

Outfinity Vision: Research Report

Author: Sînică Alboae, PhD, Axiologic Research & Outfinity

Purpose: Outfinity Vision: a proposal for an AI-driven decentralized governance model.

Visibility: Public

Date: September 2024

Version: 0.2

Introduction & Value System Framework.....	2
Towards a Meta-Rational Governance.....	4
Democracy and Its Limitations.....	5
The Role of Limited Autocracy and Oligarchy.....	6
The Limitations of Libertarianism and Anarchism.....	6
Challenges of Green and Teal Governance Models.....	6
Transcending Rationality and Democracy: The Case for Meta-Rationalism.....	7
Green and Blue Currencies.....	8
Decentralized Brands.....	10
Outfinity: Initial Implementation Plans.....	12
Phase 1: Establish Tokenomics Beyond Speculation.....	12
Phase 2: Transition to Decentralised Governance and Green Currencies.....	13
Endgame: Multiple Blue Currencies.....	14
Cosmolocalism.....	16
Conclusions.....	17
Future work.....	18
References.....	19

Abstract

This research report delves into the intersection of AI technologies and governance, advocating for a shift towards human-centered, decentralized systems based on meta-rationality that could more appropriately reflect the diversity of human values.

As AI reshapes societal and economic structures, it offers an opportunity to reimagine governance in a way that enhances personal responsibility, creativity, and human fulfillment. The report critiques historical trends of “self-domestication,” where individuals have been confined to passive roles in rigid economic and political systems, and explores how AI and alternative currencies can reverse this trend by fostering more flexible, decentralized forms of governance.

Central to the report is the call for governance models that allow for experimentation, creativity, and voluntary participation rather than imposing one-size-fits-all solutions. The rise of AI presents the chance to alleviate labor burdens and create systems that balance global competition with protections for those left behind. It also emphasizes the need for resilience through diversity, arguing that centralized systems have reduced resilience and are prone to collapse.

While embracing the spirit of checks and balances, the rejection of hereditary nobility, and the broad distribution of life’s benefits to as many as possible, this report acknowledges the limitations of a purely democratic approach where every vote holds equal weight. We also reject governance models solely based on expertise, as experts can be manipulators or manipulated by personal interests, and they can be used as a facade to provide biased advice. We believe it is wiser to establish layers of influence, where possible basing voting power on the stakes of individuals or organizations, so that the impact of decisions is felt proportionally and directly by the decision-makers rather than by a passive mass of subjects who, at best, choose their rulers once every few years. We must predominantly seek designs that allow for easy organizational forking in a way that is fair to those who remain, while ensuring that neither majorities nor manipulative minorities dominate societies under the pretense of democratic governance.

Governance systems must be developed with structured tiers of influence, such that at the lowest level—for example, individuals and their local small communities—the number of decisions is highest and the impact most significant. As groups scale up, the scope and impact of decisions should be carefully regulated to ensure both the fairness of the overall governance system and to maximize the freedom and capacity for innovation and exploration for individuals and their communities.

Drawing on Kegan's Constructive-Developmental Theory, the report highlights the importance of leaders evolving towards a “meta-rational” or “trans-rational” mindset—where multiple perspectives are integrated, fostering flexibility and wisdom in governance.

The concept of “Green” and “Blue” currencies, inspired by economist Bernard Lietaer, is introduced as a model for creating sustainable, community-focused economies. These currencies, much like governance systems, should be diverse, balancing local autonomy (Green) with broader, global coordination (Blue).

Ultimately, the report proposes a decentralized future where AI supports innovative governance models, empowering individuals and communities to thrive. By focusing on human values, creativity, and adaptability, such systems will be better equipped to face the challenges of the 21st century, fostering a more humane and resilient society.

Introduction & Value System Framework

This report explores the intersection of AI technologies and governance, with a focus on the need for new, human-centered approaches to managing complex social systems. As AI continues to reshape productivity and societal structures, the opportunity arises to reconsider how we govern and organize, with the aim of doing so in a way that reflects the diversity of human values and beliefs. Importantly, this report advocates for creative, experimental forms of governance that seek to address societal challenges in the most humane way possible—through persuasion, innovation, and a scientific mindset—rather than by imposing rigid frameworks that distort reality or suppress cultural values and diversity.

Historically, societies have undergone a form of "self-domestication." Human beings, through various institutions and structures, have been molded into roles that often limit personal responsibility and creativity. From the ancient systems of slavery to more modern forms of dependence—on wages, states, or rigid corporate structures—we see a trend of reducing individuals to passive participants. Political regimes, like communism, aimed to create a "new man," a domesticated being who relinquished responsibility and was always in expectation of solutions from society to its personal problems. This trend persists today, particularly in large corporations where proceduralization turns individuals into "drones" or "tools" within the system. Once removed from these roles, they could face despair and confusion, unable to navigate life outside of their assigned functions.

The rise of AI offers the potential to reverse this trend of self-domestication, yet it also carries risks and challenges, particularly the conflicts between groups and "tribes," which have been one of the driving forces behind the current state of excessive domestication. This exaggeration manifests in the loss of autonomy, entrepreneurial spirit, and the feeling of having no control over one's own life, often leading to loneliness, despair, and lives lived in unnatural ways that burden society. While we recognize that civilization inherently involves a certain degree of domestication, the experiences of the past centuries seem to have stripped away something essential from human life in ways that are difficult to accept as desirable. As automation and technological advancements reduce the need for labor, we have a unique chance to build systems that allow people to live fuller, more meaningful lives, liberated from the narrow confines of traditional economic and social structures. With AI increasing productivity, more resources can be shared, and new institutions can emerge—ones that balance competition with protection for those who do not succeed in the global marketplace.

However, it is critical that we approach these changes thoughtfully. The global competitive systems that drive innovation and resource mobilization have their place, but it is increasingly clear that not all of humanity needs to be imprisoned within these structures. It is time to explore governance models that allow individuals to opt out of the relentless competition of global capitalism and instead experience life in more creative and fulfilling ways. The future calls for systems that support those who wish to escape the race while still maintaining incentives for those driven by competition.

This is not an argument against inequality per se. A certain level of inequality can serve as a motivator and catalyst for innovation and exploration, providing meaning, as long as it does not lead to the societal degradation of too many individuals. But with natural resources being finite and the limits of technological growth becoming more apparent, it is unlikely that the future will involve every person having countless robots at their disposal. Instead, the focus should be on shared automation, the building of harmonious communities, and creating lifestyles that align with human values—ones that are sustainable and equitable.

