruler's ability to **effectively manage the process** (e.g., redistribution, stability provision) and the power of the ideological pretext are key sources of legitimization.
- **Mobilization:** The organized gathering and directing of resources by the central authority—primarily **labor force**, but also materials and food—to implement the megaproject.
- **Motivated Convergence:** A concept explaining how the ideological goal (**Pretext**) and the pragmatic goal (**Process**) interact, **often with positive intentions** for the survival and development of the civilization. The Pretext (e.g., religion) is the **essential** "**operating system**" for achieving the PaC goals.
- **Surplus Over Function:** The key diagnostic indicator of PaC. It is the **disproportion** between the scale/cost of the project and its declared, practical function.

- **PaC** (**Process as the Goal**)**:** An analytical model in which the actual goal of the megaproject is not the product (the structure), but **the process of construction itself**, serving socio-economic objectives.
- **PaC Pragmatic:** A type of PaC project where the final product has **real utilitarian value** (e.g., the Great Wall of China), but the process of its **construction or its maintenance** is a **key state-building goal**.
- **PaC Symbolic:** A type of PaC project in which the "**Surplus Over Function**" is **extremely high**, and the final product has negligible or **zero utility value** (e.g., the Nazca Lines).
- **Pretext:** The declared, most often ideological, goal of the project (e.g., a tomb, a temple) that **legitimizes and motivates** the societal effort, often for a purpose deemed just and beneficial by the population.
- **Process:** An integrated management system for the construction or creation of a megaproject, encompassing main and measurable elements such as **logistics** (managing resources and their flow), **organization** (mobilization and coordination of the labor force), and **standardization** (unification of methods, tools, or products).
- **Redistribution:** A mechanism involving the central authority gathering surpluses (mainly food) and re-distributing them (e.g. in the form of rations for workers). **It is a key element enabling the functioning of the PaC process.**
- **Standardization: Measurable evidence** of the existence of centralized management within the PaC process (e.g., uniform tools, modular production, standard food rations).
- **Golden Cage:** A metaphorical term describing the **deliberate use of opulence and a centralized residence** (e.g., Versailles) as a **political control tool**. The process of court life and complex etiquette keep the elites (e.g., the aristocracy) in constant presence, dependence, and rivalry at the center of power, which effectively **pacifies and legitimizes** the rule of the central authority.
- **Transcendent** (**Higher-Order Goal**)**:** A goal that **exceeds** the limits of everyday experience, the material world, or the practical (utilitarian) function of the resulting product.

50 Pieces of Evidence Supporting Jacek Krzysztoń's PaC (Process as the Goal) Model

In this section, **50 independent quotations and academic studies** have been compiled, which collectively constitute evidence supporting the key assumptions of the "**Process as the Goal**" (**PaC**) **model** by Jacek Krzysztoń.

The selection is **interdisciplinary** in nature—it covers **archaeology, history, economics, anthropology, sociology**, and **state theory**.

The purpose of this compilation is to demonstrate that the **idea of the process of realizing great undertakings as a goal in itself** emerges **independently** across different eras and research contexts. The recurring motive in these sources—the **conscious utilization of megaprojects** for socio-economic purposes—confirms the **universality and consistency of the PaC model**.

It is important to emphasize that these are **independent voices of science**. None of the cited authors referred directly to the **PaC model** (which is a novel concept), yet their observations and conclusions confirm the **fundamental assumptions of this theory**.

The recurring motive in these works is the observation that great collective projects served for **something more than just the creation of the final object**. Regardless of whether we are talking about the **Pyramids of Egypt**, the **Great Wall of China**, irrigation systems, or **modern megainvestments**, researchers observe that the **process** of **mobilization** of the populace, **redistribution** of resources, **social integration**, **legitimization of power**, and **standardization** of structures was often **the actual goal in itself**, frequently more important than the material result.

These seemingly separate testimonies compile into a **coherent picture**: the collective effort associated with megaprojects played a **fundamental state-building and socio-economic role**. The following quotations illustrate this thesis—from ancient empires to contemporary times—showcasing the **universality of the PaC mechanism** in human history.

The **quality and interdisciplinarity** of these voices are striking. For example, the list is opened by Kurt Mendelssohn—a physicist from Oxford (**and a student of Albert Einstein**)—who, as early as 1974, by analyzing logistics, proposed the revolutionary thesis that the **goal of pyramid construction was the process of their organization itself**.

Voices of Science Confirming the PaC Model

1. Kurt Mendelssohn – Oxford University; Physicist

> **"The main goal of building great monuments was not the completed structure, but the process of their erection itself. It was precisely thanks to this that societies transformed from loose communities into organized states."**

- *The Riddle of the Pyramids, 1974.*

Commentary: Mendelssohn, a physicist analyzing the logistics of pyramid construction, proposed the thesis that the technical and organizational problems encountered required the creation of **permanent administration**. He argued that **the very act of multi-generational, centralized labor** was the tool that transformed society. The collective effort was not a side effect of the state's existence, but the **catalyst for its creation**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is the **definitional foundation** of the "**Process as the Goal**" theory. Mendelssohn is one of the researchers who directly—as the quote shows—pointed to the **process as the actual goal**, and **work organization** as a tool for building stable **social and political structures**. The process is shown here as the **carrier of development** and **social transformation**.

---

2. Barry J. Kemp – University of Cambridge; Egyptologist, Professor Emeritus

> **"Early states functioned primarily as mechanisms of redistribution. Resources flowed into the center in the form of taxes and labor, and were then dispensed through the administration and ideological structure."**

- *Ancient Egypt: Anatomy of a Civilization, 2006.*

Commentary: Kemp, one of the leading Egyptologists, defines the early state not by its borders or structures, but by its **fundamental economic function**. At the base of social organization lay the **continuous movement of resources**: the gathering of surpluses (mainly food) and their re-distribution. This **constant flow**, managed by the administration, was the state's **lifeblood**, ensuring loyalty and stability.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This observation supports the **key pillar** of the PaC model, which is **redistribution**. Great public projects functioned as an **ideal, long-term driving mechanism** for this process. The material effects (structures) served as an **ideological framework** for the ongoing, continuous **administrative process** and the **flow of goods**.

