From Extraction Civilization to Home Civilization

Reconstructing East Asian Management Civilization
in the Age of AI and Global Governance Crisis

A Systemic Analysis Based on Core Code Theory and The Home Model

Tong Yin,
Ph.D., Auburn University, USA,
Founder of InsightBridge Business Consulting

February 2026

Abstract

Over the past three decades, the Western world has simultaneously entered structural crises across three domains: political institutions have lost their capacity for self-correction, business civilization has been captured by short-termism, and organizational management has devolved into a human extraction apparatus. This article, written from the perspective of a management scholar, draws on two original theoretical frameworks—Core Code Theory (submitted to the Academy of Management Review) and The Home Model (submitted to MIT Sloan Management Review)—to provide a systemic analysis of the deep roots of the current global governance impasse.

The article argues that in an era of deep AI penetration, the prevailing "extraction management" paradigm—characterized by quantified performance, instant elimination, and the treatment of people as disposable components—is systematically destroying the only human competitive advantages that algorithms cannot replicate: moral courage, crisis intuition, and the willingness to sacrifice for the collective. By comparing the structural contradictions in American political and judicial life, the systemic inertia of European welfarism, and the residual resilience embedded in East Asia's family–state–enterprise cultural continuum, the article proposes that East Asia must proactively construct an alternative "Home Civilization" that fuses

Western hard governance with Eastern humanistic stewardship—or else remain trapped between two modes of failure. The article concludes with concrete policy implications and a research agenda for East Asian governance and think tank work, ensuring the theoretical framework has the operational specificity to enter the policy toolkit.

Keywords: Core Code Theory; Home Model; trust reserves; management debt; identity fusion; AI era; extraction management; organizational resilience; East Asian governance

PART I: CIVILIZATIONAL AND INSTITUTIONAL DIAGNOSIS

1. The Problem: Not an Isolated Corporate Disease, but the Systemic Collapse of an Entire "Extraction Civilization"

Over the past thirty years, the Western world has entered a structural crisis on three fronts simultaneously: political institutions have lost their capacity for self-correction, business civilization has been thoroughly captured by short-termism, and organizational management has been reduced to a human refining machine. From the extreme polarization of American electoral politics to Silicon Valley's "hardcore work" culture and Wall Street's quarterly earnings worship, the entire system operates on a single hidden premise—people are consumable parts, and the purpose of institutions is to extract maximum residual value before rapidly scrapping and replacing them.

This logic has long exceeded the bounds of ordinary "performance culture." It more closely resembles what we might call an **Extraction Civilization**.

At the political level, leaders are treated as disposable high-performance components: driven to operate at unsustainable intensity while in power, then immediately entered into a "decommissioning procedure" upon leaving office. In recent years, a series of judicial cases involving former and sitting heads of state in the United States have generated intense controversy both domestically and internationally. Though partisans on each side offer starkly different interpretations, one trend has become increasingly difficult to ignore: judicial processes and outcomes are, to a significant degree, being read by the public as extensions of power

relationships rather than natural products of a neutral institutional order. When society broadly perceives that legal accountability for those at the current center of power tends to be "raised high but let down gently"—with charges dropped or proceedings halted at critical junctures—while those who have lost the shield of power face the reopening of old cases and intensive prosecution seen as instruments of political struggle, then the principle of "equality before the law"—the very foundation upon which modern states legitimate themselves—faces a severe credibility crisis.

At the corporate level, what is celebrated as "wolf culture" or "high-performance culture" is, in essence, the conversion of organizations into high-speed meat grinders through surveillance, stack-ranking, and forced attrition. Consider one globally prominent technology company whose senior executive turnover rate reached 44% annually, against an industry benchmark of roughly 9% (Bersin by Deloitte, 2022; Equilar, 2023). Research from McKinsey (2022) and the World Health Organization (2023) has pointed to significant systemic links between high-pressure performance cultures and both employee mental health deterioration and organizational knowledge loss on a global scale. These models use the combination of "high-pressure elimination plus at-will termination" to manufacture fear. In the short term, efficiency appears to rise. Over the longer term, people are driven into becoming myopic survivalists focused exclusively on self-preservation, while institutional memory and crisis-tested expertise are continuously eroded.