One can draw a parallel to the extinction of dinosaurs after the meteor impact: the largest entities did not survive. In the same way, today's large, centralized systems—whether cities, corporations, or governments—are vulnerable to collapse. Resilience in the future will come from agility from reduced

reliance on external resources and diversity in governance. Current trends toward monocultural dominance, particularly in nations like the U.S. and China, risk stifling the very diversity needed for long-term resilience. Moreover, the concentration of AI technologies within a few companies exacerbates this fragility. A more diverse and decentralized approach is essential.

In contrast to rigid, centralized models, what we explore is a decentralized system of governance based on diversity—of thought, social organization, and economic structure. Instead of forcing a singular vision of governance onto all people, new models should arise from experimentation and voluntary participation, respecting the varied beliefs and values that exist across societies. By fostering creativity in governance and organization, we can address problems in a way that feels authentic and humane, avoiding the imposition of artificial solutions that ignore human realities.

The future governance systems should empower people to form communities based on shared goals and values while preserving the ability to experiment with different models. Such an approach will allow us to resolve conflicts and societal challenges through dialogue, persuasion, and collective experimentation rather than through coercion. The success of these models will come not from top-down imposition but from the organic growth of systems that work with, rather than against, human nature.

A desirable world values the sharing of global knowledge and innovation while emphasizing local production and autonomy. It prioritizes sustainability, inclusivity, and resilience, encouraging decentralized decision-making and the empowerment of communities. This world seeks to balance global collaboration with local adaptability, fostering environments where individuals and communities can innovate and thrive without being constrained by centralized control or excessive inequality.

Other values that would be compatible in such a world include equity and mutual responsibility, where individuals contribute to and benefit from the collective well-being, ensuring that progress does not come at the expense of others. Additionally, transparency and accountability in governance would be essential, fostering trust and encouraging participatory engagement in decision-making. These values would support a society where individuals and communities can coexist harmoniously while continuously improving and adapting to new challenges.

Many current governance structures fear the overproduction of elites and often attempt to suppress individual development, keeping people in place rather than fostering their growth. The framework proposed in this report addresses this issue by creating a system that encourages the development of talents and leadership through layers of influence and opportunities for meaningful participation. This model ensures that individuals and communities can grow without being constrained by outdated power dynamics, allowing new elites to emerge organically in ways that benefit the broader society.

Furthermore, the challenges we face today, such as environmental degradation and technological disruption, require governance models that are adaptable, resilient, and capable of evolving in response to new crises. History has shown that societal advancements often arise from moments of great turmoil, and the crises we face now present an opportunity to rebuild institutions in ways that are more aligned with human values and the future needs of society.

Towards a Meta-Rational Governance

In this chapter, we aim to provide a foundation for many of the ideas presented in this report by drawing on "Kegan's Constructive-Developmental Theory" [KEGAN], which offers one of the key frameworks for understanding the evolution and development of individuals and societies.

Kegan's theory identifies five distinct levels of psychological development, or "orders of mind," that trace the progression of how people construct meaning. At the earliest level, the "first order", often referred to as the **magical mind**, individuals, primarily young children, experience the world in a magical and animistic way. Objects and events lack consistency, and reality is often shaped by subjective perceptions and imagination. In historical and cultural terms, this level of thinking aligns with the magical and mythical worldviews present in early human societies, where supernatural explanations were central to making sense of the world.

As individuals grow, they enter the "second order", or **self-sovereign mind**, where the focus shifts to concrete beliefs and desires. At this stage, people begin to differentiate themselves from the world and others but still interpret reality largely through their own immediate needs and perspectives. This level can be connected to the more literal and rigid interpretations of religious or moral codes, where rules and beliefs are followed for personal gain or fear of punishment rather than for deeper understanding or wisdom.

The "third order", or **socialized mind**, reflects a more advanced stage where individuals internalize external values, norms, and beliefs. At this level, people align their identity with societal expectations, religious or ideological frameworks, and the approval of others. This is where we see strong adherence to organized religion and traditional belief systems. People at this stage may struggle when confronted with conflicting ideologies or values, as they find it difficult to reconcile differing systems of meaning.

In the "fourth order" known as the **self-authored mind**, individuals begin to construct their own internal value system, allowing them to critically evaluate and synthesize different perspectives. This stage is marked by the ability to step beyond societal or religious norms to form personal beliefs and principles. People at this level of development often engage more deeply with spiritual questions, seeking to reconcile personal autonomy with their relationship to larger existential or ethical concerns. This is a key transition point where people move from a more mechanistic or rule-bound view of society to a broader, more flexible understanding. At this level, the belief in "rationality" plays a role similar to that of religious or other ungrounded beliefs specific to the third order of development.

Finally, the "fifth order" or **self-transforming mind**, represents a meta-rational stage of development where individuals can hold multiple systems of meaning simultaneously, seeing beyond the limits of any single framework. This level of thinking is often associated with advanced spiritual awareness, where paradoxes are embraced and wisdom is drawn from an integration of diverse perspectives. At this stage, individuals are more likely to engage with spirituality in a way that transcends formal religious structures, focusing on the interconnectedness of life and the acceptance of ambiguity and complexity.

In terms of societal development, the psychological growth of leaders and elites—whether they operate at a "rational" level or achieve a more "meta-rational" understanding—plays a crucial role in shaping the structure of society. A society led by individuals primarily at the third or fourth orders of mind tends to be more mechanistic, rigid, and rule-bound, reflecting a rational approach to governance. However, when leaders develop toward the fifth order, society can evolve into one that values wisdom, flexibility, and a deeper, more integrative understanding of human nature and social complexity. This meta-rational approach encourages a culture that is more open to spiritual, philosophical, and ethical nuances, enabling greater adaptability and tolerance.

As an extension of Kegan's framework, we propose a distinction between the "meta-rational" and "trans-rational" levels of development. The "meta-rational" stage, as Kegan describes in the fifth order, represents an adaptive way of dealing with complexity. Individuals at this level are able to hold multiple perspectives, navigate paradoxes, and understand the limitations of any one system of thought. It is a stage of reflection and integration, allowing leaders to be flexible, open-minded, and adaptive to shifting realities.

However, the "trans-rational" level goes beyond this adaptability. At this stage, the individual seeks to transcend the ego entirely, moving toward a deeply "prosocial orientation". Rather than focusing on personal needs or achievements, individuals operating at this level aim to "give more to the world than they receive". It represents a profound shift from self-interest to a "selfless" form of functioning, one that is aligned with the well-being of society as a whole. In this way, the trans-rational level is the antithesis of sociopathy; instead of exploiting others for personal gain, individuals at this stage prioritize the greater good, embodying what could be called a form of "super-health"—a state where personal identity and desires are secondary to the needs of the community and the planet.