---

3. Mark Lehner and Richard Redding – AERA / University of Michigan; Egyptologist and Archaeozoologist

> **"The Workers' Town at Giza** (**silos, bakeries, port**) **demonstrates the complex logistics and care for the labor involved in building the pyramids."**

- *Work and Pyramids: Heit-el-Ghurab–'The Workers' Town at Giza, 2015.*

Commentary: Archaeological research by Lehner and Redding at Giza provided **material evidence** of the existence of the "**Workers' Town.**" The discovery of **industrial-scale bakeries**, vast grain silos, and organized quarters for thousands of people demonstrates a **centrally managed logistical system**. This indicates a permanent, organized system of **care and resource redistribution** on an unprecedented scale.

Consistency with the PaC Model: These discoveries **materialize the key PaC mechanisms**. The "Workers' Town" is a **physical trace of the process** of **redistribution** (food), **mobilization** (accommodation), and advanced **logistics**. This infrastructure proves that the state invested resources not only in the monument itself but also in the **maintenance and organization of the long-term work process itself**.

---

4. Zahi Hawass – Supreme Council of Antiquities (Cairo); Egyptologist

> **"The construction of the pyramids built Egypt—a national project encompassing the entire society."**
>
> - *Giza and the Pyramids, 2017.*

Commentary: Hawass, drawing on decades of research in Giza, emphasizes the **state-building nature** of the pyramid construction. In this statement, he indicates that the very act of building was a "**national project**" that **united Upper and Lower Egypt**. This process required **nationwide organization, standardization, and coordination**, which was in itself an **act of state formation**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This statement is an illustration of the PaC thesis, as it shows that alongside the material result (the structure), the fundamental achievement was the very act of "**building Egypt.**" The process of **mobilization and integration**, defined as a "**national project,**" functioned as a **state-building tool**, realized through collective action in the erection of the monument.

---

5. Adam Kaiser – University of California, Santa Cruz; Researcher

> **"The pyramids may have functioned as a tool for redistribution—the transfer of resources from the elites to state workers strengthened the central authority."**

- *Building to a Point: The Political Economy of Pyramid Construction in Dynastic Egypt, 2024.*

Commentary: Kaiser analyzes pyramid construction from the perspective of **political economy**. He indicates that monumental projects were an **effective mechanism** for transferring accumulated surpluses (mainly food) from regional elites to the central administration. The administration then dispensed these resources to the workers, creating a **constant flow of resources** that served as the **foundation of power**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This analysis confirms **redistribution** as a **key, pragmatic PaC mechanism**. Pyramid construction is not portrayed here as a "cost" to the economy, but as a **conscious economic policy**. This process, through the redistribution of food rations, provided **stability**, demonstrated the state's **caring role** (**legitimization**), and **strengthened centralization**.

---

6. Piotr Steinkeller – Harvard University; Assyriologist, Economic Historian

> **"Corvée (labor dues) were the core of public finance and mobilization in the early states of the Near East."**

- *Labor in the Ancient World, 2015.*

Commentary: Steinkeller demonstrates that obligatory labor (**corvée**) was not merely a form of oppression, but a **fundamental economic mechanism** of early states. It was treated as a form of **public tax** that enabled the central authority to implement grand projects and constituted the basis of the state's "**finance**" before coinage became widespread.

Consistency with the PaC Model: These findings support **mobilization** as a **key administrative tool**. The PaC model shows that this "**labor tax**" was a tool of double use: it not only created infrastructure (the product), but above all, through the **process itself**, it fed the **redistribution system** and solidified the **administrative control of the state** over the population.

---

7. Michael Hudson – Institute for the Study of Long-Term Economic Trends (ISLET); Historical Economist

> **"Palace and temple economies were redistributive; labor or debt obligations organized production and public works."**

- *Labor in the Ancient World, 2015.*

Commentary: Hudson describes ancient economies (palace and temple) as **centrally planned systems**, based on **redistribution** rather than market trade. **Obligations** (in the form of debt or labor duty) were the main administrative tool used to organize the workforce and direct it toward strategic state tasks, such as **public works**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the foundation of PaC by showing the **process over the product**. The central authority used the mechanism of "**obligations**" to launch and sustain a **long-term process** (public works). The goal was the **planned organization of labor itself** and ensuring the **central flow of goods**, which **stabilized the entire socio-economic system**.

---

8. Norman Yoffee – University of Michigan; Anthropologist/Egyptologist

> **"Corvée** (**forced labor**) **is a form of taxation; early states mobilized the populace for public works** (**irrigation, fortifications, temples**)."

- *Myths of the Archaic State, 2005.*

Commentary: Yoffee, similar to Steinkeller, demythologizes **corvée**, pointing to its **systemic role**. It was the basic form of **taxation** in early states, crucial for maintaining the state apparatus. **Mobilization** for public works was not an exceptional event, but a **permanent, administrative element** of managing the state and its human resources.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This confirms **mobilization** as a **routine administrative tool**. Public projects (irrigation, temple construction) were a permanent goal that **justified and enabled** the collection of the "**labor tax**." This process ensured **constant administrative control** (**legibility**) over the workforce and its flow.

9. Karl Polanyi – Columbia University; Economist and Historian

> **"In pre-modern societies, the economy was 'embedded' in social relations; redistribution through the center constituted the basic mechanism."**

- *The Great Transformation, 1944.*

Commentary: Polanyi argued that pre-capitalist economies were not driven by the logic of profit but were **"embedded" in social structures**, such as reciprocity or **redistribution**. The central authority (e.g., chief or temple) gathered resources to then redistribute them, which **built its authority** and **integrated the community** into a single organism.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is the **theoretical foundation** for understanding **redistribution as a PaC mechanism**, as the model shows that megaprojects were the ideal, physical tool for implementing this **"embedded" mechanism**.

The construction process was the driving force behind **mass redistribution**, which was a **social and economic goal in itself**.

---

10. Joseph A. Tainter – Utah State University; Anthropologist

> **"Monumental form was a tool for legitimization and the mobilization of resources—a record of the state's efficacy."**

- *The Collapse of Complex Societies, 1988.*

Commentary: Tainter analyzes why societies invest in increasing **complexity**, such as monumental architecture. He argues that such structures are not merely decoration but a **tool for legitimizing power**.

The very **act of their construction**—that is, the ability to **mobilize resources and people**—is a **public demonstration of the state's strength** and "**efficacy**," confirming its ability to manage.

Consistency with the PaC Model: Tainter accurately identifies the **legitimizing function** of the monument. The PaC model expands this idea, pointing out that the **process of resource mobilization itself is key**. Authority gains **legitimacy** not through passive possession of the finished product, but by **actively proving** that it is capable of **managing and sustaining** such a **complex and long-term process**.

