

SARAH MILLER

The Conductor Principle[®]

A PROPOSITION FOR
SUSTAINABLE LIFE

FOUNDATIONS
FRAMEWORKS
APPLICATIONS

The Conductor Principle®

A proposition for sustainable life

Sarah Miller

Introduction

We tend to treat human wellbeing, environmental sustainability and beauty as separate concerns.

We ask how to make people healthier and happier. How to make organisations more humane. How to reduce environmental damage. How to make the things and places we create more beautiful.

The Conductor Principle begins further upstream.

It asks whether these apparently separate outcomes might share an underlying condition.

Its proposition is simple:

Sustainable life depends upon correspondence between living systems, what they actually require, and the conditions through which they function.

A human being does not function independently of their environment. Nor does an organisation function independently of the people, resources and wider systems upon which it depends. No living system exists in isolation.

Life occurs through relationship and exchange.

When those relationships exist in sufficient correspondence with the reality of the systems involved, life can function with less unnecessary resistance.

When they do not, the difference must be compensated for somewhere.

The Conductor Principle proposes that this distinction helps explain why systems can appear to function successfully while progressively exhausting the people, resources or living systems upon which that function depends.

It also suggests something more hopeful.

If we create conditions that correspond more closely with the reality of what human beings and the living world require, **wellbeing, sustainability and beauty need not always be pursued as separate corrective objectives. They can emerge from the same underlying coherence.**

1. We are not separate from our conditions

Much of modern life encourages us to think of the human being as an independent unit.

When someone struggles, we look inside the person.

Are they resilient enough?

Motivated enough?

Healthy enough?

Productive enough?

Are they managing their stress, regulating their emotions, exercising, sleeping, eating properly and thinking positively?

All of these things can matter.

But the individual is only part of the system.

Human beings exist in continuous relationship with the world around them.

We breathe air.

We metabolise food.

We respond to light and darkness.

We experience temperature, sound, texture and space.

Our bodies interact with materials.

Our physiology responds to other human beings.

Our behaviour is affected by social structures, expectations and incentives.

Our lives are organised through patterns of work, rest, movement, connection and time.

And all of this takes place within the wider living systems upon which human life depends.

The boundary between a human being and their conditions is therefore more permeable than much of our thinking implies.

We do not merely live **in** an environment.

We function **through continuous relationship with it.**

The same is true at larger scales.

An organisation depends upon people, materials, information, energy, infrastructure and ecological resources.

An economy depends upon living systems it did not create.

A society cannot indefinitely separate its own success from the condition of the systems sustaining it.

This leads to the first premise of The Conductor Principle:

The condition of a living system cannot be understood entirely separately from the conditions through which it is required to function.

2. Living systems conduct

Life requires movement and exchange.

Oxygen must reach cells.

Nutrients must be absorbed and transformed.

Heat must move.

Signals must travel.

Waste must leave.

Information must be received and responded to.

At human scale, the forms of exchange become broader still. We receive information, care, touch, resources, challenge, support, meaning and opportunity through our relationships with the world around us.

The mechanisms are different, but the functional requirement remains:

What life requires must be capable of becoming available to life.

The Conductor Principle uses the word **conductivity** to describe this capacity.

Conductivity does not mean that human beings are simply electrical wires.

Nor does it propose a single mysterious form of “energy” flowing through everything.

It describes a property of living systems:

the capacity for what a system requires to be received, transferred, transformed, used and exchanged so that it becomes functionally available.

This distinction matters because **something can be present without being functionally available**.

Food can be present without being adequately absorbed.

Information can exist without reaching the person who needs it.

Support can be offered without being receivable.

Time away from work can exist without producing restoration.

Resources can exist within an organisation while being inaccessible where they are required.

The question is therefore not simply:

What is available?

It is:

Can the system actually receive and use what it requires?

This is conduction.

3. Everything happens through relationship

Conduction occurs through relationships.

And the quality of those relationships matters.

A useful way to understand this is through **coherence**.