Ideally, global leaders would operate at this "trans-rational" level, as they would embody wisdom and altruism that transcends individual gain and works toward a more just and sustainable society.

In the context of this report, however, the focus is on moving from "level 4 (self-authored mind)" to "level 5 (self-transforming mind)". This is a critical transition, but it comes with the risk of "nihilism". When people realize the limitations of the structures they once relied upon, there can be a sense of disillusionment, leading to the belief that nothing has meaning. This can often trigger a regression back to "level 3 (socialized mind)", where individuals seek safety in rigid ideologies or external authority. Yet, this retreat is ultimately unproductive, as it sacrifices the growth and complexity required for higher levels of development.

The real challenge, and the goal, is to embrace the "meta-rational" mindset of level 5, and ideally, to move beyond it to a "trans-rational" orientation that promotes selflessness and serves the greater good. This is the path toward a society governed not by ego or nihilism but by wisdom, compassion, and an integrated sense of collective responsibility.

The evolution of societal governance has long grappled with balancing individual freedoms and collective responsibilities. Traditional democracy, while heralded for its egalitarian ideals, often succumbs to the tyranny of the majority, imposing decisions that may not reflect the nuanced needs of minority groups. This paper explores the limitations of simplistic democratic models and examines alternative governance structures, including temporary autocracy and oligarchy in localized contexts. It argues for a meta-rational approach that embraces cultural diversity and adaptive governance processes to foster a resilient and prosperous society.

Democracy and Its Limitations

Democracy, in its purest form, advocates for equal participation in decision-making. However, the practice of equal democratic voting can become a coercive force when used as a default mechanism. Fundamentally, voting is a majoritarian tool that can marginalize minority perspectives, effectively becoming a form of institutionalized violence against dissenting groups. This dynamic not only undermines social cohesion but also stifles innovative solutions that might emerge from minority viewpoints. Therefore, relying solely on democratic voting should be a last resort, employed only when consensus is unattainable through dialogue and mutual understanding.

Democracy operates on a fourth-order culture that venerates "rationality," or at least as some cunning elites present it, claiming to serve rationality while using it as a mechanism to manufacture consent. These elites leverage experts and biased rational justifications to impose their agendas. This

approach often backfires, leading segments of society to become disillusioned and tempted to revert to more primitive authoritarian mentalities, unable to progress to the fifth level of development.

The Role of Limited Autocracy and Oligarchy

In specific situations, particularly within small-scale projects or during crises, a temporary autocratic or oligarchic structure can be more effective. Such arrangements allow for swift decision-making and leverage the expertise of individuals who are most impacted by the outcomes. For instance, in a localized environmental disaster, empowering a small team of experts to make rapid decisions can mitigate harm more effectively than protracted democratic deliberations. It is crucial, however, that these autocratic measures remain temporary and context-specific to prevent the erosion of social resilience and to ensure a return to more inclusive governance once the situation stabilizes.

Oligarchy can be seen as acceptable when those in power have significant "skin in the game," meaning they face direct consequences for their decisions. For example, in a company where founders and key stakeholders make crucial decisions, their personal wealth and reputation are at risk, aligning their interests with the long-term success of the business. Similarly, in investment funds, managers who invest their own money alongside their clients are more likely to act responsibly. Lastly, in governance models where only those who contribute significantly to the system (e.g., through taxes or investments) have a weighted vote, the decision-makers are more incentivized to ensure the system's sustainability and fairness.

The Limitations of Libertarianism and Anarchism

While libertarianism champions individual liberty and minimal state intervention, it risks devolving into a societal "jungle" reminiscent of mafia-like systems where power dynamics are unregulated and might supersedes right. Such an environment is antithetical to the principles of a balanced, modern society that protects the vulnerable and promotes equitable opportunities. Similarly, anarchism's ideal of a hierarchy-free society is unattainable in practice due to inherent human social structures and the need for organized coordination in complex societies. Both models, though appealing in their advocacy for freedom, are naively optimistic about human nature and societal functioning.

Challenges of Green and Teal Governance Models

Green and Teal governance models, based on Frederic Laloux's framework [LALOUX], represent advanced organizational structures that prioritize human-centric approaches. Green organizations focus on empowerment, shared values, and a flattened hierarchy, emphasizing consensus and employee well-being. Teal organizations take this further by embracing self-management, wholeness, and an evolutionary purpose, allowing teams to self-organize and adapt organically. Both models aim to create more participatory, adaptive, and purpose-driven environments, challenging traditional hierarchical management practices. Such systems, like Holacracy, can be effective when individuals have the autonomy and responsibility to directly influence the areas they are involved in, ensuring that decisions are made by those with the most relevant expertise. For instance, in decentralized organizations, teams self-manage and adapt quickly to changes, fostering innovation and accountability. In a holacratic system, roles are defined by responsibilities rather than job titles, allowing individuals to "vote with their actions" and take ownership of outcomes. This structure can reduce bureaucracy, empowering employees to act in the organization's best interest without waiting for top-down directives.

While innovative, these models face scalability issues when applied beyond small organizations or communities. The complexity of larger societies demands structures that can manage diverse needs and conflicting interests effectively. Without hierarchical frameworks to coordinate large-scale operations, these models may falter, leading to dangerous inefficiencies or governance vacuums.

Transcending Rationality and Democracy: The Case for Meta-Rationalism

To address these challenges, this report proposes a meta-rational approach to governance. This method acknowledges the limitations of existing models and encourages a pluralistic system that adapts to varying cultural contexts and organizational levels. By accepting diverse governance processes and degrees of implementation, societies can tailor their structures to local needs while maintaining coherence at the global level. This approach minimizes antagonism between elites and less fortunate individuals by focusing on maximizing positive, creative, and constructive human experiences. It leverages advancements in science and artificial intelligence to enhance productivity and prosperity, enabling humanity to explore and develop its potential fully.

In conclusion, a one-size-fits-all governance model is insufficient for the complexities of modern society. While democracy represents a positive aspiration toward equitable governance, its current implementation is just a step toward something better. It needs to be supplemented with alternative structures in specific contexts to enhance effectiveness and social resilience. Libertarianism and anarchism, despite their idealistic allure, fail to provide practical solutions for large-scale societal organization. Embracing a meta-rational approach allows for a flexible, adaptive governance system that promotes diversity, minimizes social strife, and harnesses technological advancements for the betterment of humanity. This holistic strategy is imperative for fostering a resilient society capable of thriving amid contemporary challenges and opportunities.