---

11. Timothy Earle – Northwestern University; Economic Anthropologist

> **"Elites use staple finance** (**storage of basic goods**) **to coordinate and mobilize great undertakings for prestige and control."**

- *How Chiefs Come to Power, 1997.*

Commentary: Earle examines how early elites (chiefs) financed their power. The key mechanism was **staple finance**, which is the physical **control over the storage and redistribution** of basic goods (mainly food). By controlling the granaries, elites gained a **real tool for mobilizing labor** for great projects that built their prestige.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is an exact description of the **PaC process axis**: warehouses (**control**) → distribution (**redistribution**) → labor (**mobilization**). Great undertakings are the goal that drives this cycle. **Prestige and control** do not stem from the product itself, but from the ability to **manage this constant, administrative flow of resources**.

---

12. David A. Warburton – Researcher of Ancient Economies; (e.g.) CNRS / Univ. of Copenhagen

> **"The economy of Egypt was based on the control and redistribution of goods by central institutions, not on market mechanisms."**

- *works on ancient economy, 2000s.*

Commentary: Warburton emphasizes the **centrally controlled nature** of the Pharaonic economy. It was not market mechanisms, but **state institutions** (palace, temples) that decided on the flow of goods and the organization of labor.

Control over resources and their **planned redistribution** were the **fundamental economic mechanism** of the state.

Consistency with the PaC Model: The PaC model provides the explanation for **how this redistribution was realized in practice**. Megaprojects (like pyramids or temples) were the **ideal, long-term tool** for coordinating labor and centrally dispensing resources. The **construction process** was the **engine of this redistributive economy**.

---

13. John Baines – University of Oxford; Egyptologist

> **"Social relations were based on reciprocity: labor in exchange for protective benefits (food, stability)."**

- *Visual and Written Culture in Ancient Egypt, 2007.*

Commentary: Baines describes the **ideological foundation** of the Egyptian state as a kind of **social contract** based on **reciprocity**. The populace provided labor to the state, and the state (personified by the Pharaoh) provided, in return, **care, order** (**Maat**)**, and the material basis for existence**, such as food during the agricultural dead seasons (e.g., during the Nile floods or multi-year droughts).

Consistency with the PaC Model: PaC megaprojects were the **physical realization of this social contract**. The **building process** was the mechanism where the populace provided labor, and the state reciprocated with **redistribution** and the **guarantee of stability**. This process continuously **reinforced integration** and **legitimized authority** as the guarantor of care.

---

14. Stephen Quirke – University College London; Egyptologist

> **"The central administration collected and accounted for labor and resources—a network of officials operated like a ministry of economy."**

- *Exploring Religion in Ancient Egypt, 2015.*

Commentary: Quirke draws attention to the **elaborate bureaucratic apparatus** of the Old Kingdom. The **registration of resources**, accounting for work days, and scrupulous auditing of officials point to the existence of a **complex management system**. It operated **pragmatically**, much like an **early ministry of economy**, dealing with the **logistics and accounting** of the state.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is evidence of the **key PaC element**, which is **Legibility** (readability). For the **mass-scale redistribution process** to work, the state first had to **count and register everything**. The **development of bureaucracy and writing** was driven by the **practical necessity** of managing the **long-term process of megaprojects**.

---

15. Juan Carlos Moreno García – CNRS / EPHE (Paris); Egyptologist

> **"Trade and administrative networks functioned pragmatically, often independently of the cult."**

- *The State in Ancient Egypt, 2019.*

Commentary: Moreno García emphasizes that alongside the official, cultic façade of the Pharaonic state, there existed a **highly pragmatic administrative apparatus**. Resource management, tax collection, and logistics were **secular, bureaucratic actions** that did not always align with the religious narrative but constituted the **real foundation of the state's functioning**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the concept of "**Convergent Motivation,**" where the PaC model assumes that alongside the ideological justification (cult, religion), a **real, pragmatic process** (administration, redistribution, logistics) must have existed. García's thesis shows that this **secular management process** was the **foundation of the state**.

---

16. Christina Geisen – University of Basel; Egyptologist

> **"Tutankhamun's Restoration Stela rebuilds not only the cult but the economic and social structure—it is a repair of the state apparatus."**

- *Restoring the Order of Ma'at: Tutankhamun's Restoration Stela in Context, 2014.*

Commentary: Geisen analyzes the famous Tutankhamun stela, indicating that it is not merely a commemorative inscription but an **act of law**—a royal decree. Under the guise of religious renewal (the return to the old gods), this act was essentially an **economic tool**. The "repair of the state apparatus" proclaimed on the stela meant the practical **launching of the process** of restoring resources to the temples and **stabilizing the administration**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a perfect example of **Convergent Motivation**, because the ideological pretext (restoring the cult and order of Ma'at) here becomes the official justification for the **pragmatic restoration of the process**. The stela, as a legal instrument, initiates and legitimizes the repair of the state apparatus through the **renewal of resource redistribution**.

---

17. Nozomu Kawai – Kanagawa University; Egyptologist

> **"'Restoration' after Amarna meant the transfer of resources and the stabilization of order—the rebuilding of state networks."**

- *presentations/lectures on the Restoration Stela, 2020–2023.*

Commentary: Kawai, similar to Geisen, interprets the post-Amarna period as a time of **pragmatic state reconstruction**. "Restoration" primarily meant the **renewal of the transfer of resources** to key institutions (temples), which was essential for **stabilizing order** and reconstructing the administrative networks that had disintegrated.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis confirms that **stabilization via the process** was the overriding goal, where sacred declarations served the **pragmatic rebuilding of the state**. It points to the **economic and administrative dimension** of the process of **redistribution and legibility** as the foundation of state order.

---

18. Kara Cooney – University of California, Los Angeles; Egyptologist

> **"Royal power is theatre, economy, and religion—never just one."**

- *The Good Kings, 2021.*

Commentary: Cooney presents Pharaonic power as a **complex system** in which various elements are inextricably interwoven. An effective ruler had to simultaneously manage the spectacle (**theatre, monumentalism**), **resources** (**economy**), and **ideology** (**religion**) to maintain state stability and control.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis constitutes a concise summary of the concept of **Convergent Motivation**, where the **PaC model** sees an inseparable blend of pretext and process. Religion and "theatre" (monumentalism) are the ideological justification, while the "**economy**" is the **pragmatic process** (**redistribution, mobilization**) that drives the theatre and is **legitimized** by it.

