Breaking Bad Governance: The Democratic AI Architecture to End Anacyclosis

Paul Giles and Chris Ziomkowski
Based AI
https://basd.earth

Abstract - **Political orders decay toward oligarchy with metronomic regularity. Artificial intelligence accelerates this ancient pattern, compressing centuries of institutional decay into years. We demonstrate that halting anacyclosis requires four interlocking democratizations—governance, compute, data, and value—implemented as a fused architecture rather than piecemeal reform. We formalize minimum democratic guarantees that any implementation must satisfy, treating specific mechanisms (DAO structures, compute exchanges, data trusts, ownership instruments) as functionally equivalent when they meet these guarantees. Through mathematical proof and empirical evidence, we show that extraction-based AI ownership makes abundance structurally impossible, while democratic ownership enables both prosperity and resilience. We introduce the DAVINCI metric to measure democratic equilibrium across jurisdictions and present staged transition pathways calibrated to a closing window. The choice crystallizes: democratic equilibrium with contestable capability and falling costs, or algorithmic feudalism with closed stacks and permanent dependency.**

Keywords: artificial intelligence governance, democratic AI, platform capitalism, anacyclosis, distributed computing, Four Pillars framework, political economy, surveillance capitalism

I. Introduction: Anacyclosis in Compressed Time

"He who can destroy a thing, controls a thing." [1] This axiom from *Dune* captures a truth older than fiction: power concentrates around chokepoints. In the AI era, those chokepoints are compute, data, algorithms, and value flows. Control them, and you control the future of human agency.

Political decay follows predictable patterns. Polybius documented the cycle twenty-three centuries ago: democracy slides toward mob rule, oligarchy crystallizes, tyranny emerges, revolution restarts the wheel [2]. No static constitution has escaped. Rome fell despite its mixed government. Athens collapsed despite inventing democracy. Every institutional immune system eventually fails.

AI compresses this timeline from centuries to years. Digital coordination accelerates both collective action and its capture. In September 2025, Nepal's citizens used encrypted messaging and social media to coordinate nationwide protests, select leaders through ad-hoc digital assemblies, and topple their government in days—processes that historically required years of organization [3]. Yet this same acceleration exposed democracy's digital vulnerabilities: no verifiable personhood, no sybil resistance, no constitutional interface to make decisions binding [4]. Power changed hands, but the underlying cycle remained intact.

Thesis

Breaking anacyclosis requires transforming AI from an accelerant of decay into an architectural immune system. This demands coherent democratization across four interdependent pillars—governance, compute, data, and value—each reinforcing the others against capture.

Scope & Method

This paper defines the architecture, not a brand. We specify sufficiency conditions for democratic AI, not prescriptive implementations. Whether through Marshall Islands DAO LLCs, Wyoming legislation, Swiss associations, or novel forms, any structure satisfying our minimum democratic guarantees achieves functional equivalence [5]. Evaluation remains outcome-based via the DAVINCI metric [6], agnostic to specific jurisdictions or instruments.

Novel Contributions in this work

1. *Four-Pillar Necessity*: Formal argument that partial democratization fails through the weakest link [7] —open weights without open compute merely democratize dependency.

2. *Minimum Democratic Guarantees (MDGs)*: Testable, implementation-agnostic criteria for evaluating any governance structure's democratic legitimacy.
3. *Commitment-Anchored Governance*: Binding executive actions to public reasons, challenge windows, and immutable constraints as constitutional defaults.
4. *Heterogeneous Compute Markets*: Open scheduling across diverse hardware to break hyperscale gatekeeping while achieving superior efficiency.
5. *Usage-Accounting Data Trusts*: Privacy-preserving learning with automated provenance and contributor compensation [8].
6. *Capability-Cost Glidepath*: Programmatic mechanisms ensuring efficiency gains flow to users rather than accumulating as rents [9].
7. *Founder's Wager:* Solves democracy's bootstrap paradox through irrevocable founder commitment—pre-committing all resources and compensation to democratic control from inception [10].
8. *DAVINCI Metric (extended)*: Expansion to seven dimensions (adds Normative, Commons and Interoperability) with public methodology and reporting schedule, enabling longitudinal cross-jurisdictional comparison.

II. Governance (Pillar I)

"AI will probably most likely lead to the end of the world, but in the meantime, there'll be great companies." — Sam Altman, CEO OpenAI, 2015 [11]

Precedent.

By May 2023, 350 leading AI researchers declared: "Mitigating the risk of extinction from AI should be a global priority alongside other societal-scale risks such as pandemics and nuclear war" [12]. Six months later, OpenAI's board briefly fired Altman for allegedly prioritizing commercial expansion over safety protocols, only to reinstate him within days after 95% of employees threatened to quit—a perfect demonstration of how market pressures override safety governance in practice [13].

Problem

Corporate AI governance operates through advisory committees without binding authority—ethics theater masking unaccountable power [13][14][15]. State alternatives court authoritarian capture through centralized control. Digital coordination tools enable rapid mobilization but lack the institutional infrastructure for sustained democratic governance. Without cryptographic personhood and sybil resistance [16], online assemblies become puppet shows. Executive decisions proceed without challengeable justification or remedy. Adjudication happens sporadically, if ever.