Green and Blue Currencies

In the work of Bernard Lietaer [LIETAER], a noted economist and author, currencies are defined not just as tools for economic exchange but as systems of trust that facilitate relationships within communities. Lietaer emphasizes that money is essentially a means of exchange and a store of value, but its design and function can greatly influence the social, environmental, and economic systems it operates within.

Lietaer introduced the idea of "Yin" and "Yang" currencies, proposing that these two types of monetary systems complement each other, much like the ancient Chinese philosophy of balance between opposites. "Yang currencies" are the dominant forms of money we are most familiar with, such as national currencies. They are competitive, centralized, and focus on accumulation, often creating winners and losers within the system. These currencies encourage growth, competition, and efficiency but can also lead to social inequality, environmental depletion, and economic instability when used in isolation.

On the other hand, "Yin currencies" represent complementary, community-based currencies that focus on cooperation, local resilience, and sustainability. Yin currencies are often designed to meet the specific needs of communities, fostering stronger social ties and ensuring that local resources are utilized in a sustainable and equitable manner. These currencies can't replace Yang currencies but instead act as a balancing force, allowing for the creation of more resilient and adaptable social systems. Examples of Yin currencies include local exchange systems, time banks, or other forms of community-based money that prioritize social well-being over profit.

By encouraging the use of both Yin and Yang currencies, Lietaer argues that communities can achieve a more balanced approach to economic development. The integration of Yin currencies into a predominantly Yang system helps diversify economic relationships, building local resilience and reducing vulnerability to global financial crises. Through this dual-currency system, communities are empowered to address local needs more effectively while still participating in the global economy.

Lietaer's vision underscores the importance of currency diversity in strengthening the social fabric and fostering sustainable development, where economic growth can coexist with environmental care and social equity.

In recent decades, the author of this report has developed a new framework for categorizing currencies, using the metaphors of "Green" and "Blue" to illustrate two distinct yet interconnected perspectives. "Green" represents local, grassroots economies and communities, while "Blue" symbolizes the broader, global systems that often operate from a more detached, aerial viewpoint. Our research indicates that both perspectives are necessary and must work together to foster sustainable and resilient systems. This "Green/Blue Approach" serves as a metaphor for rethinking how we structure social, economic, and governance systems in response to the rapid technological changes brought about by AI and other innovations.

The "Green" represents localized initiatives, small communities, and "modern tribes" that share common values and goals. These smaller ecosystems are adaptive and resilient, designed to meet the unique needs of their members while maintaining the flexibility to quickly respond to environmental or social changes. In contrast, the "Blue" encompasses large-scale organizations and global collaborations, operating at a level that allows for addressing collective challenges like climate change, global trade, and technological development. For the Green and Blue systems to coexist effectively, Blue organizations must respect the diversity and autonomy of Green communities, allowing them to thrive without imposing a uniform, top-down structure.

Bernard Lietaer's work on "Yin and Yang currencies" parallels this Green/Blue approach. He suggests that centralized, dominant "Yang currencies" which promote competition and accumulation, must be balanced by "Yin currencies" which are community-focused and emphasize cooperation and

sustainability. In the same vein, Green currencies can serve local communities by facilitating exchanges that support sustainability and resilience, while Blue currencies could enable broader, cross-community collaboration. Together, these complementary systems would enhance the resilience of both local and global systems.

What differentiates the idea of Blue/Green currencies from the concepts of Yang (masculine values) and Yin (feminine values that nurture and heal) is that even Green currencies are still Yang, though with a greater balance of Yin compared to Lietaer's classic examples of Yin currencies. Only extreme Green currencies would be purely Yin, but in reality, most Green currencies are a mix of Yang and Yin. This is because, while we aim to limit interoperability with other currencies, it is not beneficial to prohibit it entirely; instead, we should create creative and constructive barriers based on the specific goals a currency seeks to achieve.

AI has the potential to play a crucial role in implementing these ideas by supporting the design of innovative governance models and economic systems and greeting good user interfaces around the inherent complexity associated with working with multiple currencies. By automating certain aspects of economic management and decision-making, AI could free individuals from mundane, repetitive tasks, allowing them to engage more deeply in their communities. This would also address the growing concern that modern systems, especially within large corporations, are turning people into "drones"—automatons following rigid procedures without room for creativity or autonomy. With AI taking over routine functions, human beings can explore more fulfilling roles, both within local communities (Green) and on a global scale (Blue).

AI could also facilitate the "implementation of a Green/Blue currency system", where local currencies incentivize sustainable practices within communities while global currencies support broader collaboration. Such a currency system would be designed to reward genuine contributions to societal and environmental well-being rather than speculative profit-seeking. Built-in mechanisms, such as transaction delays or fees, could deter rapid trading and speculation, ensuring that the currency remains a tool for fostering resilience rather than creating further inequalities.

In terms of social organization, the Green/Blue approach calls for a reconsideration of traditional governance models. The challenges of "self-domestication"—where humans, through rigid systems, become passive participants—can be mitigated by creating more fluid, decentralized governance structures. Rather than imposing uniform solutions, governance systems should be experimental, allowing for diverse forms of organization that reflect the unique values and needs of different communities. AI could support this process by analyzing data to provide insights into which governance models are most effective, enabling continuous adaptation and improvement.

Finally, the Green/Blue approach offers a solution to the increasingly "inhumane and mechanized social structures" of modern economies. By focusing on building resilient, adaptive communities that are empowered to experiment with new forms of governance and economic exchange, the Green/Blue model respects the natural diversity of human values and beliefs. It also aligns with the principles of "meta-rationality"—acknowledging the complexity of human nature and avoiding rigid, dogmatic systems. Through this balanced and scientifically informed approach, we can create a more sustainable and humane future, where both local and global systems work in harmony, fostering resilience and innovation.

Decentralized Brands

In essence, all forms of human organization can already be seen as brands—entities from which others have certain expectations and that build trust with their peers and communities. Religions were the first brands, and the modern world is filled with brands that are either admired or despised.

However, most of these brands predominantly follow a centralized governance model, with the exception of some democratic organizations, states, or flat organizations such as Teal organizations, holacracies, cryptocurrencies, open source projects, and similar decentralized structures.

A decentralized brand [DB1], [DB2], [DB3] represents a new governance paradigm where independent entities—such as citizens, experts, businesses or various types of independent human organizations—join forces under a shared brand identity. This model stands in contrast to traditional centralized governance by offering a framework for collaboration and governance that allows diverse, autonomous actors to work together while maintaining their independence. From small residential neighborhoods to international organizations, the decentralized brand model offers a flexible, scalable approach that suits a wide range of contexts.