---

19. Michael Mann – University of California, Los Angeles; Sociologist

> **"Infrastructural power is the state's capacity for logistical penetration of society and the coordinating of its actions."**

- *The Sources of Social Power, 1984–2012.*

Commentary: Mann distinguishes "despotic power" (the ability to issue arbitrary orders) from "**Infrastructural Power**" (the real capacity to execute them). The true strength of the state is the latter: possessing the **logistics, bureaucracy, and structures** that allow it to reach citizens, count them, and **coordinate their actions on a large scale**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: PaC megaprojects are shown here as the **main tool for building and exercising** "**Infrastructural Power,**" because the very process of construction (**logistics, registration, standardization**) is essentially the state's training in penetrating and coordinating society. Power relies not on possessing the monument, but on the **state**'s **ability to organize** it.

---

20. James C. Scott – Yale University; Political Scientist and Anthropologist

> **"Great modernization projects are often more valuable to the state as a tool for 'legibility' and control than for their nominal beneficiaries."**

- *Seeing Like a State, 1998.*

Commentary: Scott analyzes why states (especially modern ones) undertake gigantic, often inefficient projects. He argues that their goal is to make society **"legible"** (**legibility**) to the administration—easy to **count, tax, and control**. **Standardization and central planning** are the state's tools here.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis precisely describes the **legibility mechanism**, where the very **process of standardization** (imposing measures, registering workers, unifying methods) becomes a **state tool**. This process, by making society **"legible,"** facilitates the administration's **control and resource extraction**, which is a **fundamental PaC goal**.

---

21. Karl A. Wittfogel – Yale University / University of Washington; Historian and Orientalist

> **"'Hydraulic despotism' required the mobilization of the masses for great public works—not out of cruelty, but out of the functional necessity of labor organization."**

- *Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power, 1957.*

Commentary: Wittfogel's theory posits that civilizations based on **large-scale irrigation** (like Egypt, Mesopotamia, or China) had to develop a **strong, centralized authority**. This was a **functional necessity** for managing mass public works (the construction and **maintenance of canals**), which required constant, **mass mobilization**, and **strict labor organization**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis describes the model **Hydraulic PaC** (or Pragmatic PaC), where the **necessity of sustaining a constant, multi-generational process** (irrigation management) becomes a **state-building tool**. This continuous **process of labor organization** builds and solidifies the structure of the central authority, which becomes **essential for its coordination**.

22. Arthur Waldron – University of Pennsylvania; Historian

> **"The Great Wall's construction was not merely a defense, but a state-building project: the mobilization of the workforce, standardization, and integration of the peripheries."**

- *The Great Wall of China: From History to Myth, 1990.*

Commentary: Waldron, in his broader narrative, challenges the myth of the Wall as a single, coherent, and **effective defensive line**. He indicates that its construction across different dynasties was primarily a **political process**. It served the **mobilization of the populace**, the **imposition of administrative standards** on distant frontiers, and the **integration of the peripheries** with the state's center.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is an archetype of **Pragmatic PaC**, as the author directly indicates that the process was a **"state-building project."** This thesis shows that even when the product's utilitarian function (**military effectiveness**) proved debatable, the **multi-generational process** of **mobilization, standardization, and integration** still played a **fundamental, state-building role** as a tool for managing the population and unifying the empire.

---

23. Julia Lovell – Birkbeck, University of London; Historian

> **"The Wall was a means of restricting movement and mobilizing labor for political unification."**

- *The Great Wall: China Against the World, 1000 BC–AD 2000, 2006.*

Commentary: Lovell expands on Waldron's thesis, pointing to the Wall as a **tool of internal control**. It served not only to defend against external enemies but also to **restrict the movement of its own population**. It was also a **constant mechanism for labor mobilization**, which **strengthened political unification** around the central authority.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis confirms the key PaC functions serving **internal control**, where the multi-generational process of building and garrisoning the Wall was a **permanent state-building mechanism** (political unification) and a **tool for managing the population** (labor mobilization, movement restriction).

24. Lukas Nickel – SOAS University of London; Art Historian

> **"The Terracotta Army was created using modular, standardized production, symbolizing the unification of the Qin authority."**

- *The First Emperor and the Terracotta Army, 2011.*

Commentary: Nickel analyzes the **Terracotta Army's production process**. He indicates that thousands of figures were created using a **modular system**—various workshops produced standardized parts (legs, torsos, heads) that were then assembled. This **mass, standardized production** was a material reflection of the **unification policy** of the First Emperor.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is an excellent example of **standardization** as a PaC tool, because the **mass, modular production process itself** was a real **act of state-building**. It demonstrated the state's **total control** over the productive force, **imposing a single standard** and manifesting the unification of the empire through action.

---

25. Jessica Rawson – University of Oxford; Art Historian

> **"The modular production of the Terracotta Army reflects Qin standardization and symbolizes unification."**

- *The British Museum Book of Chinese Art, 1992.*

Commentary: Rawson, similar to Nickel, emphasizes the significance of the **Army's modular production**. She sees it not merely as a technical method but primarily as a **political symbol**. The **standardization of parts** reflected the **broader policy of unifying** measures, weights, writing, and law imposed by the First Emperor.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis confirms that the **production process** was a tool for **integration and a demonstration of total standardization**, where the **mass, modular production** (**the process**) was a tangible manifestation of **unified control**, reflecting the broader policy of imperial unification.

---

26. Bernard-Philippe Groslier – French School of the Far East; Archaeology

> **"Angkor was a hydraulic city; the irrigation system enabled centralized control over water, agriculture, and the population."**

- *Angkor: Art and Civilization, 1966.*

Commentary: Groslier's theory interprets the power of the Khmer Empire through its mastery of **water management**. This gigantic hydraulic system (**barays**, canals) gave rulers (**Devaraja**) a nearly divine monopoly over resources (**water and rice**). This enabled the generation of **huge food surpluses** that fueled the functioning and expansion of the entire empire.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a classic example of **PaC** that operated on two levels: **pragmatic** (the process of managing the hydraulic system stabilized the economy and generated surplus) and **symbolic**. The process of building monumental temples, characterized by often **excessive, time-consuming detail** (a key **PaC indicator**), was the ideal tool for absorbing this surplus, demonstrating prestige, and raising the ideological standing of the pretext (the Devaraja cult).

