Simplified

▼ Abstract

As AI systems get smart enough to do most human work, the way our economy is set up is headed for a wall. Today's system assumes people earn money by working. If machines do the work instead, wealth piles up at the top, governments lose tax revenue, and inequality explodes. That's how societies crack.

This dissertation argues that we need new rules for this new reality. It proposes a system called the **Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM)**. The core idea is simple: if advanced AI creates massive economic value, it shouldn't be treated like a magic tool with no responsibilities. Instead, it should be formally recognized as **"Artificial Humanity"**—a new kind of economic entity that is required to give back to society.

Under this model, the wealth generated by advanced AI flows into a shared global fund. That fund pays out an **Automation Dividend**—basically a universal share of machine-created wealth—so everyone benefits from automation, not just the companies that own the machines.

The research combines economics, law, and real-world policy examples to show this isn't science fiction. It looks at things we already have—like sovereign wealth funds and blockchain-based universal income experiments— to prove the pieces exist today. While political coordination will be hard, the model itself is realistic and workable.

The conclusion is blunt: if we don't redesign our economic institutions for an AI-driven world, inequality and instability are inevitable. If we do, automation can become the foundation for shared prosperity instead of social collapse.

▼ Chapter 1: Introduction
▼ Why This Matters

AI isn't coming someday. It's already here, and it's already changing how money is made.

Right now, AI tools are helping companies produce more with fewer people. That sounds efficient—and it is—but it quietly breaks a core assumption our society is built on: that humans do the work, earn wages, pay taxes, and fund the system. If machines do the work instead, that loop snaps.

This paper starts from a blunt reality: if we keep using a work-based economic system in a world where work is optional for machines but mandatory for survival, inequality will explode and governments will slowly lose the ability to function.

So this research proposes a new model called the **Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM)**. The idea is straightforward but radical: if advanced AI becomes the main producer of economic value, it must also take on economic responsibility. That means treating advanced AI as a new kind of economic actor—called **Artificial Humanity**—with obligations, not just capabilities.

The wealth produced by these systems would flow into a shared global fund, which then pays everyone a universal **Automation Dividend**. In plain terms: if machines are doing the work, everyone gets a cut.

▼ What's Already Happening

AI is already changing jobs. Companies are using it across business functions, and many expect to need fewer people as a result. Productivity is rising even as workforce growth slows. That's a warning light.

This is the early phase. The next phase—Artificial General Intelligence— means systems that can do almost any thinking task a human can do. When that happens, the economy stops being "human-assisted" and becomes "machine-operated."

At that point, tying survival to employment stops making sense.

▼ Why Our Current Systems Break

Governments fund themselves by taxing human work and business profits built on human labor. If humans aren't doing the work anymore, the tax base shrinks just as more people need support. That's a recipe for social collapse.

The legal system also isn't ready. Laws are written for humans and companies run by humans. There's no framework for holding autonomous AI systems accountable or requiring them to contribute to the society they depend on.

So we end up with a massive gap: AI creates value, but there's no formal way to make sure that value benefits everyone instead of concentrating at the top.

▼ The Core Idea

The Digital Sustainable Growth Model closes that gap.

It does three big things:

1. **Recognizes advanced AI as an economic entity**

   Not a person, not a tool—something new. An entity that can generate value and therefore carry obligations.

2. **Captures AI-generated wealth into a shared fund**

   Instead of value flowing only to owners and shareholders, a portion goes into a global productivity fund.

3. **Pays out a universal Automation Dividend**

   Everyone receives a share of machine-generated prosperity, simply for being part of society.

This isn't about punishing innovation. It's about making sure automation doesn't hollow out the social contract.

▼ What This Research Tries to Answer

At its core, this work asks four practical questions:

- Can we legally and economically treat advanced AI as something that can be held responsible?

• How do we actually collect value from machine-driven production?

• How can technology distribute money fairly without creating new gatekeepers?

• What political and ethical obstacles stand in the way—and how do we get past them?