At the smallest scale, decentralized brands can be applied within a residential neighborhood or a housing complex. In this case, a decentralized brand would serve as a framework for residents to collaborate on managing shared resources or services, such as energy projects, community events, or maintenance. Residents contribute to decision-making processes, either through democratic voting or by allowing those with more significant contributions (such as financial investment) to have a greater say in governance. This local application emphasizes community empowerment and collective management, fostering a sense of ownership and alignment with shared values.

Another example of a decentralized brand at a smaller scale could be a project that initiates collaboration between a small group of specialists, each maintaining their autonomy while collectively investing in a shared research project, technology development, application, or even an artistic endeavor. In this model, it is easier to monitor the involvement of each participant, as contributions can be transparently tracked and verified using decentralized technologies such as blockchain. Each specialist retains control over their own work, while the group benefits from the collective resources and expertise brought to the project. This type of decentralized brand allows the project to grow over time while ensuring that the independence and contributions of all members are respected. Although there are clear challenges regarding the protection of contributors, such as intellectual property rights or fair compensation, these issues appear increasingly solvable as governance mechanisms evolve to ensure transparency, fairness, and trust in such collaborative environments.

Moving up in scale, a decentralized brand can govern an entire small town or city. In this scenario, professionals, businesses, and residents collaborate to shape the city's policies and development initiatives. The decentralized brand could serve as the city's identity, driving local tourism, investment, and innovation. A city's decentralized brand might focus on sustainability, technology, or culture, depending on its core strengths. Governance could involve various models, from direct democratic participation in city decisions to a more oligarchic approach where key stakeholders—such as local businesses or landowners—have greater influence. This flexibility allows the city to adapt governance to its unique needs while maintaining a transparent and accountable system.

At a regional level, decentralized brands can support collaboration across cities, industries, or scientific communities. For example, a consortium of scientists or professionals across a region might use a decentralized brand to work on shared technological or environmental projects. Each participant maintains independence, but the decentralized brand unifies their efforts under a common identity, allowing them to collectively market their innovations, share resources, and influence regional policy. Blockchain-based

governance systems could ensure that all participants have visibility into decisions and that contributions are fairly rewarded. The brand becomes a tool for generating trust among stakeholders, both locally and globally.

When applied at the level of a country or even an international organization, decentralized brands offer an innovative way to organize collaboration across borders. For instance, a decentralized brand could unify various industries in a country, creating a shared identity around sustainability or technological advancement. Rather than a single government or corporation controlling the narrative, independent stakeholders—including businesses, NGOs, and citizens—work together to shape the brand’s message and goals. Governance could include voting mechanisms like “voting with the wallet,” where financial contribution determines influence, or “voting with the feet,” where dissatisfied members can leave the brand or fork it to create a new version better aligned with their values. This system allows for flexibility while ensuring the brand remains aligned with the interests of its members.

At the level of international organizations, a decentralized brand can manage global initiatives that require collaboration across multiple countries and regions. For example, an organization working on climate change could leverage a decentralized brand to unite various stakeholders under one umbrella, allowing for shared decision-making and resources across borders. Such a brand could implement a blend of governance models, with some decisions made democratically and others influenced by key players with more resources or expertise. This approach offers an alternative to the slow, often bureaucratic nature of large international institutions, enabling more agile and effective collaboration while maintaining the trust and accountability necessary for large-scale projects.

A compelling example of a decentralized brand in action is an international open-source or semi-open-licensed project that brings together dozens or even hundreds of companies from around the world. In such a scenario, instead of relying on a single large corporation to drive innovation or control the brand, these independent companies collaborate under a shared global brand. This decentralized approach allows them to collectively develop and maintain the project, whether it's software, hardware, or a complex technical solution, presenting a unified and trusted identity to the global market. Each company contributes resources, expertise, and development, but governance is distributed, often relying on open collaboration tools and blockchain technologies to ensure transparency, fair contribution tracking, and decision-making. The result is a global brand with the reach, credibility, and influence of a major corporation but without the risks of inefficiency, monopolistic control, or corruption typically associated with large centralized entities. This model of collaboration allows for faster innovation, adaptability, and a broader pool of talent, as companies and individuals around the world contribute to the brand’s continuous evolution.

Across all these use cases, the core principle of a decentralized brand remains the same: it is a system where multiple independent entities collaborate under a shared identity, making decisions together through flexible, self-regulated governance. Whether it’s a small neighborhood or an international organization, the decentralized brand fosters trust, transparency, and long-term collaboration. Governance models can vary, from democratic voting to more oligarchic systems where larger contributors have greater influence. Importantly, the decentralized brand allows members to self-regulate and adapt to changes without the inefficiencies or monopolistic risks associated with large, centralized corporations.

In this model, participants recognize the importance of the brand as a generator of trust. They are incentivized to maintain high standards, ensure transparency, and act in the brand’s best interests to preserve its reputation and credibility. This shared sense of responsibility distinguishes decentralized brands from traditional corporations, where decision-making is often concentrated in a few hands, and accountability can be limited. Instead, decentralized brands offer a flexible, resilient alternative that is capable of addressing the diverse needs of independent entities while creating collective value.

Outfinity: Initial Implementation Plans

The name Outfinity is emblematic of a green/blue currency system that embodies the gradual yet purposeful progression towards realizing the comprehensive vision articulated in this document. It evokes the notion of boundless potential, suggesting an innovative framework where decentralized governance and sustainable economic models are implemented step by step, guiding the system towards long-term resilience and balance.

The implementation of Outfinity's alternative currency system will unfold in two primary phases, with a strong emphasis on experimentation in the early stages and gradual decentralization as the ecosystem matures. The core goal is to foster the creation of decentralized brands through the Outfinity Blue token while simultaneously encouraging the formation of independent, resilient economic structures with their own green currencies. This vision will be realized through a step-by-step approach designed to ensure stability, adaptability, and community participation.

The first phase of implementation will focus heavily on experimenting with decentralized brands and incentivizing early adopters. This phase is critical for setting the foundation of the ecosystem and will primarily involve distributing Outfinity Blue tokens to participants, allowing them to test and build their own decentralized structures.

Phase 1: Establish Tokenomics Beyond Speculation

The Outfinity Blue tokenomics are specifically designed to minimize speculative behavior and ensure stable, long-term growth. This is achieved through a fixed minting process with prices tied to FIAT currencies, structured in "exponentially increasing steps". The initial seven million tokens will follow this pricing model, starting at one euro and progressively increasing through phases to 10, 100, and 1,000 euros, eventually reaching one million euros per token. This controlled minting strategy discourages speculation by offering fixed prices, ensuring that any increase in token value reflects genuine ecosystem development rather than market manipulation. Evidently, this method will not allow price increases, as long as tokens can still be minted at the current price, making it illogical to buy at a higher rate. However, downward fluctuations are permitted to ensure investment liquidity. On the other hand, this type of investment is inherently long-term, with returns materializing primarily when the system transitions to the next pricing threshold, which instantly multiplies the value of the entire investment by a factor of ten.