---

27. Toby Wilkinson – University of Cambridge; Egyptologist

> **"The pyramid was a political communication of power—directed at the living, not just the dead."**

- *The Rise and Fall of Ancient Egypt, 2010.*

Commentary: Wilkinson argues that the **monumental scale** of the Old Kingdom pyramids was primarily a **political communication**. The structure was intended to demonstrate the pharaoh's power, organization, and divine status to his contemporaries, rather than merely serving as a tomb for the deceased. It was a demonstration of strength "**here and now**."

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the **legitimizing function** of **PaC**, because the very process of construction—the visible, mass effort coordinated by the state—was the **most powerful** "**political communication.**" By carrying out this process, authority **integrated society** and continuously demonstrated its **efficacy and capacity for management**.

28. Jan Assmann – University of Heidelberg; Egyptologist/Cultural Scientist

> **"State cult and 'cultural memory' organize the community; monuments and rituals legitimize order (Ma'at)."**

- *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization, 2011.*

Commentary: Assmann examines how societies build a common identity through "**cultural memory,**" perpetuated by **rituals and monuments**. In Egypt, the ideology of cosmic order (**Maat**) was legitimized by the state cult and materialized in the architecture, which became the **physical carrier of this idea**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis describes the **ideological function of PaC**, where **ideology** (**Ma'at**) becomes the "**operating system**" for the **social integration process**. The **PaC Model** shows that the process of building monuments (as "**ritual infrastructure**") was a **pragmatic tool** that translated this abstract ideology into real, everyday state action (**mobilization, redistribution**).

---

29. Bruce G. Trigger – McGill University; Anthropologist

> **"Monumental architecture is a consumption of energy exceeding functional requirements; its scale goes beyond practical necessity."**

- *Monumental Architecture: A Thermodynamic Explanation of Symbolic Behavior, 1990.*

Commentary: Trigger defines **monumentalism** in "**thermodynamic**" terms—as an investment of **energy** (labor and resources) that far **exceeds the practical, utilitarian function** of the structure. This "**surplus**" consumption of energy is symbolic behavior aimed at demonstrating the authority's strength, status, and **organizational capacity**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a **precise, scientific definition** of the key **PaC diagnostic indicator**: "**Surplus Over Function**." The greater the disproportion between the energy expended (**the process**) and the function (the product), the more probable it is that this **long-term process of energy consumption and labor organization** was the **fundamental PaC goal**.

30. Colin Renfrew – University of Cambridge; Archaeologist

> **"Monumentality and ceremonial centers in Aegean prehistory are focal points for integration and the rivalry of peer polities** (**peer-polity interaction**)**."**

- *The Emergence of Civilization, 1972.*

Commentary: Renfrew, analyzing early civilizations (e.g., Minoan), indicates that large ceremonial centers and palaces served as **focal points for social integration**. Their construction was also often a result of **rivalry** between neighboring centers of power (polities), which mutually fueled the escalation of **monumentalism**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the **integrative function of PaC**, because the **process of building the ceremonial center** (or rivalry-driven construction, like the Moai) is shown here as a **tool for community organization**. The very act of **collective building** and participation in ritual **united society** around the center of authority and built its identity.

---

31. Marshall Sahlins – University of Chicago; Anthropologist

> **"The chief's prestige is measured not by what he possesses, but by what he gives away; feasts and construction projects are mechanisms of redistribution."**

- *Stone Age Economics, 1972.*

Commentary: Sahlins described the "**gift economy**" and the mechanism of building prestige (the so-called "**big man**"). In this system, the chief does not hoard goods for himself but gathers them to **publicly redistribute them**. Grand feasts or, indeed, **collective construction projects** serve as a public arena for this **redistribution**, which builds his authority and **integrates the community**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports **redistribution** as a **key PaC mechanism**, where the megaproject (construction) becomes the **ideal, long-term pretext** to launch this cycle. The central authority (chief) gathers surpluses (taxes) to then "**generously**" dispense them (e.g., as rations for workers), which **legitimizes its status**.

32. Thorstein Veblen – University of Chicago / Stanford; Economist and Sociologist

> **"Conspicuous consumption and monumentality demonstrate status and power, ordering social relations."**

- *The Theory of the Leisure Class, 1899.*

Commentary: Veblen introduced the concept of "**conspicuous consumption.**" This is an activity that involves the deliberate **waste of resources** (time, energy) to publicly demonstrate high status. **Monumental architecture** is one of the most potent forms of this consumption, as its scale and costliness **hierarchize society**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: Veblen describes the psychological mechanism of "**Surplus Over Function**," because "**conspicuous consumption**" (the product) is the **ideological justification**. The PaC model shows that the **process** (the organization of this "consumption") becomes the **tool** that continuously demonstrates the authority's status and **engages the entire society** in this demonstration.

---

33. Eric Hobsbawm – Birkbeck, University of London; Historian

> **"'Invented tradition' serves the legitimization of institutions and social order; monuments materialize this tradition."**

- *The Invention of Tradition, 1983.*

Commentary: Hobsbawm's work showed that many traditions considered ancient were deliberately "**invented**" **at a specific historical moment**. They served to **legitimize new institutions** or build social cohesion. **Monuments** often act as the material, permanent carrier for this "**invented tradition**."

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis perfectly explains the **function of the ideological pretext**, where **ideology** (e.g., an "ancient cult" or "national tradition") is **consciously constructed** to **legitimize power**. The monument becomes the **physical anchor** for this ideology, and the **process of its construction** becomes the **tool for integrating society** around this new, "invented" tradition.

34. Peter Turchin – Complexity Science Hub Vienna / University of Connecticut; Complexity Science, Macro-Historical Analyst

> **"Ultrasociality and the growth of cooperation capacity require institutions that mobilize resources and coordinate large-scale action."**

- *War and Peace and War, 2006 / Ultrasociety, 2016.*

Commentary: Turchin, analyzing history using mathematical models, examines how "**ultrasocial**" empires (those capable of mass cooperation) emerge. He argues that the key is the evolution of **institutions** that can overcome the egoism of individuals and groups to **coordinate large-scale action** (e.g., warfare, construction).

Consistency with the PaC Model: The **PaC Model** is shown here as precisely such a key "**ultrasocial institution,**" because the process of **mobilizing resources and coordinating large-scale labor** is a practical training and demonstration of this "**capacity for cooperation**." Megaprojects are the **tool** that builds and strengthens this **ultrasociality**.