At the cultural level, "success" is defined as maximizing quantifiable returns within a finite window, with no regard for whether the process destroys trust, community, or long-range capability. Extreme individualism, when unconstrained by institutional guardrails, has mutated from an engine of progress into a structural risk factor that corrodes the foundations of social trust. Relationships are reduced to transactional exchanges; discarding those who once served with distinction—"burning bridges" and "kicking away the ladder"—becomes standard operating procedure. When a civilization no longer teaches people how to be human but only how to win, that civilization is already on a downward trajectory.

The deepest problem with this civilizational model is not merely that it is "harsh" or "unfair," but that in an age defined by AI disruption and compounding crises, it has become

inefficient, unsustainable, and ultimately self-defeating. To understand why, we must first lay out two original theoretical frameworks.

2. The Deep Erosion of Western Institutions: From the "Myth of Procedural Justice" to "Power-Contingent Law"

The logic of Extraction Civilization has penetrated the deep structure of national governance. The traditions of democracy and rule of law that America has championed for well over a century now face an unprecedented crisis of public credibility.

In recent years, a series of judicial proceedings involving former and sitting national leaders have sparked fierce debate both within and beyond the United States. Supporters of opposing political camps offer irreconcilable narratives, but one observation has become increasingly difficult to dismiss: judicial processes and their outcomes are, to a significant extent, being interpreted by the public not as the natural workings of a neutral system, but as projections of power relationships. When the prevailing perception is that accountability for those at the current center of power tends to be "lifted high but set down softly"—with cases dismissed or procedurally suspended at pivotal moments—while those who have lost the protection of power find themselves subject to the reopening of old cases and concentrated prosecution, widely seen as moves in a political chess game, then the foundational principle of "equality before the law" suffers a grave crisis of institutional credibility.

From the vantage point of governance and management, the consequences of this trajectory are strikingly consistent: **it systematically reinforces short-term behavioral logic among elites.** If key decision-makers believe that once they lose power, they will face highly uncertain or politically biased accountability—that long-term contributions and institutional loyalty will not be effectively protected through transitions of power—then the incentive to "use one's time in office to serve the system's long-term health" is weakened, while the incentive to "maximize self-protection during a limited tenure" is amplified.

When this mentality diffuses through the elite stratum, national governance inevitably slides toward a **dangerous equilibrium: everyone speaks the language of institutions while privately calculating only personal advantage.** Institutions cease to be regarded as reliable long-term containers and become merely instruments of factional struggle. This slide from the

"myth of procedural justice" toward "power-contingent law" is not unique to any single country; it is a shared risk across contemporary democracies, manifesting in different forms and at different intensities.

It should be emphasized that this critique does not stem from ideological bias against any particular nation. Rather, it proceeds from a more universal judgment: **when any civilization's institutional framework gradually drifts toward a de facto logic of "impunity for the strong, inaccessible justice for the weak," that framework's capacity to incentivize long-term behavior undergoes systemic failure.** This is a shared alienation risk that emerges whenever instrumental rationality is taken to its extreme—a risk the West now faces, and one that East Asia, without vigilance, could equally well encounter.

3. The European Warning: When the Pursuit of Mediocrity Becomes National Policy

If the American problem can be characterized as a "ruthless arena," Europe's predicament is best described as a "costly greenhouse." In the postwar period, to quell social upheaval, European states adopted a policy regime of high taxation, generous welfare, and egalitarian redistribution: incomes were compressed toward a narrow band through progressive taxation, and exceptionally generous benefits—free education, universal healthcare, and abundant holidays—became the norm. For a considerable period, this served a vital stabilizing function. Over time, however, it generated a systemic incentive imbalance: when both policy and culture reward "average" while offering insufficient returns to excellence, visionary and decisive talent faces systematic marginalization.

The consequences are plainly visible in industrial competitiveness. From the 1990s to the present, Europe has been essentially absent from the leading edges of the internet, AI, and big data. Chronic underinvestment in defense, combined with the subordination of industrial strategy to welfare expenditure, has progressively hollowed out national strategic capacity. When external pressure surges—trade protectionism, for example—Europe often lacks the means to respond: it possesses neither leading industries as bargaining leverage nor robust defense as strategic ballast, and—critically—it lacks leaders willing to take risks and act decisively in crisis, precisely because the system's selection logic has long marginalized such individuals.