The primary objective of this phase is to establish the foundation for the Outfinity ecosystem by attracting early participants who are encouraged to create and experiment with decentralized brands. The focus is on building a community of innovators committed to sustainable development, testing new governance models, and contributing to the long-term success of the ecosystem.

Up to seven million Outfinity Blue tokens will be minted under this initial structure, providing essential funding for early decentralized brands. These tokens will be distributed to early adopters through grant competitions, partnerships, and other targeted initiatives aimed at encouraging experimentation and innovation. By offering financial support to promising projects, the token distribution will stimulate growth and foster a vibrant, decentralized ecosystem. During this phase, governance will be centralized and managed by the Outfinity core team, ensuring strategic oversight and preventing speculative misuse. The team will closely monitor token distribution to support meaningful development and long-term stability rather than focusing on short-term profits.

To further incentivize early participation, tokens will be offered as rewards in various engagement programs. However, they will be presented not as speculative investments but as practical tools for crowdfunding decentralized brands, with the emphasis on use within the ecosystem rather than trading for

profit. As decentralized brands begin to take shape, they will experiment with governance models supported by blockchain technology to ensure transparency and trust in transactions between independent entities. Legal compliance will be maintained at the local level, ensuring that decentralized brands operate within regulatory frameworks while benefiting from blockchain's transparency.

Beyond the first seven million tokens, the mechanism for minting new tokens and setting future price thresholds will transition to a "decentralized governance model". At this stage, the Outfinity community will collectively decide on minting policies, ensuring that the system remains adaptable and responsive to the evolving needs of the ecosystem. This transition will further decentralize control while maintaining stability and sustainability as core principles. The purpose of this phase is to test various configurations of decentralized brands, learn from the successes and failures, and evolve the system with minimal risk. Failures and challenges are expected and viewed as necessary steps toward building a resilient system.

Phase 2: Transition to Decentralised Governance and Green Currencies

Once the foundational structure of the Outfinity ecosystem is established and tested, Phase 2 will shift focus towards decentralizing governance and facilitating the creation of independent green currencies for each decentralized brand. This phase marks a critical evolution from a centralized management system to a distributed model, allowing each brand to operate autonomously while still benefiting from the overarching governance structure provided by the Outfinity Blue token.

The primary goal of this phase is to transition governance from a centralized approach to one that is distributed across multiple stakeholders and decentralized brands. Another key objective is the creation of green currencies for individual decentralized brands. These currencies will maintain a level of interoperability with the Outfinity Blue token, ensuring their connection to the larger ecosystem while preserving the independence of each brand's local economic structure. This dual approach helps safeguard the integrity of local economies, preventing systemic risks that arise from overintegration.

As each decentralized brand matures and becomes fully operational, it will mint its own green currency. These currencies are tailored to the specific needs, economic activities, and governance structures of the respective brands and communities they serve. While they will interact with the Outfinity Blue token, the interoperability will remain limited to protect the autonomy of each currency and reduce the potential impact of broader market fluctuations.

The shift towards decentralized governance will also mean a broader distribution of decision-making power across stakeholders who hold and vote with Outfinity Blue tokens. Brands within the ecosystem will govern themselves using decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) or similar governance structures. Outfinity Blue tokens will play a central role in key ecosystem decisions, such as voting on the revocation of mining rights or addressing fraudulent activities, thus ensuring continued integrity and fairness.

To promote long-term engagement and stability, tokens acquired in Phase 2 will be subject to certain restrictions, such as a lock period during which they cannot be sold or transferred. This mechanism discourages speculative trading and encourages participants to remain committed to the long-term success of decentralized brands. As the ecosystem and token value evolve, these restrictions will gradually be relaxed, allowing for greater liquidity while maintaining stability.

A decentralized minting process will be introduced in Phase 2, with independent members and a governance entity, such as a Swiss NGO, overseeing the process. This will ensure transparency and accountability, reducing the risk of manipulation. Token mining partners will be required to hold a minimum amount of Outfinity tokens as a safeguard against potential misconduct.

To support the growth of decentralized brands, a crowdfunding platform will be developed, allowing innovative projects to secure funding transparently within the ecosystem. An exchange mechanism aligned with the fixed minting price will also be introduced to mitigate extreme price fluctuations and maintain market stability, further supporting the ecosystem's growth.

In the long term, the Outfinity ecosystem aims to balance global and local economies. The vision is to create a decentralized, self-sustaining economy in which localized brands with their green currencies operate harmoniously within the broader framework governed by the Outfinity Blue token. This structure is designed to limit the rise of monopolistic super-corporations, ensuring that economic power remains distributed across smaller, decentralized entities.

As AI technology advances, it will play a crucial role in supporting governance within decentralized brands. AI systems will aid in resource distribution, conflict resolution, and ensuring transparency, all while helping to monitor compliance and manage real-time data. This will contribute to a fairer, more efficient allocation of opportunities across the ecosystem.

The system is designed to prevent the concentration of economic and political power by maintaining limited interoperability between the Outfinity Blue token and individual green currencies. This decentralized approach enhances resilience and safeguards the ecosystem from the vulnerabilities typically associated with centralized governance and economic systems.

Endgame: Multiple Blue Currencies

It is important to recognize that each type of blue currency could serve a distinct social purpose, addressing different global challenges, much like how FIAT currencies today reflect the power of taxation. FIAT currencies are primarily backed by the ability of states to tax labor and profits, but this could evolve into currencies that measure and regulate the use of non-renewable resources, such as land and minerals. In such a system, these resources, being common goods of humanity, could become the foundation for new forms of taxation and economic value, aligning financial systems with environmental sustainability.

The Outfinity Blue token, for instance, could focus on governance and the interoperability of decentralized brands, facilitating collaboration and decision-making across diverse ecosystems without falling into the traps of centralization. Bitcoin and other similar cryptocurrencies already serve the function of resisting censorship from national and international institutions, preserving financial independence in a global landscape increasingly dominated by regulatory bodies. Additionally, we could envision separate currencies designed for various societal needs—one currency might represent social trust and community engagement, acting as a measure of social cohesion and responsibility. Another currency could be tied to AI computation power, regulating and allocating access to the immense processing capacities required for advanced AI applications. There are many more possibilities for new blue currencies that could address challenges we cannot fully foresee today. The challenge, therefore, lies in ensuring that no single blue currency becomes overwhelmingly dominant at the expense of others. By developing a diverse ecosystem of blue currencies, each tailored to different aspects of societal and economic needs, we can create a resilient and adaptable system. This approach would prevent systemic fragility and ensure that various global, environmental, and technological demands are met by currencies designed for specific purposes. As we propagate these ideas and states, organizations, and communities begin to adopt them, we can work toward a more sustainable, equitable, and innovative economic future where each currency plays a meaningful role.