---

35. Lewis Mumford – Historian of Technology and Urban Planning

> **"The Megamachine: the organization of human labor becomes a goal in itself, transcending the material effect."**

- *The Myth of the Machine, 1967–1970.*

Commentary: Mumford, analyzing the history of technology, introduced the concept of the "**megamachine**." He argued that the first great machine was not an engine, but **ancient bureaucracy** (e.g., the Egyptian system). It consisted of people (as "parts") organized by authority to perform a single task (e.g., building a pyramid). In this system, the **organization of labor itself becomes the overriding goal**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This view is almost **identical** to the **PaC model**, where Mumford directly calls the organization of human labor "**a goal in itself,**" placing it above the material effect. The "**Megamachine**" is essentially another name for **PaC**—a system in which the process (bureaucratic organization) dominates the product.

36. Mike Parker Pearson – University College London; Archaeologist

> **"Stonehenge involves mass feasting and the transport of megaliths; the undertaking mobilized hundreds of people and shaped the community."**

- *Stonehenge: Exploring the Greatest Stone Age Mystery, 2012.*

Commentary: Parker Pearson's research on Stonehenge shifts the focus from astronomy to the **social aspect**. He argues that the **cyclic, mass feasting** and the very **act of transporting the bluestones** from Wales were key. These were events that required **huge mobilization and coordination**, and their purpose was **collective action** that **integrated and shaped the community**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the **integrative function of PaC**, where the **process** (transporting megaliths and organizing feasts) is shown as a **tool for "shaping the community."** The monument (the product) is a memorial and a focal point for the cyclically repeated **process of mobilization and social integration** through collective effort.

---

37. Anthony F. Aveni – Colgate University; Archaeaoastronomer

> **"The Nazca Lines—the main value was the act of creation; the process organized labor and community cohesion."**

- *Archaeology Magazine, 1990.*

Commentary: Aveni, one of the leading Nazca researchers, argues that regardless of the astronomical or ritual function of the geoglyphs, their **fundamental value was the "act of creation" itself**. This process, which involved removing dark stones, was a **long-term, collective effort** that **organized local work groups** and built their **cohesion**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a model example of **Symbolic PaC**, because the product (lines invisible from the ground) has **zero utilitarian value**. Aveni explicitly states that the value lay in the **process**, which served purely **social functions**: it **organized labor** and built community **cohesion** (**integration**).

38. Jo Anne Van Tilburg – University of California, Los Angeles; Archaeologist

> **"Monumental projects, like the Moai, were a tool for mobilization and social rivalry—the economic sense lay in the organization of resources, not in the practical function of the statues."**

- *Easter Island Studies: Rapa Nui Moai Movements, 1994.*

Commentary: Van Tilburg, the leading expert on the Moai statues, interprets them as the result of **clan rivalry** (so-called **peer-polity interaction**). Clans competed for prestige by building ever-larger statues. The **economic sense** of this activity lay not in the statues but in the **process itself**—the clan's **ability to mobilize resources and organize labor**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis illustrates **Symbolic PaC driven by rivalry**, where the **process** (building and transporting the Moai) was the **goal in itself**, and the statues (the product) were merely an **indicator of prestige**. The "**economic sense lay in the organization of resources,**" which is the definition of the **PaC process** as a tool for **mobilization and integration**.

---

39. John Hyslop – UCLA / American Museum of Natural History; Archaeologist

> **"The Mit'a system was a rotating labor tax for the state, integrating conquered peoples and maintaining infrastructure."**

- *The Inka Road System, 1984.*

Commentary: Hyslop describes the **Mit'a** not as slavery but as a **highly organized, state system of "labor tax."** Every conquered community was obliged to periodically send a contingent of workers for public works (e.g., road construction). This system was the **foundation of the imperial economy and administration**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is one of the **purest examples of PaC in history**, because the **process itself** (**rotating labor**) **was the goal**. This system simultaneously fulfilled all PaC functions: it **mobilized the workforce**, **redistributed goods** (the state fed the workers), **integrated conquered peoples** into a single imperial system, and **legitimized the Inca's authority**.

40. Terence N. D'Altroy – Columbia University; Anthropologist

> **"The Mit'a was a rotating labor tax that integrated conquered peoples into the Inka system."**
>
> - *The Incas, 2002.*

Commentary: D'Altroy, like Hyslop, emphasizes the **integrative function of the Mit'a**. It was a "**labor tax**" that compelled conquered, often mutually hostile peoples to **act together** on behalf of the state. Through this obligatory, collective process, the Inca built a **new, imperial identity** that superseded local loyalties.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis highlights the **key integrative function of PaC**, where the **obligatory, rotating labor process** was a **conscious political tool**. It served the **assimilation and integration** of diverse populations into a single, cohesive state organism, which was a **fundamental PaC goal**.

---

41. David M. Kennedy – Stanford University; Historian

> **"New Deal investments served the mobilization of society, redistribution, and economic integration—their significance lay in the process of employment, not in the material effect itself."**
>
> - *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1999.*

Commentary: Kennedy, analyzing the Great Depression in the USA, describes the **New Deal** program as a gigantic **socio-economic mechanism**. He indicates that although dams, roads, and parks were built (the products), the true, fundamental function of these investments was **process-based**: **mass employment**, **redistribution of federal funds**, and the **reintegration of the collapsed economy**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is an excellent example of **secular** (**modern**) **PaC**, where the author explicitly states that the significance lay in the **"process of employment,"** not in the product. Programs like the **WPA** or **CCC** were tools for **workforce mobilization** and **redistribution**, and the structures built (the ideological pretext of "rebuilding the country") were the justification for this **state stabilization process**.

42. Stephen Kotkin – Princeton University; Historian

> **"Magnitogorsk was a mobilization project: collectivization, resource control, and the strengthening of central authority."**
>
> - *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization, 1995.*

Commentary: Kotkin describes the construction of **Magnitogorsk**—a gigantic industrial city in the USSR—not as a purely economic goal, but as a **totalitarian mobilization project**. Building it from scratch "**in the middle of nowhere**" was a tool for **collectivization**, imposing **total control over resources and population**, and **strengthening the central authority** through the realization of a grand ideological goal.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis describes the **Totalitarian PaC variant**, in which the ideological pretext ("**building socialism**") justifies the **process of total mobilization**. The goal was not economic efficiency (the product), but the **construction process itself** as a tool for **control, standardization**, and building a new **totalitarian state apparatus**.