In the language of The Home Model, Europe absorbed the welfare dimension of "soft connective tissue" but discarded the incentive, accountability, and excellence-pursuing dimensions of the "hard framework." Soft tissue without a hard framework does not produce a home—it produces a greenhouse, incapable of cultivating people who can stand firm in a storm. This is precisely what distinguishes The Home Model from simple welfarism: **a home needs a spine, not merely a roof.**

PART II: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

4. Core Code Theory

Full title: CORE CODE THEORY: Identity Fusion and the Non-Linear Returns of Organizational Trust in the Age of AI. Submitted to the Academy of Management Review (AMR) in February 2026; currently under review. The AMR manuscript develops three core propositions and three moderating propositions; this article presents only a distilled overview.

4.1 The Theoretical Puzzle: Trust, Identity Fusion, and Non-Linear Returns

Core Code Theory does not set out to answer whether trust "matters"—that is taken as given. It addresses a sharper theoretical puzzle: why do two organizations with seemingly comparable levels of trust exhibit radically different behaviors in crisis—one rapidly disintegrating, the other producing collective sacrifice and mutual defense?

Existing mainstream frameworks—Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman's (1995) integrative model of organizational trust, Rousseau's (1995) psychological contract theory—tell us that trust is composed of ability, benevolence, and integrity. What they do not explain is how trust as a relational quality is converted into concrete behaviors under extreme duress. Core Code Theory's contribution lies in a three-layered explanatory architecture: it distinguishes between Performance UI and Core Code (what we are truly protecting); it identifies Identity Fusion as the mechanism through which trust is converted into sacrificial behavior; and it uses an "options-like non-linear returns" framework to explain how trust operates in crisis.

4.2 Performance UI, Core Code, and VRIN Analysis

Performance UI (the Performance User Interface) refers to the observable, quantifiable, and standardizable portion of human work output: completing tasks, writing reports, running models, producing decision records. Because this layer can be captured as data, it is precisely the domain in which AI excels at learning and replication. Frey and Osborne (2017) estimate that 47% of U.S. employment faces high automation risk.

Core Code refers to the capabilities tightly bound to selfhood and moral agency: the moral courage to say "no" when confronted with illegitimate orders (Hannah et al., 2011); the non-linear intuition that detects "something is wrong here" when standard protocols fail; and the capacity for collective sacrifice when the entire organization faces an existential threat. These capabilities are not derived from "running the numbers one more time." They are grounded in an individual's experience of being part of a community.

Through Barney's (1991) VRIN framework (Valuable, Rare, Inimitable, Non-substitutable), Core Code Theory systematically demonstrates that in AI-saturated environments, Performance UI is being rapidly eroded across all four VRIN dimensions—it can be observed, learned, and replicated—while Core Code emerges as the only cluster of human capabilities that simultaneously satisfies all four conditions. Its inimitability derives from what the theory terms "constitutive illegibility": these capabilities presuppose a subject with identity commitments and moral stakes, properties that algorithms are architecturally incapable of possessing.

4.3 Identity Fusion and the Trust Option

Core Code Theory draws on Swann and colleagues' (2012) identity fusion theory. When organizations engage in sustained, consistent acts of benevolence—investing in employee development, providing family support, ensuring dignified exits—they accumulate in their members' psyches an experience that can be summarized as: "You treat me as a person, not as a cost line." Over time, this experience transforms "where I work" into a constituent element of "who I am"—the organization shifts from "my employer" to "an extension of my identity." Identity fusion differs from ordinary organizational identification: identification is a cognitive categorization; fusion is an experiential merger—"when the organization is hurt, I feel it as my own injury." In high-fusion organizations, crisis ceases to be "the company's problem" and becomes "my problem"—fundamentally resolving the free-rider dilemma at the heart of Olson's (1965) collective action problem.

The theory further proposes that trust is not merely a "lubricant" but an **organizational option**: in stable periods, it resembles a cost center (high welfare, high investment, slow decision-making); the moment crisis strikes, it suddenly releases enormous defensive value. The returns curve of trust is non-linear: below a certain threshold, marginal differences appear inconsequential; once that threshold is crossed, behavior in crisis can flip abruptly from "collective flight" to "collective defense." The theory also incorporates a social network perspective (Borgatti & Halgin, 2011; Burt, 2005), arguing that the conversion of trust depends not only on the aggregate level of fusion but on its distribution within the network—high-fusion individuals at critical nodes exert disproportionate influence on the direction of cascading behavior.