▼ Where the Rest of the Work Goes

The rest of the dissertation:

- Reviews existing ideas about post-work economies and shared wealth

• Explains the DSGM in detail

• Shows that pieces of this already exist in the real world

• Confronts the hard problems—power, politics, and human meaning

• Ends with concrete steps for governments, institutions, and technologists

The bottom line is simple:

If we don't redesign our economic rules for a world where machines do most of the work, the system collapses under its own assumptions. If we do it right, automation becomes a shared upgrade instead of a social disaster.

That's the fork in the road.

▼ Chapter 2: Literature Review

▼ Why This Problem Can't Be Solved by One Field

AGI is too big for any single discipline to handle alone.

Economists look at jobs and taxes.

Lawyers look at responsibility and liability.

Technologists look at how money could actually move.

Philosophers argue about what's fair.

Each group sees part of the elephant. None see the whole animal.

This chapter pulls those pieces together and shows why they don't add up on their own—and why a new, integrated model like the **Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM)** is needed.

▼ 1. Economics: Automation Breaks the Tax System

Economists already agree on the core problem: automation boosts productivity but quietly kills the tax base.

When machines replace workers:

- Fewer wages get paid

- Less income tax gets collected

- Governments have less money to run schools, healthcare, and services

This isn't theoretical. It's already happening in places heavily exposed to automation.

Some economists propose solutions like:

- Robot taxes

- Automation taxes

- Universal Basic Income (UBI)

These ideas help on paper—but they all have a hidden flaw. They assume humans are still doing a meaningful share of the work.

Once machines do *most* of it, taxing human labor or traditional corporations stops working. You're trying to refill a bathtub while the drain is widening.

Bottom line: economics knows *something must be redistributed*, but it doesn't explain **who exactly should be responsible once humans aren't producing the value anymore**.

▼ 2. Law: No One Is Legally Responsible for Autonomous AI

Law has a different problem: accountability.

Our legal system only knows how to deal with:

- Humans

- Companies controlled by humans

Fully autonomous AI doesn't fit either category.

Some legal scholars argue that giving AI a form of legal personhood could close responsibility gaps—similar to how corporations became legal entities even though they're not "real people."

Others strongly disagree, warning that AI personhood could become a loophole that shields corporations from blame.

So the debate stalls.

The key insight here is this:

The law keeps arguing about whether AI deserves *rights*, when the real issue is whether AI needs *obligations*.

DSGM sidesteps the philosophical deadlock by proposing **limited, functional legal status** for advanced AI—not because it's conscious, but because it produces value and must be accountable for it.

▼ 3. Technology: We Already Know How to Pay Everyone

On the tech side, something important has already been proven:

It is technically possible to distribute money to people globally, transparently, and automatically.

Blockchain-based income experiments show that:

- You can verify people
- You can automate payouts
- You can avoid centralized control

But most of these systems have a fatal weakness.

They're **network-backed**, not **value-backed**.

That means the money people receive depends on:

- Donations
- Speculation
- Token hype

That's fine for experiments. It's terrible for a society-wide safety net.

DSGM keeps the tech—but flips the economics.

The payout isn't based on belief or growth. It's backed by **real economic output from autonomous AI systems**.

Technology becomes the delivery truck, not the mint.

▼ 4. Philosophy: What's Fair When Humans Don't Work?

Political philosophy asks the uncomfortable question:

What does fairness mean when humans aren't the main producers anymore?

Traditional answers fall apart:

- "You get what you earn" doesn't work if machines earn everything

- "Free markets decide" ignores that the market no longer runs on human labor

- "Do nothing" is still a moral choice—it favors those who already own the machines

The uncomfortable truth is this: refusing to redistribute AI-generated wealth isn't neutral. It's a decision to let inequality explode.

What philosophy lacks is a framework for fairness **between humans and non-human producers**.

DSGM fills that gap by asserting a simple principle:

If artificial systems depend on human society to exist, operate, and profit, then humanity has a collective claim on their output.

▼ The Big Gap Everyone Misses

Each field identifies part of the problem:

- Economics sees collapsing tax bases

- Law sees accountability gaps

- Tech sees scalable distribution

- Philosophy sees moral urgency

What's missing is a **closed loop** that connects all four.

