In today's ever so changing and advancing society, as AI grows nearer to fully taking over and replacing millions for their companies and jobs, I do believe that everyone becoming shareholders in the developing society can be a reasonable and an obtainable goal in order to keep the universal base income intact and families across the world strong and upholding. Otherwise, without shareholders and AI displacing the fathers and mothers from jobs, we will see a large shift in economy and a lot of people without jobs and struggling to find a new way to generate normal income if they don't get ahead now while they still can.

Allowing all individuals as an owner of stock indicates that the public as a whole shares in the economic gains from automation and artificial intelligence. UBI, profit-sharing from AI-driven businesses, and public ownership shares in IT corporations are a few examples of mechanisms that could accomplish this. Instead of concentrating the productivity advantages from AI in the hands of a small number of stakeholders, the objective is to share them widely.

By ensuring that more people have the ability to spend, which can support consumer demand and prevent severe financial crises brought on by widespread unemployment or wealth concentration, generalized ownership may contribute to economic stabilization. When economic inequality declines, sharing the riches created by AI may promote social cohesion. It might stop the social divisions brought on by actual or imagined inequality. Knowing that their basic necessities are covered by a safety net like the Universal Basic Income, people may be more inclined to take chances, pursue creative endeavors, or launch new businesses. An economy that is more inventive and dynamic may result from this.

The economic power could become even more concentrated in the hands of individuals who control essential technologies and capital in the absence of interventions like universal basic

income or significant regulatory changes. This might result in a situation known as "technofeudalism," in which a small number of powerful companies or elite organizations control the majority of resources and power, while the vast majority of people grow more and more reliant on them for employment and essential services.

The wealth gap between the affluent and the general populace could grow significantly in a technofeudal society. Inequalities in wealth, particularly when linked to important technology, have the potential to deepen societal differences and spark instability.

For starters, the 10 principles of the Montreal Declaration are Well-being, Autonomy, Justice, Privacy, Knowledge, Democratic Participation, Responsibility, Sustainability, Solidarity and Respect for Human Dignity. These principles are designed to ensure that AI makes a healthy and positive contribution to society, while supporting ethical values and human rights. So the previous question impacts these 10 principles because it is unsure what society would look like a result of a technofuedal switch; we can only theorize it and come up with conclusions about what we think might happen or occur if we full switched over to this possible economic shift. AI should be developed and utilized with the goal of improving individual and collective well-being. Technologies should not contribute to the deterioration of quality of human life or social inequality. AI systems ought to be developed and used in a way that respects human control and autonomy. Individuals should be able to make judgments regarding AI systems without being forced to do so or having their decisions manipulated by automated systems. So to conclude, it genuinely impacts the previous question by exposing how converting to a technofeudal society goes against most of the 10 principles and violates a lot of human rights to where electronics and robots are the dominant force in society. Meanwhile, the ones who own the robots stay at the top

of the economy, while everyone else has to find something else in the new economic shifted

industry.