---

43. Pierre Goubert – Université de Rouen; Historian

> **"Versailles was a political tool: expansion and court etiquette integrated the aristocracy and kept them under state control."**
>
> - *Louis XIV and Twenty Million Frenchmen, 1970.*

Commentary: Goubert analyzes **Versailles** not as a building but as a **"political tool"** of Louis XIV. The palace was a "**golden cage,**" and the complicated court etiquette and constant construction were a **permanent process**. This compelled the aristocracy to maintain a constant presence and engage in costly rivalry, which effectively **pacified them** and kept them under **strict state control**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is an example of **Political PaC**, where the goal is not the palace itself (the product), but the **constant, time-consuming, and costly process** (court life, etiquette). This **PaC process** fulfilled the key functions of **integration** (gathering the elites in one place) and **legibility** (constant control and pacification of the aristocracy).

44. Jared Diamond – University of California, Los Angeles; Geographer and Biologist

> **"Seasonal labor surplus (in agriculture) was directed toward public projects that integrated society and advertised the state's power."**

- *Guns, Germs, and Steel, 1997.*

Commentary: Diamond, in his broad analysis of civilizational development, points to a key moment: the emergence of an **agricultural labor surplus** (e.g., during the flood season). Rulers, seeking to maintain stability, had to utilize this energy. They directed it toward **large public projects** that served two functions: **integrating society** and **demonstrating the power of the state**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis describes the **economic foundation of PaC**, because "**seasonal labor surplus**" (as in Egypt) is a problem that PaC solves. The construction process (e.g., pyramids) becomes a **tool for absorbing this workforce** while simultaneously fulfilling **integrative and legitimizing functions** ("**advertising the state's power**").

---

45. Jean-Pierre Adam – CNRS; Architect and Egyptologist

> **"The building of a pyramid is an act of collective organization; it cannot be understood without administration and the division of labor."**

- *L'architecture civile et militaire de l'Égypte ancienne, 1999.*

Commentary: Adam, as an architect analyzing ancient Egyptian structures, brings monumentalism down to earth. He indicates that pyramid construction was a **fundamental logistical and organizational challenge**.

He emphasizes that the success of the project depended directly on the existence of **efficient administration** and **precise division of labor**.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports PaC from a **purely pragmatic standpoint**, because the "**act of collective organization**" is placed at the center. Adam explicitly states that the **key to understanding the monument is the process itself** (administration, division of labor). In the PaC view, this essential **organizational process** was the **tool for building and stabilizing state structures**.

---

46. Salima Ikram – American University in Cairo; Egyptologist

> **"Some monumental tombs may not have contained bodies—their purpose was to demonstrate the presence and power of the deceased."**

- *Death and Burial in Ancient Egypt, 2003.*

Commentary: Ikram's thesis indicates the existence of **cenotaphs**, or **symbolic tombs**. These were fully equipped, monumental graves deliberately left **empty**. Their function was not sepulchral (utilitarian) but purely **symbolic**: they were intended to establish the **presence and authority** of the king or elite in a given location.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a **strong argument for Symbolic PaC**, because it shows that the **process itself** (the ritual performance, construction, sealing) and the **administrative act** (establishing the authority's "presence") were the goal. The product (the tomb) did not have to fulfill its declared utilitarian function (storing the body) for the **process of its creation** to be considered successful and complete.

---

47. Michael E. Smith – Arizona State University; Archaeologist

> **"Urban standardization acts as a tool for the coordination and integration of urban systems."**

- *works on urbanism and urban systems, c. 2007.*

Commentary: Smith, studying ancient cities (e.g., Teotihuacan), analyzes **standardization** as an **administrative tool**. He indicates that imposing a single urban plan, identical measures, or building modules is not a matter of aesthetics. It is, above all, a **central authority**'s **tool** serving the **coordination and integration** of complex urban systems.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the **key PaC pillar of standardization**, where the very **process of imposing and implementing standards** (urban, productive) is a **state-building goal**. It serves integration, but primarily builds the **legibility** (readability) of the system for the central administration, facilitating **management and control**.

---

48. John Maynard Keynes – King's College, Cambridge; Economist

> **"The government could employ people to dig holes and fill them up again—or to build pyramids."**
>
> - *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money, 1936.*

Commentary: Keynes, in his famous, ironic thesis, indicated that during a crisis, the **fundamental responsibility** of the government is to **stimulate the economy** and **create jobs**. Although this statement was delivered with irony, it contains a deep truth (as contemporary analyses suggest): the **construction process itself** holds enormous economic and social value.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is a **theoretical formulation of PaC in its purest form**, because Keynes was the first economist to so explicitly place the **process** (**employment**) at the center of attention. In this light, pyramid construction can be viewed as a "**prototype of Keynesian policy**"—a state stimulus program aimed at **stabilizing the country**, integrating dispersed communities, and strengthening authority through **resource redistribution**.

---

49. Pierre Tallet – Sorbonne / CNRS; Egyptologist

> **"The Merer Diary: regular transports of limestone to Akhet-Khufu through the Ro-She-Khufu port, according to the commands of Inspector Ankhhaf."**

- *La route de la pyramide, 2017.*

Commentary: The discovery of the **Merer Diaries** (the oldest surviving papyri) is one of the most important in Egyptology. This is not a religious text, but a factual "**ship**'**s log**" of a labor brigade. It describes the **logistics** with **bureaucratic precision**: schedules, transport routes, distributed food rations, and a strict **hierarchy of supervision** (Inspector Ankhhaf).

Consistency with the PaC Model: This is **hard, archaeological evidence** for the existence of the PaC process, because the **Merer Diary materializes the mechanisms of logistics, mobilization, and legibility**.

It shows that pyramid construction was, above all, a **precisely managed, bureaucratic administrative process**, based on schedules and **redistribution** (food rations).

---

50. Stuart Tyson Smith – University of California, Santa Barbara; Archaeologist

> **"Resource management was carried out by the state apparatus, often independently of the priesthood."**

- *Wielding the Past, in: Egypt, Israel, and the Ancient Mediterranean World, 2003.*

Commentary: Smith, analyzing Egyptian administration (similar to Moreno García), indicates that alongside the religious facade, there existed a **hard, pragmatic state apparatus**. Resource management, tax collection, and logistics were **secular, bureaucratic actions** that constituted the **real engine of the state**, often operating parallel to or independently of purely priestly structures.

Consistency with the PaC Model: This thesis supports the concept of **Motivated Convergence**, where the PaC model assumes the existence of a **real, pragmatic process** (administration, redistribution) alongside the ideological pretext (cult). Smith's work provides evidence of this **secular, administrative dimension of the process**, which was the **foundation of the state**.