An analogy may help readers outside management scholarship grasp these concepts: **"management debt" functions like "technical debt" in software engineering—shortcuts taken in the short term generate hidden costs that detonate during crisis. "Trust reserves" function like "crisis options" in finance—their returns are invisible in normal times but determine survival under extreme conditions.**

Comparative Framework: Extraction vs. Home Management

Dimension	Extraction Management (Management Debt)	The Home Model (Trust Reserves)
Human Metaphor	**Disposable Component**: People are treated as consumable parts and "performance interfaces" (Performance UI).	**Creative Citizen**: Individuals are treated as moral agents and cultivators of "Core Code".
Incentive Drive	**Fear & Short-term Transaction**: Operates through high-pressure elimination and "at-will" termination.	**Identity Fusion & Shared Destiny**: Built on relational mutual investment and the merger of personal and organizational identity.
Crisis Response	**Rational Exit & Systemic Collapse**: Leads to "collective flight" as members seek to minimize personal costs.	**Collective Sacrifice & Survival Premium**: Triggers "collective defense" and non-linear defensive value.
Long-term Outcome	**Knowledge Loss & Empty Shell**: Systemic erosion of institutional memory and long-range capability.	**Compounding Resilience & Distributed Trust**: Accumulation of trust reserves that determine survival under extreme conditions.

5. The Home Model

Full title: THE HOME MODEL: Beyond Extraction and Toward Sustainable Resilience in the Age of AI – A Practice-Oriented Theory of Trust-Based Management. Submitted to MIT Sloan Management Review; currently under review.

If Core Code Theory explains why trust and identity fusion matter and through what mechanisms they operate, The Home Model answers the operational question: how can an enterprise, a public institution, or even a national system build trust reserves and identity fusion through institutional design—rather than relying on charismatic leadership or fortunate circumstance?

5.1 From Extraction Machine to Bounded Home

The Home Model characterizes the prevailing management paradigm as "extraction management": maximizing short-term quantifiable output through high-pressure performance regimes, disposable labor markets, and fear-driven incentives. The result is the accumulation of massive **"management debt"**: trust is overdrawn, institutional memory is eroded, individuals with courage and judgment are screened out, and only "high-output, low-agency" workers remain—what the model calls "child-soldier employees."

The Home Model is not a return to traditional paternalism or the iron rice bowl. It seeks a stable architecture between hard governance and soft connectivity: hard governance ensures efficiency and accountability; soft connectivity generates identity fusion and trust reserves. Together they constitute a "disciplined home," not a "sentimental disorder."

5.2 Six Institutional Modules: Three Hard Pillars, Three Soft Pillars

Hard governance pillars. First, bounded growth pathways—replacing the binary of "rigid tenure versus brutal elimination" with transparent, competency-based advancement. Second, institutionalized upward dissent—designing "truth-telling and convention-challenging" as protected and rewarded behavior. Third, value-creation leadership accountability—using institutional mechanisms to remove "property-manager leaders"—those who only extract rent from subordinates without creating future value—from critical positions.

Soft connective pillars. Fourth, career sovereignty and long-term passports—preventing the "age-35 cliff" phenomenon of one-time disposal of experienced workers through senior contributor tracks and structured mentorship. Fifth, bringing the family rear into the governance

9

radius—extending health coverage to families, developing childcare and eldercare support, and freeing individual psychological bandwidth. Sixth, dignified departure and reunion—providing 3–6 months advance notice and transition support for structural adjustments, building alumni networks, and strictly prohibiting "shock-and-awe" terminations.

The strategic reserve value of alumni networks deserves particular emphasis. In the AI era, a mobile "alumni resource" constitutes the organization's "second Core Code" outside its formal boundaries. A successful Home Civilization should exhibit **"distributed trust"**—even after individuals leave the organization, the identity fusion forged during their tenure sustains ongoing attention to and support for the community. Dignified departure is not an ending; it is an extension of the trust network.

5.3 Three-Phase Implementation Roadmap

The Home Model provides a three-phase roadmap. Phase I (first 6 months): stop the bleeding and begin trust repair—halt the most destructive extraction practices. Phase II (months 7–18): institutional build-out—introduce key signaling institutions. Phase III (year 2 and beyond): governance embedding—integrate trust reserve cultivation into board-level evaluation and investor assessment frameworks.

PART III: THE EAST ASIAN PATH AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

6. The Real Problem of the AI Era: People Trained to Become the Version of Themselves Most Easily Replaced by Algorithms

In previous technology cycles, machines displaced physical labor while cognition and judgment remained securely in human hands. This time, AI has entered the cognitive layer directly: writing reports, conducting analysis, generating text, and assisting decisions—precisely the domain Core Code Theory defines as Performance UI.