Structural solution

A constitutional stack with interlocking checks:

- *Democratic Assembly (DA)* employing cryptographic identity and quadratic mechanisms for legitimate voice [17];
- *Thematic Working Groups (TWGs)* translating values into policy;
- *Stewardship Council (SC)* executing within immutable boundaries;
- *Constitutional Court (CC)* with an *Active Constitutional Guardian (ACG)* providing continuous oversight through both human judgment and machine-assisted constitutional analysis [18].

Every executive action becomes commitment-anchored—publishing reasons, binding to on-chain constraints, opening challenge windows for contestation.

Minimum Democratic Guarantees

1. *Personhood integrity:* Cryptographic identity with sybil resistance ensuring one human, one voice.
2. *Challengeable execution:* All actions carry public justifications, face time-bounded contestation, and enable enforceable remedy.
3. *Independent adjudication:* Constitutional review with precedent, audit trails, and separation from executive function.
4. *Progressive decentralization:* Irrevocable constraints preventing re-centralization as systems mature.

Evidence

Nepal's digital uprising demonstrated both the potential and peril of networked democracy—coordination without infrastructure leads to revolution without resolution [3][4]. Modern DAO frameworks across multiple jurisdictions (Marshall Islands, Wyoming, Switzerland) prove that cryptographic governance can achieve legal personhood and cross-border enforceability when properly structured [5][19][20]. Society's demonstrated willingness to sacrifice 4% of GDP addressing COVID-19's 0.3% mortality risk suggests comparable investment scales for AI risks are warranted—yet only democratic governance can coordinate such collective action [21].

Handoff

Governance determines who may authorize, contest, and reverse decisions about compute, data, and value.

Ways forward

Ship modular constitutional components (Democratic Assembly, Thematic Working Groups, Stewardship Council, Constitutional Court, Active Constitutional Guardian) with baseline identity infrastructure; make commitment-anchored execution the irrevocable default for all governance actions.

III. Compute (Pillar II)

"We create markets. We don't compete in markets." — Jensen Huang, CEO Nvidia [22]

Precedent

Nvidia accounted for 98% of the GPUs shipped to enterprise data centers in 2022 and 2023 [23][24]. Today, four corporations control 70% of foundation model development [25], with platforms achieving market dominance in years rather than the decades this previously required [26].

Problem

Computational power concentrates through compound advantages: capital for GPUs, relationships for allocation, expertise for optimization, scale for efficiency. Hyperscalers control not just chips but cooling, power, siting, and the five-to-seven-year build cycles that lock in advantage [27][28]. 'Open weights' without compute access creates democratic theater—communities can admire models they cannot run. Subsidy capture and regulatory moats protect incumbents while thermal and grid constraints physically prevent new entrants [29][30]. Displacement Paradox: As capabilities scale, human knowledge workers face binary displacement—either to routine work AI cannot perform or ultra-specialized tasks requiring decades of experience, with no middle ground for skill development [31].

Structural solution

Distributed architecture prioritizing algorithmic efficiency over raw scale, supporting heterogeneous hardware including neuromorphic and analog accelerators breaking the GPU monopoly [32][33]. An open scheduling market explicitly prices latency, privacy, locality, and carbon—making community priorities economically legible. Energy coupling through waste-heat recovery and behind-the-meter renewables transforms power from bottleneck to value stream [34][35][36], driving price-per-capability toward zero [34][37].

Minimum Democratic Guarantees

1. *Non-discriminatory access*: Transparent queues and public pricing without gatekeeping.
2. *Hardware diversity*: Verifiable performance across architectures preventing monoculture lock-in.
3. *Local participation*: Entry paths independent of hyperscale subsidies or exclusive contracts.
4. *Efficiency sharing*: Systematic reduction in price-per-capability benefiting users, not owners.

Evidence

Distributed training achieves 500-fold communication reduction through gradient compression and asynchronous updates [38][39][40]. Neuromorphic architectures demonstrate 100–1000× performance-per-watt advantages for specific workloads [32][33][41][42]. Community clusters running mixed workloads with locality premiums already match centralized efficiency when total system costs include cooling and transmission [43][44][45]. Economic modeling confirms that as AI capabilities advance, wages decouple from growth while income flows increasingly to compute owners—making democratic compute ownership not just preferable but necessary to prevent permanent oligarchic capture [46].

Handoff

Compute topology determines who can materialize governance decisions into working systems.

Ways forward

Launch federated compute exchanges with heterogeneous hardware support; publish migration playbooks helping communities transition from rented to owned infrastructure.