Coherence does not mean perfection or uniformity. Living systems are dynamic. They contain difference, tension, challenge and change.

Coherence describes the degree of correspondence between the different realities upon which function depends:

what a system is;

what it requires;

how it operates;

the conditions surrounding it;

the relationships within it;

and the effects it produces.

A coherent system does not need every element to be identical.

It needs those elements to exist in sufficiently compatible relationship for the system to function without continually fighting against itself or the conditions upon which it depends.

This is why coherence and conductivity belong together.

Where relationships are sufficiently coherent, conduction can occur with less unnecessary resistance.

And where what the system requires can be effectively conducted, the system has greater capacity to maintain and restore coherence.

The relationship is reciprocal:

Coherence ↔ Conductivity

Coherence enables conduction.

Conduction supports coherence.

This is the central relationship within The Conductor Principle.

4. Truth

At the heart of coherence is a deceptively simple idea:

truth.

Not truth as moral righteousness.

Not truth as personal opinion.

Truth as **correspondence with reality.**

A human body has realities whether or not our culture acknowledges them.

The natural world has limits whether or not our economic systems recognise them.

Materials have properties regardless of what marketing says about them.

A relationship has an actual dynamic irrespective of how it is described.

An organisation produces actual effects regardless of the values printed on its website.

A person has needs, limits and internal signals even when the structure of their life requires them to override those signals.

Reality does not disappear because a system fails to account for it.

Instead, the discrepancy has to be managed.

And management requires capacity.

A person may compensate.

Another person may carry the cost.

More resources may be consumed.

Damage may be displaced into the environment.

Consequences may be deferred into the future.

The system can therefore continue to appear successful while becoming increasingly dependent upon compensation.

This is what The Conductor Principle means by **falseness**.

It is the gap between what is and what the system is organised as though were true.

Hence the simplest expression of the principle:

Truth conducts. Falseness resists.

5. Resistance has a cost

Resistance is not inherently bad.

Muscles develop through resistance.

Living systems adapt to challenge.

Boundaries regulate exchange.

Effort is part of life.

The problem is not resistance itself.

The problem is **unnecessary or persistent resistance created when a system is continually required to function against its own nature, requirements or dependencies**.

That mismatch has a cost.

A person can work in conditions that continually dysregulate them.

They may still perform.

But performing may require increasing effort.

A building can be designed without sufficient regard for the human beings occupying it.

People can adapt.

An organisation can operate through contradiction, poor communication or excessive demand.

People develop workarounds.

A productive system can extract from soil faster than the soil regenerates.

Production can continue.

In each case, visible function may persist.

But something else is happening beneath the outcome.

The system is compensating.

6. Compensation can hide the truth

Living systems are extraordinarily adaptive.

That is one of their strengths.

It is also why deterioration can be difficult to see.

A system does not necessarily stop functioning the moment its conditions become poor.

It compensates.

A person works harder.

A colleague absorbs additional responsibility.

The body redirects resources.

An organisation creates another process.

An ecosystem draws upon accumulated capacity.

For a time, the outcome may look almost unchanged.

This creates a dangerous assumption:

If the system is still functioning, the conditions must be acceptable.

That does not necessarily follow.

The more useful question is:

What is it costing the system to continue functioning?

And then:

What capacity remains afterwards?

This distinction matters because a system can maintain its present function while progressively consuming its ability to function in the future.

Burnout is an obvious human example.

But the same question can be asked of an organisation consuming its people, an industry consuming finite resources, or a productive landscape whose regenerative capacity is being progressively diminished.

The visible outcome tells us what the system is producing.

It does not necessarily tell us the condition of the system producing it.

7. Sustainability is about regeneration

This reframes sustainability.

Sustainability cannot simply mean keeping something going.

Almost anything can be kept going temporarily if enough cost is displaced elsewhere.

The deeper question is:

Does the way the system functions preserve or regenerate the conditions required for its future function?

A genuinely sustainable system cannot indefinitely depend upon consuming the human, material or ecological capacity upon which its own continuation depends.