The crux of the problem: the past thirty years of extraction management have reinforced exactly the measurable dimensions of human capability while systematically atrophying everything that resists quantification—moral courage, non-linear intuition, willingness to sacrifice for a collective. In other words, organizations have spent three decades training people

to become the version of themselves most easily replaced by AI. Compounding this, the spread of algorithmic surveillance is accelerating the process: when algorithms take over all feedback pathways—from performance evaluation to daily communication—the human Core Code is being systematically silenced. What Edmondson (1999) defined as "psychological safety" suffers devastating damage in environments of algorithmic monitoring.

This means that organizations obsessed with "quantified performance and instant elimination" believe they are building high-efficiency machines, when in fact they are investing in a systematically depreciating asset. The "soft elements" they sacrifice—trust, commitment, and identity fusion—are the only irreplaceable assets that determine survival when crisis strikes.

7. The Crisis-Era Watershed: Who Still Has a "Home," and Who Is Left with Only a "Contract"

In the first type of organization, senior leaders protect themselves first—cashing out, transferring assets, and distancing themselves from responsibility. Middle managers calculate exit options. Core talent votes with its feet. Everyone is making a rational choice: minimize personal cost. The result is that when the organization most needs collective intelligence, it discovers it is nothing but a hollow shell.

In the second type, senior leaders proactively cut their own compensation—or take unpaid leave—without being asked. Middle managers follow suit, refusing to deflect blame. Employees with outside opportunities choose to "stay a while longer" because they regard this institution as their home. This is the power of identity fusion: people are no longer merely parties to a contract but experience the organization as part of who they are.

The two types are nearly indistinguishable in normal times but exhibit a cliff-edge divergence in crisis. This is precisely what Core Code Theory calls the **"option structure of trust"**: high cost and invisible returns in stable periods; life-or-death divergence the moment crisis erupts.

8. The Dual Lessons of East Asian Experience and the "Third Path"

The East Asian experience is profoundly complex. On one hand, the cultural continuum of family–state–enterprise in East Asian traditions provides a powerful foundation for identity

fusion and collective sacrifice. The deepest strength of Chinese culture lies in its concept of the family as a community of shared destiny—not a monetary contract but a covenant of mutual fate. Parents sell property and endure deprivation for their children's education; entire families rally around a sick member. This resilience, which transcends contractual logic, constitutes an asymmetric advantage that atomized Western societies cannot replicate.

On the other hand, one must confront an uncomfortable truth: the nepotism, opacity, and patronage inherent in traditional family enterprises and official-rank systems generate severe inefficiency in modern economies. **Cronyism and "gate politics" are the greatest internal enemies of Home Civilization.** Over the past several decades, many East Asian economies began from traditional family-style management, imported performance-based systems under the pressures of globalization, and in practice gradually slid toward "extraction systems wearing the clothing of modern management."

This is East Asia's current predicament: **if East Asia continues to oscillate between old-style paternalism and Western-style meat grinders without proactively building a third path, the so-called "East Asian model" will forfeit its historic opportunity in the AI era.**

Against this backdrop, "The Home Model plus Core Code Theory" is fundamentally an attempt to provide East Asia with a third path that integrates East and West: inheriting from the West scientific governance, transparent rules, and accountability mechanisms; excavating from the East long-term relationships, family bonds, identity fusion, and the ethics of benevolence and duty—while rejecting the toxins at both extremes. In the design of the "hard governance pillars," the boundary between "home citizens" and "family cronies" must be explicitly defined—transparent rules, public accountability, and competency-based institutional arrangements are the very institutional defenses that prevent a "home" from degenerating into a "clan."

9. From Extraction System to Home System: Six Institutional Pivots

The truly important question is not to pile on further layers of critique, but to answer: if organizations can no longer run on extraction-and-disposal logic, how else can they be governed? The Home Model provides six institutional pivots, forming an interlocking structure of three "hard governance pillars" and three "humanistic pillars." These are not soft slogans; they

are institutional arrangements that can be written into corporate charters, board governance codes, national governance guidelines, and financial evaluation frameworks.