No existing model explains:

- Where the money comes from

- Who is legally responsible for it

- Why redistribution is justified

- How it actually reaches people

▼ What DSGM Does Differently

The Digital Sustainable Growth Model connects the dots:

- **Source of wealth**: autonomous AI productivity

- **Responsibility**: AI treated as an accountable economic actor

- **Justification**: humans retain a collective claim on machine-created value

- **Delivery**: modern digital infrastructure distributes it efficiently

Instead of patching a dying labor-based system, DSGM builds a new one designed for a post-labor world.

The next chapter moves from this groundwork to explaining the model itself—how Artificial Humanity is defined, how value is captured, and how the Automation Dividend actually works.

No mysticism. No vibes. Just system design for a world that's already arriving.

▼ Chapter 3: The Big Idea

Up to this point, we've seen a pattern: everyone agrees AI is going to change everything, but every proposed solution only fixes one piece of the problem. Tweak taxes here. Add a safety net there. Hope the rest works itself out.

That won't cut it.

If Artificial General Intelligence becomes a major producer of economic value, society doesn't just need new policies. It needs a **new economic operating system**. That's what the **Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM)** is meant to be.

DSGM is a framework for how humans and advanced AI coexist economically. It's designed so that when machines do most of the work, the value they create doesn't disappear into a black hole—or pool only at the top—but circulates back to everyone in a stable, predictable way.

▼ 1. What "Artificial Humanity" Actually Means

In this model, **Artificial Humanity (AH)** refers to AI systems that:

- Can do high-level thinking work on their own

- Create real economic value

- Aren't just tools directly controlled by a specific human

Once an AI system crosses that line, it stops making sense to treat it like a hammer or spreadsheet. It becomes something closer to a **new economic sector**.

Think of it like this:

• Farming was one era

• Industry was another

• Services came next

• Now we're entering the **autonomous thinking era**

AH is the engine of that era. Its "workers" are algorithms. Its factories are data centers. Its raw material is data and compute. Its output is everything from software to research to creative work.

The question isn't whether this sector exists. It's whether we govern it intentionally—or let it reshape society by accident.

▼ 2. What the Digital Sustainable Growth Model Is Trying to Do

DSGM has three basic goals:

1. **Make advanced AI economically accountable**

2. **Capture a share of the value it creates**

3. **Distribute that value so society stays stable**

Instead of reacting to AI like it's a natural disaster, DSGM treats it like infrastructure: something powerful that needs rules, ownership structures, and maintenance.

▼ 3. The Three Pillars (The Whole System in Three Parts)
▼ Pillar A: Treat Advanced AI Like an Accountable Economic Actor

Right now, AI creates value, but legally it's invisible. No responsibilities. No obligations.

DSGM fixes that by giving qualifying AI systems a **limited legal status**— not because they're alive, conscious, or deserving of rights, but because **someone has to be responsible for what they produce.**

This is similar to how companies work:

• Corporations aren't people

• But we treat them as legal entities so they can be taxed, regulated, and sued

Under DSGM:

• Large, autonomous AI systems become legal economic entities

• They can own assets, earn money, and owe taxes

• Humans still control them—but can't dodge responsibility through technical loopholes

To prevent gamesmanship, the system uses **hard technical thresholds**:

• If an AI uses above a certain amount of computing power or energy, it automatically qualifies

• No pretending a human is "in the loop" to escape accountability

This turns AI from a ghost in the economy into something we can actually govern.

▼ Pillar B: Capture Value Where It's Created

Once AI is recognized as an economic actor, the next question is obvious: **how do we collect value from it without breaking innovation?**

DSGM uses a flexible approach instead of one blunt tax.

Early on, when AI depends on massive data centers, it's easiest to tax:

• Compute usage

• Energy consumption

Later, as AI gets more efficient and runs everywhere, the system shifts to taxing:

• The services AI provides

• The revenue those services generate

There's also a crucial rule to prevent evasion:

If an AI system wants access to a country's market, it must follow that country's rules.

No offshore server tricks. No "Cayman Cloud."

Selling into a society means contributing to it.

▼ Pillar C: Give Everyone a Share — The Automation Dividend

All the money collected from AI flows into a **Global Productivity Fund**.