This applies to a person.

It applies to a relationship.

It applies to an organisation.

And it applies to our relationship with the natural world.

The mechanisms at each scale are different.

But the question is remarkably similar:

Is current function regenerating or consuming future capacity?

The Conductor Principle therefore understands sustainability not simply as endurance, but as the preservation of regenerative capacity.

8. The human and the planet are not separate problems

This is where the implications become larger.

We commonly treat human wellbeing and planetary sustainability as different agendas.

One concerns people.

The other concerns the environment.

But human beings are themselves living systems embedded within larger living systems.

The separation is artificial.

A way of living that continually requires human beings to override their own biological, relational and psychological requirements cannot simply be declared successful because it produces economic output.

Likewise, a way of producing that continually consumes the regenerative capacity of the natural world cannot be called successful merely because goods continue to appear.

Both reveal the same underlying mistake:

We are measuring the output while ignoring the condition of the system required to produce it.

This is why The Conductor Principle is concerned with the whole relationship.

Human needs cannot be considered entirely separately from environmental conditions.

Environmental sustainability cannot be separated entirely from human behaviour and structures.

Materials cannot be separated from their origins, properties, use and eventual consequences.

Organisations cannot be separated from the people through whom they function.

Parts cannot be indefinitely optimised at the expense of the whole.

Everything participates in relationship.

9. Materials matter

The physical world is therefore not merely the backdrop to human experience.

It participates in it.

Light matters.

Sound matters.

Air matters.

Temperature matters.

Food matters.

Space matters.

Touch matters.

Materials matter.

Nature matters.

Exactly **how** different materials and physical conditions affect human and ecological systems is a matter for appropriate scientific investigation. The Conductor Principle does not require the assumption that everything natural is beneficial or everything synthetic is harmful.

Its claim is more fundamental:

The properties and consequences of the physical world we create cannot be separated from the living systems required to interact with it.

A material has a source.

It has physical properties.

It interacts with bodies and environments.

It requires processes of manufacture.

It may release substances.

It creates sensory conditions.

It has a lifespan.

And eventually it goes somewhere.

To consider only its appearance, cost or immediate utility is therefore to consider only part of its reality.

Truth requires us to consider the whole relationship.

This is as relevant to a piece of clothing or a room as it is to a building, product or industrial system.

The question is not simply:

Does this work?

It is:

What relationships does its existence create, what effects follow from them, and are those relationships coherent with the living systems involved?

10. Why wellbeing, sustainability and beauty belong together

Once the problem is viewed this way, three things that are normally separated begin to converge:

wellbeing, sustainability and beauty.

Wellbeing concerns the condition of the human system.

Sustainability concerns whether the conditions required for continued life and function are being preserved and regenerated.

Beauty is harder to reduce to a functional definition, and The Conductor Principle does not claim that everything coherent will necessarily be judged beautiful.

But beauty repeatedly appears where relationships feel resolved: proportion, material, place, purpose, craftsmanship and form belonging together rather than fighting one another.

This suggests that wellbeing, sustainability and beauty need not always be treated as three independent objectives.

They may instead **emerge** as different outcomes of the same underlying coherence.

A building designed around the realities of place, material and human experience may simultaneously become more comfortable, more enduring and more beautiful.

A product made with respect for material, purpose, maker and user may acquire qualities that cannot be achieved simply by adding a sustainability claim or luxury signal afterwards.

A life organised in greater correspondence with the realities of the person living it may require less continual self-override.

The point is not that coherence guarantees every desirable outcome.

It is that **chasing the outcomes while ignoring the conditions that produce them is backwards.**

We keep trying to add wellbeing to systems that exhaust people.

We add sustainability strategies to systems organised around extraction.

We add beauty to objects and places after their fundamental relationships have already been determined.

The Conductor Principle proposes starting somewhere else:

Get the underlying relationships right.

Then observe what becomes possible.

11. A different definition of progress

Much of modern progress has been built upon our ability to overcome constraints.