Pivot One: From "lifetime tenure versus high-pressure elimination" to bounded growth pathways. Establish clear competency models and transparent promotion standards for each role category; institutionalize "quarterly development dialogues"; design lateral expansion tracks for individuals who have reached a competency plateau but remain reliable contributors.

Pivot Two: From "silent compliance" to institutionalized upward dissent. Create innovation and early-warning channels that bypass hierarchical layers; designate "safe experimentation zones" where failure does not count against performance evaluations; formally recognize "untimely warnings" that prove prescient.

Pivot Three: From "property-manager leadership" to "value-creating stewardship." Introduce a standalone "value creation and talent development" metric in executive evaluations; periodically review whether a unit is stronger after a leader's departure; establish explicit exit mechanisms for leaders who produce no innovation over an extended period.

Pivot Four: From the "age-35 cliff" to career sovereignty and long-term passports. Establish senior contributor tracks, structured mentorship programs, advisory contracts, and project-based collaboration arrangements.

Pivot Five: From "employees fighting alone" to bringing the family rear into the governance radius. Extend health coverage to family members; develop childcare and eldercare infrastructure; offer flexible arrangements for employees in caregiving phases.

Pivot Six: From "use and discard" to dignified departure and reunion. Provide 3–6 months advance notice and transition support; build active alumni networks; strictly prohibit "shock-and-awe" termination procedures.

10. Implications for East Asian Governance and Think Tank Work: From Critique to Toolkit

If the preceding analysis has primarily revealed problems and theoretical mechanisms, the more consequential question for East Asia is: how can this theoretical framework be converted

into something that belongs in the policy toolkit, rather than remaining at the level of abstract critique and value declarations?

10.1 Implications for National Governance and Long-Term Strategic Planning

When East Asian states discuss "long-term competitiveness" and "national resilience," they tend to focus on industrial policy, technology investment, and educational reform, while rarely engaging in systematic discussion of "trust reserves and Core Code capabilities at the organizational level." Core Code Theory and The Home Model suggest that a society's performance in crisis depends, to a considerable degree, on whether its organizational ecosystem still contains a sufficient mass of "home-type organizations" as opposed to "extraction-type organizations." Accordingly, national medium- and long-term plans—in areas such as "the future of work," "human capital development," and "social resilience"—should incorporate concepts such as "trust reserves," "management debt," and "identity fusion" into their indicator systems and policy evaluation frameworks.

This does not mean the state should directly intervene in the details of corporate management. Rather, it can proceed through several pathways: explicitly proposing "human-centered resilience-oriented management" as a policy objective in official reports and policy white papers; encouraging local governments to pilot selected Home Model modules in public sector institutions and state-owned enterprises; and allowing public sector demonstration to gradually diffuse into broader society.

10.2 Implications for Corporate Governance and Regulatory Frameworks

Regulators and capital markets have long evaluated firms primarily on financial metrics and compliance, with little systematic attention to "human-centered resilience." The Home Model offers an operational structure for enriching existing corporate governance frameworks. Specifically, governance codes or voluntary guidelines could add principle-based provisions regarding "leadership value-creation responsibility," "career sovereignty pathways," and "dignified exit mechanisms." ESG or other non-financial disclosure regimes could guide firms to report on key trust-reserve practices and indicators—long-term employee attrition patterns, family support policies, alumni network functioning, and the like. In regulatory assessments of major platform companies or strategically significant industry players, "whether the firm

systematically generates management debt" could be introduced as a potential risk factor, rather than focusing exclusively on short-term efficiency.

The purpose of such measures is not for regulators to manage firms on their behalf, but to render visible—through rules and disclosure—the hidden costs of extraction management and the long-term returns of home-type management, placing the judgment in the hands of markets and society.

10.3 Implications for Think Tanks' Own Research Agendas

For East Asian think tanks and advanced research institutions, Core Code Theory and The Home Model can serve as a new analytical vocabulary and a point of departure for an ambitious research agenda. In research programs on the future of work, social governance, and enterprise reform, the focus should extend beyond institutional design and policy instruments to the "organizational operating system": does the prevailing organizational form in a given economy lean more toward "extraction" or "home"? How are trust reserves distributed across industries and ownership structures?

Concrete research directions include: cross-national and cross-regional comparative studies examining the relationship between management debt, trust reserves, and crisis performance across different East Asian economies—combining quantitative data with in-depth case studies to test Core Code Theory's propositions on "thresholds and non-linear returns"; crisis resilience case studies identifying and analyzing enterprises and public institutions that demonstrated "home-type resilience" during crises; and policy pilot evaluations assessing the medium- and long-term effects of implementing selected Home Model modules—such as career sovereignty, family support, and dignified exit—in specific jurisdictions.