Conclusion

The **50 cited quotations** presented above form a polyphonic evidence base for the **PaC model**. Collectively, they demonstrate the importance of the **process** as a conscious or unconscious tool for shaping societies: **mobilizing** vast human forces, **redistributing** surpluses and resources, **integrating** diverse groups into a single community, **legitimizing** authority through collective effort, and **standardizing** organization and technology.

What previously functioned in science only as **dispersed observations** across various disciplines has, thanks to Jacek Krzysztoń's model, been **compiled and synthesized into one clear theory**. In other words, by uniting these scattered threads, the **PaC model** brings to light the hidden common denominator of many studies: the conviction that great undertakings served primarily for the **building of social and state order** through the process of their realization itself.

This compilation thus constitutes a **solid foundation** for the further development and verification of the **PaC model**. Since representatives of so many fields independently observed the described mechanisms, this opens the possibility for **in-depth comparative research** on megaprojects across different cultures and eras.

The collected evidence inspires a **revision of previous interpretations** of the role of great structures and projects in human history—encouraging us to view them not only as impressive products of their era but primarily as **processes driving social, economic, and political development**.

Through the synthesis provided by the **PaC model**, we can better understand why societies undertook such enormous challenges and how these long-term efforts contributed to the formation of civilizations.

This new perspective on megaprojects allows us to look at the history of human achievement from a different point of view—seeing **the hidden engine of change in the process of their implementation**, the significance of which we are only now beginning to fully appreciate.

Publication Details and Metadata

Version: October 2025 (Updated: 30.10.2025)

Keywords: Process as the Goal (PaC), Jacek Krzysztoń, socio-economic theory, megaprojects, ancient economy, pyramids, Egypt, 4th Dynasty, Giza, Khufu, Nazca Lines, Inca Mit'a, Easter Island, Moai, Great Wall of China, Angkor, Khmer Empire, hydraulic despotism, Terracotta Army, Qin, New Deal, WPA, CCC, Keynes, Magnitogorsk, DnieproGES, Versailles, Louis XIV, Stonehenge, public works, redistribution, standardization, logistics, central power, surplus over function, convergent motivation, ideological pretext, Symbolic PaC, Pragmatic PaC, theory criticism, response to objections, polemics, theory resilience, skepticism, 50 proofs, Integration.

Author: Jacek Krzysztoń – economist, entrepreneur, and author of "Jacek Krzysztoń's Theory on the Socio-Economic Purpose of Building the Great Pyramids in Egypt" (2023). He is the author of the book *Egyptian Pyramids: Big Tombs or Big Business?* and inspired the documentary film *The Pyramids – Tools of Power*.

Conclusion and Related Works (Publication Details)

This section provides a structured overview of the core publications that form the foundation and expansion of the **PaC** (**Process as the Goal**) **Model**. The model, though rooted in the analysis of Ancient Egypt, offers a universal theoretical framework for explaining the purpose of building megaprojects globally.

I. Core Publications (Scholarly Preprints)

These publications represent the formal, analytical, and evidence-based foundation of the PaC Model.

1. Universal PaC Model and Evidence (This Document)

Title: 50 Pieces of Evidence Supporting Jacek Krzysztoń's PaC (Process as the Goal) Model: Proposing a Simple Solution to Humanity's Greatest Building Mysteries

Description: This comprehensive document provides the synthesis, defense (Resilience Test), typology, and evidence base for the universal PaC Model, extending the theory beyond Egypt.

DOI (Permanent Link): *(Will be provided upon successful upload to Zenodo)*

Academia.edu: *(Will be provided upon upload to Academia.edu)*

2. Process as the Goal (PaC) Theory: Response to 10 Key Skepticisms

Title: Process as the Goal (PaC) Theory: Author's Response to 10 Key Skepticisms Regarding the Socio-Economic Purpose of Building the Great Pyramids in Egypt

Description: This polemical preprint publicly "tests" the PaC socio-economic interpretation by identifying 10 key doubts that might arise from sceptics and providing evidence-based answers. It reinforces the internal logic and resilience of the model.

DOI (Zenodo): https://zenodo.org/records/17377170

Academia.edu: https://www.academia.edu/144514130/Process_as_the_Goal_PaC_Author_s_Response_to_10_Key_Doubts_about_the_Socio_Economic_Purpose_of_the_Great_Pyramids_of_Egypt

3. **The Main Theory (Egypt Focus)**

Title: The Great Pyramids of Egypt - Tombs or Primarily a Socio-Economic Development Project?

DOI (Zenodo): https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15858488

Academia.edu:
https://www.academia.edu/130405722/The_Great_Pyramids_of_Egypt_Tombs_or_Primarily_a_Socio_Economic_Development_Project

4. **Supporting Evidence (Egypt Focus)**

Title: 30 Pieces of Evidence Supporting Jacek Krzysztoń's Theory on the Socio-Economic Purpose Behind the Building of the Great Pyramids in Egypt

DOI (Zenodo): https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16732277

Academia.edu:
https://www.academia.edu/143246135/30_Pieces_of_Evidence_Supporting_Jacek_Krzyszto%C5%84s_Theory_on_the_Socio_Economic_Purpose_Behind_the_Building_of_the_Great_Pyramids_in_Egypt

5. **Continuation and Evolution**

Title: Why Did Ancient Egypt Stop Building Great Pyramids – The Evolution of a Tool of Power and Economy

DOI (Zenodo): https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15979657

Academia.edu:
https://www.academia.edu/144704249/Why_Did_Ancient_Egypt_Stop_Building_Great_Pyramids_The_Evolution_of_a_Tool_of_Power_and_Economy

---

II. Popular Science and Source Materials

These materials aim to disseminate the PaC Model to a wider audience and provide supplementary information.

Book: *Egyptian Pyramids: Big Tombs or Big Business?*

Link: https://www.amazon.com/dp/8396765642

Documentary Film: *The Pyramids - Tools of Power*

Link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xw17_BcBB_Q

Ancient Origins Article: *Pyramids of Egypt: Tombs or Rather Tools of Power? New Theory Shatters Stereotypes*

Link: https://www.ancient-origins.net/articles/pyramids-egypt-tombs-or-rather-tools-power-new-theory-shatters-stereotypes

---

III. Author's Theory HUB

All materials, updates, polemics, and new insights regarding the PaC Model are archived and published on the author's main website.

Author's Website (Main Theory: Why Pyramids Were Built): https://www.krzyszton24.pl/why-were-the-great-pyramids-in-egypt-built