IV. Data (Pillar III)

"If you dislike the idea of living in a digital dictatorship the most important contribution you can make is to find ways to prevent too much data from being concentrated in too few hands." — Yuval Harari, historian, October 2018 [47]

Precedent

In September 2025, Senator Josh Hawley echoed that same warning in his speech to lawmakers: "Platforms that monitor and record our every click, every pause, every purchase, every preference. Algorithms to turn our attention into a commodity and sell it, over and again. There is virtually nothing you know about yourself that Big Tech does not also know—and profit from. And entirely without your consent. They are in charge, not you. They control the information, much of the news—and entertainment. They decide who can speak and who not. Now, does that sound like liberty to you?" [48]

Problem

Surveillance capitalism's core innovation was discovering that behavioral surplus could be extracted without consent and monetized without compensation [49]. AI amplifies this extraction—every interaction trains models that predict and shape behavior for profit. Sensitive populations suffer disproportionate harm as their data improves systems that discriminate against them. Without community data sovereignty, democratic governance becomes cosmetic—communities may vote on values, but training data determines behavior. Extraction Death Spiral: Platform extraction follows mathematical inevitability: aggregating information without compensating creators reduces production incentives, degrading the ecosystem even as transmission efficiency improves [50].

Structural solution

Community data trusts embedding consent, provenance, and revocation as technical primitives rather than legal promises. Privacy-preserving learning (homomorphic encryption, secure aggregation, differential privacy) as irrevocable defaults. Usage accounting creating audit trails from data to model to inference, enabling automatic compensation [51]. Civic datasets reflecting local norms, languages, and values rather than imperial defaults. Mandatory disclosure of compute usage, data valuation, and environmental footprints transforms AI from statistically invisible infrastructure into democratically accountable systems [52].

Minimum Democratic Guarantees

1. *Consent infrastructure*: Granular, revocable, and auditable permission systems.
2. *Privacy by architecture*: Mathematical guarantees replacing trust in operators.
3. *Compensation flows*: Automated payment from usage to contribution.
4. *Local sovereignty*: Communities control their behavioral surplus and cultural data.

Evidence

Federated learning achieves comparable accuracy to centralized training while preserving privacy [53][54]. Recent advances in sparse training reduce data requirements by 60–80%, eroding assumptions about inevitable data monopolies [41][55][56][57][58]. Community-tuned models outperform generic systems on locally-relevant tasks when evaluation metrics reflect community priorities rather than benchmark leaderboards [19].

Handoff

Data sovereignty transforms governance from aspiration to implementation.

Ways forward

Deploy production data trusts with privacy guarantees and transparent accounting; enforce compensation flows through smart contracts auditable by the CC/ACG.

V. Value (Pillar IV)

"In a benign scenario probably none of us will have a job" — Elon Musk, CEO SpaceX/Tesla, June 2025 [59]

Precedent

Musk recently characterized that outcome as "nearly inevitable" [59]. The Tesla CEO, projected to become a trillionaire in 2027, envisions a post-work society funded by *abundance* [60]. Senator Josh Hawley, however, warns this "earthquake" will leave displaced workers with nothing but "sweeping floors at a data center" [48].

Problem

AI's economic structure inverts abundance: the more capable systems become, the more expensive access grows. "Renting superpowers" sounds empowering but creates permanent dependency—users pay forever for capabilities that could be owned once. Network effects ensure value flows to platforms rather than participants. Traditional redistribution cannot remedy structural extraction; taxing monopoly rents legitimizes them while failing to democratize capability itself. Economic modeling confirms this trajectory leads to labor's share of GDP converging to zero as wages become bounded by computational replacement costs—making democratic value distribution economically necessary for human economic survival [46]

Structural solution

Democratic ownership through instrument-agnostic claims—whether tokens, equity, dividends, or novel mechanisms—ensuring value circulates to contributors. Dual-circuit economics where community services and external revenue both fund common infrastructure. A capability-cost glidepath that programmatically reduces prices as efficiency improves, making Moore's Law benefit users rather than shareholders. Challenge markets rewarding error discovery and governance participation.

Minimum Democratic Guarantees

1. *Programmatic price reduction:* Efficiency gains automatically lower costs, not increase margins.
2. *Contributor ownership:* Value flows to participants through enforceable claims, not corporate charity.
3. *Error incentives:* Economic rewards for identifying failures and improving systems.
4. *Anti-extraction limits:* Hard constraints on rent-seeking and insider appropriation.

Evidence

Historical precedent shows community ownership accelerates adoption while reducing costs—from rural electric cooperatives to open-source software [61][62][63]. Mathematical modeling proves that when contributors capture value, investment in quality increases while extraction decreases. Empirical studies of platform cooperatives demonstrate 3–5× higher value retention in communities versus shareholder extraction models [64][65].

Handoff

Value mechanics determine whether the other pillars remain sustainable or decay through resource starvation.

Ways forward

Implement contribution-indexed value distribution with capability-cost glidepaths; make efficiency gains structurally un-capturable through constitutional constraints.

VI. Implementation

Pathway

Begin with a founder's wager—irrevocable commitment of resources and control to constitutional constraints, demonstrating credible neutrality from inception [8]. Progress through staged decentralization as each component matures: first identity and sybil resistance, then basic governance, then resource allocation, finally full community custody [8]. Maintain thin interfaces between layers, enabling component upgrades without systemic risk.