In applied policy consulting and dialogue initiatives, the six modules of The Home Model can serve as a structural framework for closed-door workshops with corporate executives, civil service leaders, and social organizations, helping them translate "human-centered resilience" from an abstract value into institutional innovations that can be piloted and evaluated.

Additionally, exploring the construction of a "Core Code Index" to complement traditional KPI metrics holds significant methodological value. How does one measure an organization's degree of identity fusion? How can one quantify the accumulation of management debt?

Answers to these questions will provide think tank audiences with stronger scientific decision support and lay the instrumental foundation for empirical testing of the theory.

For think tanks themselves, this also implies a form of self-demand: no longer content with describing existing models and offering incremental adjustments, but actively proposing East Asia's own "third way" vision in the competition between civilizations and institutional innovation—and continuously testing and refining it in practice. Core Code Theory and The Home Model offer precisely this kind of starting point: debatable, open to critique, and progressively implementable.

11. Conclusion: If East Asia Does Not Propose an Alternative, It Will Remain Trapped Between Two Modes of Failure

The world today is swinging between two extremes. At one end stands the Western "meat grinder civilization": procedural justice gradually degenerating into an instrument, institutions protecting status rather than justice. At the other end lies the retreat into insularity and paternalism—a "false home." If East Asia merely picks sides passively, it will ultimately shuttle between different forms of failure.

The real opportunity lies in this: leveraging the not-yet-exhausted family–state–enterprise cultural connectivity still alive in its own traditions, proactively absorbing the West's effective contributions in governance, transparency, and accountability, and using systemic frameworks like The Home Model and Core Code Theory to elevate the idea of "home" from an emotional narrative into an institutional program that can be piloted, measured, and progressively scaled.

When the next systemic crisis arrives, the divergence will be unmistakable. Some nations and organizations will continue operating on extraction logic—and when they most need human stewardship, they will find themselves surrounded only by cold contracts and algorithms. Others will have begun paying the costs of "human-centered resilience" today—and in the storm, they will discover that they possess not only technology and capital, but a cadre of people willing to defend the community as if it were their home.

The measure of a civilization's advancement is not how it worships its strongest, but how it treats those who once served with distinction and those who are vulnerable today. This article merely offers those decision-makers willing to choose "Home Civilization" a

blueprint that can be debated and contested, but is at least sufficiently clear. What truly matters is this: who is willing, before the crisis arrives, to begin paying the price for this kind of civilization?

References

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2020). Robots and jobs. Journal of Political Economy, 128(6), 2188–2244.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.

Borgatti, S. P., & Halgin, D. S. (2011). On network theory. Organization Science, 22(5), 1168–1181.

Dierickx, I., & Cool, K. (1989). Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage. Management Science, 35(12), 1504–1511.

Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254–280.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Relationships between authentic leadership, moral courage, and ethical and pro-social behaviors. Business Ethics Quarterly, 21(4), 555–578.

Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. Human Resource Management Review, 21(3), 243–255.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734.

McKinsey & Company. (2022). The state of organizations 2023: Ten shifts transforming organizations.

Olson, M. (1965). The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups. Harvard University Press.

Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swann, W. B., Jr., Jetten, J., Gómez, A., Whitehouse, H., & Bastian, B. (2012). When group membership gets personal: A theory of identity fusion. Psychological Review, 119(3), 441–456.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

World Health Organization. (2023). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. Geneva: WHO.

Tong Yin. (2026a). Core Code Theory: Identity fusion and the non-linear returns of organizational trust in the age of AI. Manuscript submitted to Academy of Management Review.

Tong Yin. (2026b). The Home Model: Beyond extraction and toward sustainable resilience in the age of AI – A practice-oriented theory of trust-based management. Manuscript submitted to MIT Sloan Management Review.

About the Author

Tong Yin, Ph.D., Auburn University and the founder of the InsightBridge Business Consulting. His research focuses on organizational behavior, trust, and human capital strategy, with particular emphasis on management paradigm transformation in the age of AI. He brings over twenty years of senior management experience to his academic work. His current research centers on the development of Core Code Theory and The Home Model, with the aim of constructing a management theoretical system that integrates Eastern and Western governance wisdom.