Money acts as the backbone of social organization, but the current system faces critical resilience issues due to the artificial interoperability imposed through state currencies. While this may facilitate global transactions, it creates a dangerous monoculture where systemic failures can cascade rapidly. Bernard

Lietaer's theories emphasize the importance of maintaining barriers to interoperability between alternative currencies. Such barriers are crucial for ensuring the resilience of systems and preventing corruption from spreading across interconnected networks. In his view, it is essential to allow diverse forms of currency to operate independently to sustain a healthy economic and social ecosystem.

In a meta-rational society, Yang systems—focused on competition and accumulation—must coexist with Yin systems, which emphasize collaboration and sustainability. Governance structures should mirror this balance, with top-down coordination (the "Blue") complemented by local autonomy (the "Green"). This dual approach empowers individuals and communities to contribute according to their capacities within a flexible framework that can adapt to global challenges without succumbing to a one-size-fits-all model.

At its highest level, societal development reaches a trans-rational stage, where governance systems not only adapt to external changes but also nurture the inner spiritual and psychological growth of individuals. Such systems promote long-term thinking, compassion, and collective well-being, recognizing that true resilience stems from the alignment of individual and collective interests with the natural world.

One key challenge of modern rational societies is the phenomenon of self-domestication, where rigid systems reduce people to passive participants, stripping them of creativity and responsibility. Meta-rationality offers a solution by advocating for governance models that are decentralized, fluid, and diverse. AI can play a significant role by automating routine tasks, freeing individuals to engage in higher-order thinking and decision-making. With AI supporting decentralized systems, communities can experiment with governance models that reflect their unique contexts, fostering greater flexibility and adaptability. Building on these principles, we propose the creation of a system of alternative currencies based on the Green/Blue framework. This system would empower small communities, cooperatives, and interest groups to form their own currencies, tailored to local needs and values. These currencies could operate at different levels—local, regional, national, and global—while maintaining necessary barriers to interoperability to prevent corruption and protect the integrity of smaller systems.

The vision for "Neo-Tribalism" assumes that individuals can belong to multiple "tribes," much like shareholders in different companies, participating in various social or economic systems. This new form of tribalism idealizes a decentralized capitalist model where firms and communities compete fairly without monopolies or corrupt forces distorting the playing field. Not everyone needs to follow the same rules or use the same currency; local and regional economies should have the freedom to establish their own terms of exchange.

Global rules regarding essential issues like property rights, natural resource management, and the prevention of war would be regulated at the "blue" currency level, ensuring a stable foundation for cooperation. However, most human interactions, especially at local and community levels, could be governed by "green" currencies, tailored to specific contexts. This approach ensures that the diversity of human values and goals can be respected, preventing the rise of fragile, easily corruptible systems. By promoting currency diversity and local autonomy, we can build a more resilient and adaptive future.

Cosmolocalism

The vision of Outfinity, as presented in the report, aligns with the principles of cosmolocalism [CL], but it also provides a pragmatic, structured framework for implementing these ideas at scale. Both Outfinity and Cosmolocalism share a core belief in the decentralization of production, governance, and knowledge, and both aim to empower local communities while benefiting from global networks. However, where cosmolocalism primarily envisions a world where global knowledge is shared openly and local production is facilitated by digital fabrication technologies, Outfinity offers a complementary and more detailed blueprint for how such a system might be practically realized.

Outfinity's governance and currency models, particularly the concept of Blue and Green currencies, attempt to formalize the dynamics that cosmolocalism advocates. In the cosmolocalist model, local production is key, but Outfinity takes this a step further by introducing decentralized governance through blockchain and tokenomics. The Outfinity Blue token acts as a tool for governance and coordination across decentralized brands, allowing for global collaboration while respecting local autonomy—closely mirroring the cosmolocalist idea of global knowledge sharing and local implementation.

A key difference between Outfinity's vision and cosmolocalism lies in the use of complementary currencies. In Cosmolocalism, there is no specific monetary system proposed to support its decentralized vision. Outfinity, however, proposes a series of complementary currencies—Green and Blue—designed to support different layers of social and economic interaction. The Outfinity Blue token, for example, facilitates interoperability between decentralized brands, acting as a governance tool to ensure that these entities can collaborate and grow while retaining their local control. This introduces a more structured and formalized way to manage the balance between local autonomy and global interaction, something that is crucial for ensuring the resilience of the system.

Moreover, Outfinity proposes that multiple Blue currencies could exist to address different aspects of global needs. While one Blue currency might focus on governance, another might be tied to AI computational power, and another to social trust. This segmentation of roles aligns with cosmolocalism's vision of addressing global challenges while enabling local production and resilience. The difference is that Outfinity offers a more structured mechanism for ensuring that these roles do not overlap excessively or create systemic risks.

In cosmolocalism, the idea of limiting interoperability between global systems and local economies is implied but not deeply explored. Outfinity tackles this directly by suggesting that Green currencies—representing local, decentralized economies—should have barriers to full interoperability with other currencies, particularly Blue tokens, to preserve local resilience. These barriers are not meant to prevent interaction but to create creative and constructive limits that help focus each currency on its specific purpose. This ensures that no single currency, especially at the global level, becomes overly dominant or undermines the diversity of local economic systems.

In essence, Outfinity Vision tries to offer a pragmatic method to promote cosmolocalist values through decentralized governance, complementary currencies, and clear frameworks for local-global interaction. By formalizing these dynamics through tokenomics and decentralized brands, Outfinity provides the structure necessary to scale the cosmolocalist vision, ensuring that local economies remain resilient, creative, and empowered while benefiting from the wealth of global knowledge and collaboration.

Conclusions

The world we envision is not a uniform one but a living, dynamic set of ecosystems composed of decentralized brands that, rather than fearing or competing against one another, collaborate in a balanced, constructive and environmentally friendly way. Each ecosystem would thrive on cooperation, contributing to the greater harmony of human civilization on planet Earth. At the same time, the competitive energy typically found in large cities and corporations should continue to exist, but without trapping people in a lifelong struggle. Instead, individuals would be free to explore alternatives. Many, perhaps half of the population—though it's difficult to predict the optimal ratio—after experiencing both the challenges and benefits of large systems could transition to smaller communities or projects governed as local decentralized brands. These would serve as oases of stability where people could raise children, pursue what they enjoy, and grow as individuals, free from pointless jobs or the shackles of social games that serve institutions unable to value them.