Operating cadence

Deploy through testable milestones: (i) cryptographic identity with sybil-resistant personhood [16], (ii) heterogeneous compute exchange with community nodes,

(iii) privacy-preserving data trusts with usage accounting [51], (iv) value distribution with automatic glidepaths. Each stage includes challenge periods, rollback capabilities, and stress testing against adversarial conditions. Success metrics are published continuously, not announced retroactively.

VII. Transition Pathway and DAVINCI Metric

Transition pathways

Civic pilots prove viability through municipal deployments—local compute for city services, community data trusts for schools and hospitals, participatory budgeting for AI investments [66]. Sector pilots demonstrate specialized applications—SMEs in regulated industries needing auditable AI, research consortiums requiring reproducible training, creative communities building non-exploitative tools. Movement pilots stress-test adversarial resilience—activist networks requiring censorship resistance, journalists needing source protection, communities organizing against authoritarian regimes [67].

DAVINCI Metric

An extension of the original DAVINCI index [6], the DAVINCI metric is a diagnostic measuring democratic equilibrium on a scale of 0-100 through seven dimensions:

- **D**istribution (compute access breadth)
- **A**ccountability (transparency and contestability)
- **V**alue (returns to contributors versus extractors)
- **I**dentity (integrity of personhood systems)
- **N**ormative (alignment with community values)
- **C**ommons (growth of shared resources)
- **I**nteroperability (portability across systems).

It should be published quarterly with methodology transparency, enabling longitudinal and cross-jurisdictional comparison. (Detailed scoring rubrics and validation will appear in a companion methods note; this paper specifies dimensions and release cadence).

VIII. Emergence Through Convergence

Across the landscape, independent efforts accumulate. Research labs publish bias detection algorithms. Legal teams challenge data extraction practices. Engineers release distributed training protocols [38]. Communities deploy local inference infrastructure. Each initiative addresses a specific failure mode of centralized AI, yet together they trace the outline of something larger—a systematic alternative to concentration.

The pattern resembles previous technological transitions. Personal computers emerged not through grand planning but through hobbyists, researchers, and entrepreneurs independently recognizing mainframe limitations. The internet expanded not through mandate but through universities, businesses, and individuals separately building interconnected networks. These shifts appeared inevitable only in retrospect; contemporaries saw merely scattered experiments until sudden convergence revealed new architecture.

Today's distributed AI efforts exhibit similar dynamics. Open model releases accelerate [68]. Federated learning deployments multiply [69]. Data cooperative formations increase [70]. Compute sharing protocols mature [71]. Even incumbent platforms experiment with democratic input mechanisms, suggesting recognition that pure extraction models generate unsustainable resistance [72]. These developments don't require coordination—they emerge from shared recognition that current trajectories produce suboptimal outcomes for most participants.

The four democratizations we've identified—governance, compute, data, and value—provide a framework for understanding these independent efforts as complementary rather than competing. Each addresses a different capture vector; together they constitute comprehensive architecture. This isn't prescriptive but descriptive: successful democratic AI implementations already demonstrate these principles, whether consciously designed or organically evolved [73][74].

Evidence suggests we've passed critical thresholds. The technical barriers that once made distributed AI implausible—synchronization overhead, verification costs, coordination complexity—have fallen below viability points [75][31]. The economic logic that once favored concentration—scale economies, network effects, switching costs—now encounters countervailing forces as extraction costs exceed value creation [49][50]. The social dynamics that once accepted algorithmic opacity—trust in platforms, belief in benevolent innovation, hope for self-regulation—have shifted toward demanding accountability [14].

What emerges isn't revolution but evolution—the natural progression from centralized to distributed architecture as technology matures and externalities compound. Democratic AI represents not ideological position but engineering solution to observed failure modes. The question isn't whether this transition occurs but how quickly and completely. Current trajectories suggest acceleration rather than resistance, as each successful implementation demonstrates viability and attracts resources.

The work continues, distributed across thousands of contributors who may never meet but whose efforts combine toward common architecture. Some build infrastructure. Others establish governance. Many simply choose open over closed, shared over extracted, transparent over opaque. Through these aggregate choices, democratic AI emerges not as imposed structure but as revealed preference—the system participants build when given tools to build systems.

This convergence suggests optimism warranted by evidence rather than hope. The pieces exist. The principles clarify. The precedents multiply. What seemed impossible becomes inevitable through accumulated demonstration. Not because it must, but because enough choose to make it so.

IX. What Only Democratic AI Resolves

- *Legitimacy through contestability*. When algorithms allocate opportunity, only democratic governance can legitimate those allocations across diverse communities with conflicting values.
- *Abundance through ownership*. Renting intelligence ensures permanent dependency and expanding costs; ownership enables compound returns where efficiency gains benefit users [65][66].
- *Critical functions beyond capture*. Education, healthcare, justice, and public discourse require governance structures that can override profit motives and resist authoritarian control [76].
- *Corrigibility as constitutional right*. Continuous oversight with rollback authority transforms AI safety from corporate promise to enforceable guarantee [77].
- *Resilience through commons*. Shared models, datasets, and tools create antifragile systems that strengthen under stress rather than cascading failure [78][79].