That ability has produced extraordinary benefits.

But capability creates its own danger.

Because we **can** force a system to produce something does not mean the way we are producing it is sustainable.

Because a human being **can** tolerate a condition does not mean the condition supports human function.

Because an ecosystem **can** absorb damage does not mean its regenerative capacity is unaffected.

Because technology allows us to override a natural constraint does not mean the constraint was meaningless.

The Conductor Principle therefore asks us to distinguish:

What can be made to work?

from:

What works in a way that preserves the capacity of the whole?

That is a different standard of progress.

It does not reject technology, growth, ambition, challenge or human ingenuity.

It asks that they operate in greater correspondence with the realities of the systems upon which they depend.

12. The principle

The Conductor Principle can therefore be stated as follows:

Living systems exist through continuous relationship and exchange. Sustainable function depends upon sufficient correspondence between the nature and requirements of those systems and the conditions through which they function.

Where those relationships are coherent, what life requires can become functionally available with less unnecessary resistance. Where persistent mismatch exists, compensation increases and capacity may progressively be consumed maintaining function rather than regenerating it.

A sustainable system is therefore one whose way of functioning preserves or restores the conditions required for future function.

At human scale, this means we cannot separate the person from the conditions through which they live.

At environmental scale, we cannot separate what we create and consume from the living systems from which it comes and to which it returns.

At structural scale, we cannot judge success solely by visible output while ignoring where its cost is being carried.

And at every scale, it brings us back to correspondence with reality.

Or, more simply:

Truth conducts. Falseness resists.

13. What this principle is, and is not

The Conductor Principle is a proposition.

It brings together a way of seeing relationships that are often examined separately.

It does not claim that every living process operates through an identical mechanism.

It does not propose that humans, organisations and ecosystems are literally the same kinds of systems.

It does not claim that “conductivity” is a single measurable form of energy flowing between all things.

And it does not suggest that every problem can be solved simply by removing resistance.

Its proposition is structural:

Living systems depend upon exchange.

The integrity of the relationships through which that exchange occurs matters.

Persistent mismatch can increase the cost of maintaining function.

Compensation can conceal that cost.

Current output does not necessarily reveal remaining capacity.

And sustainable function ultimately depends upon preserving the capacity for regeneration.

The technical implications of this proposition; including the relationship between coherence, conductivity, resistance, functional capacity and regenerative trajectory are developed separately in [*Coherence, Conductivity & Functional Capacity: An Integrative Systems Hypothesis.*](#)

The purpose here is more fundamental.

It is to ask whether we have been trying to solve many of the consequences of incoherent systems without sufficiently examining the conditions from which those consequences emerge.

Conclusion

We know that human beings are struggling.

We know that many of the natural systems upon which human life depends are under pressure.

And we devote enormous effort to addressing the resulting symptoms.

We pursue wellbeing.

We pursue sustainability.

We pursue healthier workplaces, better environments, more responsible materials and more meaningful lives.

The Conductor Principle proposes that beneath many of these ambitions lies a simpler question:

Are the systems we have created in sufficient correspondence with the reality of the life required to function within them?

If they are not, compensation becomes necessary.

Humans compensate.

Communities compensate.

Organisations compensate.

Living systems compensate.

And because living systems can compensate remarkably well, the underlying mismatch may remain hidden for a long time.

Until the cost becomes visible.

The alternative is not a perfect world without challenge, effort or constraint.

It is a world designed in greater correspondence with reality.

A world in which we pay attention to what human beings actually require.

To what materials actually are.

To what places actually support.

To what relationships actually contain.

To what our systems actually produce and consume.

And to what the living world can actually regenerate.

From that perspective, wellbeing, sustainability and beauty stop looking like three separate ambitions.

They become different expressions of something more fundamental:

coherence between life and the conditions through which life is lived.

Perhaps the route to a more sustainable world is therefore not to become better at compensating for systems that contradict the realities of life.

Perhaps it is to create systems that require less compensation in the first place.

Truth conducts. Falseness resists.