For many, especially young people, such utopian forms of organization might seem too boring. Therefore, a significant portion of social and economic life could remain within structures similar to those of large cities or corporations, offering diverse paths and a heroic or quest-like illusion of a life path. However, the key to our efforts is to strike a balance, allowing for the evolution and psychological maturation of as many people as possible and providing individuals with multiple opportunities to succeed in living fulfilling and vibrant lives. Even if they don't become millionaires or billionaires, they can form local elites, grow their expertise and wisdom, and lead a meaningful life aligned with their aspirations and abilities.

This report emphasizes that AI and emerging technologies open the door to these new opportunities. Our aim here is to present an optimistic vision of future governance and social organization, even as much of the current discourse is dominated by fear and pessimism. By embracing a creative, decentralized approach to governance in the age of AI, we can foster systems that encourage experimentation, diversity, and individual agency.

One of the key messages of this report is that the limits of interoperability or barriers between Green and Blue currencies, as well as among the various Blue currencies, represent a crucial area of research, forming an essential part of the envisioned decentralized financial ecosystem.

As a final warning, it is important to be cautious about the idea of a global UBI (scheme for Universal Basic Income) organized by states or supranational institutions. While it may seem appealing and humanitarian, such a system risks exacerbating the trend of over-domestication and diminishing human resilience by creating overly powerful institutions—institutions that, as history has shown, are prone to corruption. However, localized forms of UBI may have their own value, especially when implemented within the framework of more extreme "green" currencies. These systems, of course, would need to include strong safeguards and limits, allowing for transitions between the green and blue currencies to maintain balance and adaptability. The future of governance is not about control or dominance but about empowering individuals to live meaningful lives. These systems will evolve naturally alongside technological and societal progress, allowing people to shape their lives within vibrant, evolving ecosystems where they can find both personal fulfillment and collective well-being.

Future work

While this report offers a visionary approach to AI-driven decentralized governance and alternative currencies, several areas require further development and empirical exploration to strengthen the proposed models and ensure their practical implementation. First, the theoretical foundations of the report, including Kegan's Constructive-Developmental Theory and Lietaer's currency models, should be validated with more empirical data. If we accept the insights of meta-rationality, we understand that any theoretical model is fundamentally limited, including the meta-rationality framework, and should be accompanied by other models, even if those models sometimes contradict between them. The real skill lies in knowing which model to apply in each context. The universe is too complex for simplistic theories. Future work should prioritize pilot studies and case examples to show how these concepts can be effectively applied to real-world governance and economic systems, offering valuable insights into both the strengths and limitations of these models. The feasibility of transitioning from centralized to decentralized systems, particularly with respect to governance and currency models, must also be critically examined. This report lacks a detailed roadmap for overcoming the technical, legal, and social barriers inherent in such a transition. Future research should focus on creating scalable implementation frameworks, including regulatory alignment and technological integration strategies, that address the challenges of decentralization in both developed and developing economies.

Another key area for future work is the integration of AI into decentralized governance. While AI is mentioned as a tool to assist in decision-making and economic management, the report lacks specificity on how AI would be practically applied within these systems. Future studies should explore AI-driven governance models in detail, outlining the technical infrastructure, data governance, and ethical considerations required for AI to effectively support decentralized decision-making.

Tokenomics, as proposed in this report, introduces innovative mechanisms to discourage speculation and ensure stable growth. However, this model's complexity may hinder its practical adoption. Future research should focus on refining the tokenomics model to ensure simplicity, transparency, and liquidity, possibly by experimenting with more flexible pricing structures or hybrid models that incorporate elements of market-driven pricing without sacrificing stability.

Lastly, the report's emphasis on Green and Blue currencies requires a deeper exploration of how these systems can maintain stability while fostering resilience. Future work should explore mechanisms that prevent systemic risks and ensure that such currencies can operate within broader financial systems. Moreover, the societal transition toward decentralized governance and currencies will face resistance from established systems. Therefore, strategies for fostering gradual adoption and addressing potential inequalities must be developed, ensuring that decentralized systems do not inadvertently exacerbate social divides. These steps will be essential to the successful realization of the vision outlined in this report.

Lastly, while it is impossible for any team to comprehensively research and analyze all the intricate details and challenges of transitioning to decentralized governance and alternative currencies in an AI-driven world, the purpose of this document is to outline a vision. This vision is of a world transformed by AI technologies, where humanity has the opportunity to build a utopia grounded in our current realities. Even if some aspects remain vague or speculative, the effort to shape such a vision is essential and worth pursuing. It is through bold ideas and exploration of the unknown that we can lay the groundwork for a future that fosters human creativity, diversity, and resilience.

References

- [KEGAN] Short summary of Kegan constructive development of adults narrative <https://www.beeleaf.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Kegan-constructive-development-of-adults-narrative.pdf>
- [METARAT] Moderna meta-rationality theoretical framework <https://metarationality.com>
- [LIETAER] Bernard Lietaer, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bernard_Lietaer
- [OUTFINITY] Outfinity's research blog, <https://outfinity.medium.com/>
- [DB1] DECENTRALIZED BRANDING SPECTRUM: COLLABORATION AND COMPETITION ACROSS DIVERSE ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS <https://www.uaiasi.ro/revagrois/PDF/2022-s/paper/39.pdf>
- [DB2] Decentralised Brands in Social Media Networks and Beyond https://blockchain-observatory.ec.europa.eu/document/download/d00b590b-c8ee-4560-8d4d-a9104c098778_en?filename=EUBOF3.0%20-%20Decentralised%20Brands%20in%20Social%20Media%20Networks%20and%20Beyond_1.pdf
- [DB3] Balan, A., Alboaie, S., Alboaie, S., Kourtit, K., and Nijkamp, P. (2023), Liveable Cities and the Instantiation of Decentralized Brands: A New Urban Digital Challenge. In: The Future of Liveable Cities (L. Fusco Girard, P. Nijkamp, and Kourtit, K.). Franco Angeli (forthcoming).
- [CL] Ramos, J. (2017). Cosmo-localism and the Futures of Production. *Journal of Future Studies*, 22(1), 1-18. Cosmolocalism proposes a model where global knowledge is freely shared while production is localized, fostering sustainability, resilience, and community empowerment through decentralized manufacturing and governance.
- [LALOUX] Laloux, F. (2014). Book: *Reinventing Organizations: A Guide to Creating Organizations Inspired by the Next Stage of Human Consciousness*.