Author's Disclosure

The authors pursue independent research on democratic AI architectures. References to legal structures, technical mechanisms, and economic instruments are illustrative of the minimum democratic guarantees, not endorsements of specific implementations. The framework remains implementation-agnostic and jurisdiction-neutral by design.

References

[1] Herbert, Frank. *Dune*. Chilton Book Company, Radnor, 1 Oct. 1965. ISBN: 978-0801950773.

[2] Polybius. (c. 150 BCE). *The Histories*, Book VI. Ch. 9. Trans. Waterfield, R. (2010). Oxford World's Classics. https://theswissbay.ch/pdf/Books/Ancient%20history/Polybius%20-%20The%20Histories%20-%20Robin%20Waterfield.pdf

[3] Shamim, Sarah. “Who's leading Nepal after Oli resignation, what's next for Gen Z protests?" Al Jazeera Media Network, 10 Sep. 2025. https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/9/10/whos-leading-nepal-after-oli-resignation-whats-next-for-gen-z-protests.

[4] "2025 Nepalese Gen Z protests." Wikipedia, 8 Sep. 2025. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2025_Nepalese_Gen_Z_protests.

[5] Decentralized Autonomous Organization Act of 2022, Bill No. 75ND2P.L.2022-50, 43rd Constitutional Session, 2022, Republic of the Marshall Islands, 25 Nov. 2022. https://rmicourts.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/PL-2022-50-Decentralized-Autonomous.pdf.

[6] Giles, Paul & Chris Ziomkowski. “Democratic AI: Inhibiting Anacyclosis Through a Perpetually Self-Correcting Democratic Equilibrium.” Based AI Working Paper, 9 Sep. 2025. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5462016.

[7] Schneier, Bruce. *A Hacker's Mind: How the Powerful Bend Society's Rules, and How to Bend them Back*. W. W. Norton & Company, 7 Feb. 2023. ISBN: 978-0393866667.

[8] Barocas, Solon, Moris Hardt, & Arvind Narayanan. *Fairness and Machine Learning: Limitations and Opportunities*. MIT Press, 13 Dec. 2023. ISBN 978-0262048613. https://fairmlbook.org/pdf/fairmlbook.pdf

[9] Athey, Susan and Fiona Scott Morton. "Artificial Intelligence, Competition, and Welfare." NBER Conference Paper f227494, September 19, 2025. https://conference.nber.org/conf_papers/f227494.pdf.

[10] “Based AI Whitepaper.”, Based AI, Aug. 2025, https://www.basd.earth/documents/whitepaper.pdf, Accessed 24 Aug. 2025

[11] Weinberger, Matt. “Head of Silicon Valley's most important startup farm says we're in a 'mega bubble' that won't last.”, Business Insider, Tech, Y Combinator president Sam Altman at Airbnb's Open Air 2015 conference, 5 Jun. 2015. https://www.businessinsider.com/sam-altman-y-combinator-talks-mega-bubble-nuclear-power-and-more-2015-6.

[12] “Top AI Scientists Warn: Risk of Extinction from AI on Scale with Nuclear War”. Center for AI Safety, AI Extinction Statement Press Release, 30 May 2023. https://www.safe.ai/press-release.

[13] "Amoral Drift in AI Corporate Governance." Harvard Law Review, Developments in the Law, Vol. 138, Issue 6, 10 Apr. 2025.

https://harvardlawreview.org/print/vol-138/amoral-drift-in-ai-corporate-governance/
[14] Greene, Daniel, Anna Lauren Hoffmann & Luke Stark. "Better, Nicer, Clearer, Fairer: A Critical Assessment of the Movement for Ethical Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning." Proceedings of the 52nd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 8 Jan. 2019. https://doi.org/10.24251/HICSS.2019.258.
[15] Raji, Inioluwa Deborah et al. "Closing the AI Accountability Gap: Defining an End-to-End Framework for Internal Algorithmic Auditing." Association for Computing Machinery, FAT* '20: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, pp. 33-34, 27 Jan. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873.
[16] Borge, Maria et al. "Proof-of-Personhood: Redemocratizing Permissionless Cryptocurrencies." 2017 IEEE European Symposium on Security and Privacy Workshops (EuroS&PW), Paris, France, 2017, pp. 23-26, 26 Apr. 2017. https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW.2017.46.
[17] Lalley, Steven P. & E. Glen Weyl. "Quadratic Voting: How Mechanism Design Can Radicalize Democracy." American Economic Association, AEA Papers & Proceedings, Vol. 108, pp. 33–37, May 2018. https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20181002.
[18] Hitzig, Zoë and Erik Brynjolfsson. "AI's Use of Knowledge in Society." NBER Conference Paper f227495, September 18, 2025.
[19] Ovadya, Aviv, et al. "Democratic AI is Possible: The Democracy Levels Framework Shows How It Might Work." Proceedings of ICML, 21 Aug. 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2411.09222
[20] Wyoming Decentralized Unincorporated Nonprofit Association Act, Unincorporated nonprofit DAO's, Original Senate file No. SF0050, enrolled act No. 23, Senate, 67th Legislature of the State of Wyoming 2024 Budget Session, Chapter 32, 7 Mar. 2024. https://wyoleg.gov/Legislation/2024/SF0050.
[21] Jones, Charles I. "How Much Should We Spend to Reduce A.I.'s Existential Risk?" NBER Conference Paper f227502, March 17, 2025. https://conference.nber.org/conf_papers/f227502.pdf.
[22] Newman, Daniel & Patrick Moorhead. "Is NVIDIA a Monopoly?" The Futurum Group, The Six Five, Episode 210, 2 Apr. 2024. https://futurumgroup.com/insights/is-nvidia-a-monopoly.
[23] Williams, Shawn. "Is Artificial Intelligence (AI) GPU Giant Nvidia Poised to Be a Victim of Its Own Success?" The Motley Fool, Nasdaq Publishers. 31 Mar. 2025. https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/artificial-intelligence-ai-gpu-giant-nvidia-poised-be-victim-its-own-success.
[24] Trueman, Charlotte. "Nvidia data center GPU shipments totaled 3.76m in 2023, equating to a 98% market share - report." Data Centre Dynamics Ltd., Media, News, The Compute, Storage & Networking Channel, 12 Jun. 2024. https://www.datacenterdynamics.com/en/news/nvidia-gpu-shipments-totaled-376m-in-2023-equating-to-a-98-market-share-report/.
[25] Vipra, Jal & Anton Korinkek. "Market Concentration Implications of Foundation Models." Brookings Institution, Center on Regulation and Markets Working Paper #9, 2 Nov. 2023. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.01550.
[26] Parker, Geoffrey G., Marshall W. Van Alstyne & Sangeet Paul Choudary. *Platform Revolution: How Networked Markets Are Transforming the Economy—and How to Make Them Work for You*. W. W. Norton & Company, 28 Mar. 2016. ISBN: 978-0393249132.
[27] Rand, Joseph et. al. "Queued Up: 2024 Edition Characteristics of Power Plants Seeking Transmission Interconnection As of the End of 2023." Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Markets & Policy, Berkeley Lab, Apr. 2024, (Updated Aug. 2025,summaries through 2024). https://emp.lbl.gov/queues.
[28] Ford, Neil. "Western US embraces grid reforms but solar queues will linger." Reuters, Business, Energy, 20 Jun. 2024. https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/western-us-embraces-grid-reforms-solar-queues-will-linger-2024-06-20/.
[29] Tarczynska, Kasia and Greg LeRoy. "Cloudy with a Loss of Spending Control: How Data Centers Are Endangering State Budgets". Good Jobs First National Policy Resource Center, April 2025. https://goodjobsfirst.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/Cloudy-with-a-Loss-of-Spending-Control-How-Data-Centers-Are-Endangering-State-Budgets.pdf.
[30] Wilkins, Joe. "There's a Stunning Financial Problem with AI Data Centers." Futurism, 28 Aug. 28, 2024. https://futurism.com/data-centers-financial-bubble.
[31] Agrawal, A., Gans, J. S., & Goldfarb, A. (2025). "Genius on Demand: The Value of Transformative Artificial Intelligence." NBER Conference Paper f227491. https://conference.nber.org/conf_papers/f227491.pdf
[32] Aifer, Maxwell et al. "Solving the compute crisis with physics-based ASICs.." arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.10463, 14 Jul. 2025. https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.10463.
[33] Leroux, Nathab, et al. "Analog in-memory computing attention mechanism for fast and energy-efficient large language models." Nature Computational Science, 5(9), 1234-1245, 8 Sep. 2025. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-025-00854-1.
[34] Smolaks, Max. "Heat reuse: a management primer." Uptime Institute, Briefing Report 114, 2 Oct. 2023. https://intelligence.uptimeinstitute.com/resource/heat-reuse-management-primer.
[35] Kauranen, Anne. "Nordics' efficient energy infrastructure ideal for Microsoft's data centre expansion." Reuters, Technology, 7 Mar. 2025. https://www.reuters.com/technology/nordics-efficient-energy-infrastructure-ideal-microsofts-data-centre-expansion-2025-03-07.
[36] Masanet, Eric, Arman Shehabi, Nuoa Lei, Sarah Smith, & Jonathan Koomey. "Recalibrating Global Data Center Energy-Use Estimates." Science, 367(6481), 984-986, 28 Feb. 2020. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aba3758.
[37] Chai, Sek. "How Edge Computing Can Solve AI's Energy Crisis." Built In, Built In AI Analysis Series, 3 Apr. 2025. https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/edge-ai-energy-solution.
[38] Douillard, Arthur et. al. "DiLoCo: Distributed Low-Communication Training of Language Models." Google Deep Mind, 23 Sep. 2024. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.08105.
[39] Jaghouar, Saml, Jack Min Ong & Johannes Hagemann. "OpenDiLoCo: An Open-Source Framework for Globally Distributed Low-Communication Training." Technical Report, Prime Intellect Inc., 10 Jul. 2024. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.07852.
[40] Ryabinin, Max & Anton Gusev. "Towards Crowdsourced Training of Large Neural Networks using Decentralized Mixture-of-Experts." NeurIPS 2020 · Thirty-Fourth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, 13 Nov. 2020. http://dx.doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2002.04013.
[41] Pan, Yuqi, et al. "SpikingBrain Technical Report: Spiking Brain-inspired Large Models." Brain-inspired computing lab, 5 Sep. 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2509.05276.
[42] Wang, Guan, et al. "Hierarchical Reasoning Model." Sapient Intelligence, 4 Aug. 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2506.21734.
[43] Cozzi, Laura et al. "Energy and AI", International Energy Agency, Energy and AI, IEA, Paris, Apr. 2025,

https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-and-ai.

[44] Shehabi, Arman et al. "United States Data Center Energy Usage Report." Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Energy Technologies Area, LBNL-1005775, Jun. 2016. https://eta.lbl.gov/publications/united-states-data-center-energy.

[45] Jones, Nicola. "How to Stop Data Centers from Gobbling Up the World's Electricity." Nature, 561(7722), 163-166, Sep. 2018. http://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-06610-y.

[46] Restrepo, Pascual. "We Won't be Missed: Work and Growth in the Era of AGI." National Bureau of Economic Research, Economics of Transformative AI Workshop Fall 2025, Yale University and NBER, 19 Sep. 2025. https://www.nber.org/conferences/economics-transformative-ai-workshop-fall-2025.

[47] Harari, Yuval Noah. "Why Technology Favors Tyranny." The Atlantic, Sep. 2018. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2018/10/yuval-noah-harari-technology-tyranny/568330/.

[48] Hawley, Josh. “HAWLEY: AI Threatens the Working Man.” The Daily Signal, Commentary, Prepared Remarks, National Conservatism Conference in Washington, D.C., 4 Sep. 2025. https://www.dailysignal.com/2025/09/04/hawley-ai-threatens-the-working-man/.

[49] Zuboff, Shoshana. “Surveillance Capitalism and the Challenge of Collective Action.” New Labor Forum, 28(1), pp. 10-29. SAGE Publications, 24 Jan. 2019. https://doi.org/10.1177/1095796018819461.

[50] Stiglitz, Joseph E & Maxim Ventura-Bolet. "The impact of AI and digital platforms on the information ecosystem." National Bureau of Economic Research, Economics of Transformative AI Workshop Fall 2025, Columbia University and NBER, 18 Sep. 2025. https://www.nber.org/conferences/economics-transformative-ai-workshop-fall-2025

[51] “GitHub Copilot Intellectual Property Litigation.” Joseph Saveri Law Firm, Cases, 3 Nov. 2022. https://www.saverilawfirm.com/our-cases/github-copilot-intellectual-property-litigation. Accessed 25 Aug. 2025.

[52] Coyle, Diane & John Lourenze Salan Poquiz. "Making AI Count: The Next Measurement Frontier." National Bureau of Economic Research, Economics of Transformative AI Workshop Fall 2025, University of Cambridge, 18 Sep. 2025. https://www.nber.org/conferences/economics-transformative-ai-workshop-fall-2025

[53] Xu, Zhang et al.. "Federated Learning of Gboard Language Models with Differential Privacy." Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 5: Industry Track), 629-639, Jul. 2023. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-industry.60.

[54] McMahan, Brendan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson & Blaise Aguera y Arcas. "Communication-Efficient Learning of Deep Networks from Decentralized Data." Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS) PMLR 54:1273-1282, 20 Apr. 2017. https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/mcmahan17a.html.

[55] Albalak, Alon et al.. “A Survey on Data Selection for Language Models.” Transactions in Machine Learning Research, 26 Feb. 2024. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.16827.

[56] Li, Jiazheng et al. “MASS: Mathematical Data Selection via Skill Graphs for Language Models.” International Conference on Machine Learning, 16 Jul. 2025. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.14917.

[57] Shen, Zhiqiang et al. “SlimPajama-DC: Understanding Data Combinations for LLM Training.” MBZUAI Abu Dhabi, UIUC Illinois, Stanford University, CMU and Cerebras Systems, arXiv:2309.10818, 9 May 2024. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.10818.

[58] Hoefler, Torsten , Dan Alistarh, Tal Ben-Nun, Nikoli Dryden & Alexandra Peste. "Sparsity in Deep Learning: Pruning, growth, and everything in between." Journal of Machine Learning Research, 22(241), 1-124, Sep. 2021. https://jmlr.org/papers/v22/21-0366.html.

[59] Mancini, Jeannine. "'There Will Be Universal High Income' — Elon Musk Predicts With 80% Certainty That 'None of Us' Will Have Jobs, But Bill Gates Says It's Too Soon." Benzinga, Personal Finance, 13 Jun. 2025. https://www.benzinga.com/personal-finance/management/25/06/45930142/there-will-be-universal-high-income-elon-musk-predicts-with-80-certainty-that-none-of-us-will-have-jobs-but-bill-gates-says-its-too-soon.

[60] “The 2024 Trillion Dollar Club. Which brands and billionaires are on track to hit the trillion-dollar valuation next?”, Informa Connect Academy, Sep. 2024. https://informaconnect.com/academy/companies-entering-trillion-dollar-club-in-2024/.

[61] Bauwens, Michel. "The Political Economy of Peer Production." University of Victoria, CTheory Journal, 1 Dec. 2005. https://journals.uvic.ca/index.php/ctheory/article/view/14464.

[62] "Electric Co-op Facts & Figures." National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Arlington, VA, Co-Op 101, 25 Jun. 2025. https://www.electric.coop/electric-cooperative-fact-sheet. Accessed 19 Sep. 2025.

[63] Bauwens, Michel & Vasilis Kostakis. "From the Communism of Capital to Capital for the Commons: Towards an Open Co-operativism." TripleC Communication Capitalism & Critique, Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society 12(1):356-361,3 Apr. 2014. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v12i1.561.

[64] Bühler, Michael Max et al. "Unlocking the Power of Digital Commons: Data Cooperatives as a Pathway for Data Sovereign, Innovative and Equitable Digital Communities." Digital 3, no. 3: 146-171, 29 Jun. 2023. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital3030011.

[65] Scholz, Trebor. "Platform Cooperativism: Challenging the Corporate Sharing Economy." Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, Rosa Luxemburg Foundation, 21 Jun. 2016. https://rosalux.org.br/platform-cooperativism/.

[66] Kattel, Rainer, and Ines Mergel, “Estonia’s Digital Transformation: Mission Mystique and the Hiding Hand”, in Paul 't Hart, and Mallory Compton (eds), *Great Policy Successes* pp. 143-160 (Oxford, 2019; online edn, Oxford Academic, 24 Oct. 2019). ISBN: 978-0198843719. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198843719.003.0008.

[67] Funk, Allie, Kian Vesteinsson & Grant Baker. "Freedom on the Net 2024: The Struggle for Trust Online." Freedom on the Net 2024, Freedom House, 16 Oct. 2024. https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2024/struggle-trust-online.

[68] Linux Foundation Research. (2025). "The Economic and Workforce Impacts of Open Source AI." Meta commissioned study. https://about.fb.com/news/2025/05/new-study-shows-open-source-ai-catalyst-economic-growth/

[69] "Federated Learning Market (2025 - 2030).” Grandview Research, Report ID GVR-4-68040-162-2, 9 Apr. 2025. https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/federated-learning-market-report.

[70] Pentland, Alex and Thomas Hardjono. *2. Data Cooperatives.* In *Building the New Economy (0 ed.).* The MIT Press, Works In

Progress, 30 Apr. 2020. https://doi.org/10.21428/ba67f642.0499afe0.
[71] "Blockchain Technology Market (2025 - 2030)." Grandview Research, Report ID GVR-1-68038-329-4, Jan. 2025. https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/blockchain-technology-market.
[72] Acemoglu, Daron. "Oligarchic Versus Democratic Societies." Journal of the European Economic Association, 6(1), 1-44, 1 Mar. 2008. https://doi.org/10.1162/JEEA.2008.6.1.1.
[73] Podes, Stephan. "Polybius and His Theory of 'Anacyclosis': Problems of Not Just Ancient Political Theory." History of Political Thought, Imprint Academic Ltd.12(4), 577-587, Winter 1991. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26213908.
[74] Srnicek, Nick. *Platform Capitalism*. Polity Press, Dec. 2016. ISBN: 978-1509504909. https://mudancatecnologicaedinamicacapitalista.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/platform-capitalism.pdf.
[75] Shaheen, Momina, Muhammad Shoaib Farooq,Tariq Umer & Byung-Seo Kim. "Applications of Federated Learning; Taxonomy, Challenges, and Research Trends." MDPI, Electronics, 11(4), 670, 21 Feb. 2022. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics11040670.
[76] Winner, Langdon. "Do Artifacts Have Politics?" Daedalus, 109(1), 121-136, Winter 1980. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20024652.
[77] Soares, N., Fallenstein, B., Yudkowsky, E., & Armstrong, S. (2015). "Corrigibility." Machine Intelligence Research Institute Technical Report. https://intelligence.org/files/Corrigibility.pdf
[78] Ostrom, Elinor. "Analyzing Long-Enduring, Self-Organized, and Self-Governed CPRs." *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Political Economy of Institutions and Decisions, Cambridge University Press, Ch. 3, pp 58–102, Jun. 2012. ISBN: 978-0511807763. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807763.
[79] Taleb, Nassim Nicholas. *Antifragile: Things That Gain from Disorder.* Incerto Book 3. Random House, 27 Nov. 2012. ISBN: 978-0679645276.