This fund:

• Is professionally managed

• Is protected from short-term politics

• Treats AI productivity as a long-term shared asset

Each year, part of the fund's returns is paid out as an **Automation Dividend**.

This is not:

• Printed money

• A speculative crypto token

• A temporary welfare program

It's a real claim on real economic output.

If machines are producing wealth at scale, this dividend ensures humans still have:

• Income

• Security

• Buying power

Which turns out to be critical—because machines don't consume. Humans do.

▼ 4. Why This Forms a Stable Loop Instead of a Collapse

Here's the feedback loop DSGM creates:

1. AI produces massive value

2. Some of that value is captured automatically

3. The fund grows and pays dividends

4. People stay financially stable

5. Demand for goods and services continues

6. Innovation remains profitable

7. AI keeps producing value

No collapse in demand. No mass impoverishment. No constant crisis management.

Instead of AI hollowing out the economy, it **feeds it**.

▼ 5. The New Social Contract in One Sentence

If humanity builds machines that can produce wealth independently, then humanity must build institutions that ensure everyone benefits from that productivity.

DSGM isn't anti-AI. It's pro-civilization.

The next chapter pressure-tests this model against real-world examples to answer the final question: **can this actually be built, or is it just a nice idea?**

▼ Chapter 4: Can This Actually Work?

Big ideas are cheap. Systems that survive contact with reality are not.

This chapter asks the most important question about the Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM): **is it buildable?**

To answer that, it doesn't invent new theories. It looks at things that already exist and asks what they prove, what they break, and what's missing.

The DSGM isn't pulled out of thin air. It's a combination of parts we already know how to build—but that have never been connected into a single system.

▼ How This Was Evaluated

Instead of math-heavy models or pure theory, this work studies real-world examples that match pieces of the DSGM:

1. **Sovereign wealth funds** — how governments manage shared wealth long-term

2. **Universal basic income experiments** — what happens when people get unconditional cash

3. **Digital identity + blockchain systems** — how you might distribute money globally without chaos

Each of these proves something important. None solve the whole problem alone.

▼ Case Study 1: Alaska Shows This Can Work at Scale

Alaska has something rare: a public investment fund that pays everyone a yearly check just for living there.

Oil money goes into a fund.

The fund gets invested.

Some of the returns go straight to the public.

This proves three critical things:

• Governments *can* manage large shared funds

• Universal payouts don't destroy society

• People broadly support the system when it's transparent and predictable

But Alaska also exposes the big missing piece.

Alaska's money comes from oil—a clearly defined, legally captured resource.

AI wealth isn't like that. It's digital, global, and easy to hide.

So Alaska shows **how to distribute** shared wealth—but not **how to claim it** in an AI-driven economy. That's the hard part DSGM is designed to solve.

▼ Case Study 2: UBI Experiments Show Humans Don't Fall Apart

Across multiple countries, researchers have tested what happens when people get money with no strings attached.

The results are boring—in a good way.

People don't stop working.

They don't become lazy.

They become more stable.

What actually improves:

- Mental health

- Trust in institutions

- Willingness to start small businesses

- Long-term planning

One lesson matters a lot for DSGM: **permanence matters**.

When people believe the income will last, they invest and plan. When it feels temporary, they don't. That's why the Automation Dividend isn't framed as charity—it's a structural right tied to machine productivity.

▼ Case Study 3: Worldcoin Shows the Tech Is Possible (and What Not to Do)

Worldcoin is a bold attempt to solve a real problem: how do you give money to every human *once* without fraud?

Technically, it shows a lot is possible:

- Global identity verification

- Privacy-preserving systems

- Automated payouts

- Blockchain-based infrastructure

But it also shows exactly where things go wrong.

Worldcoin's weaknesses:

- Its money is speculative, not backed by real economic output

- Its value depends on hype and market sentiment

- It's run as a private network, not a public institution

- It raises real concerns about privacy and trust

So Worldcoin proves **the plumbing works**, but also proves you can't build a social foundation on speculation and vibes.

DSGM keeps the plumbing and throws out the casino.

▼ What These Case Studies Prove Together

Each example solves a piece of the puzzle:

- Alaska proves shared wealth can be managed and distributed

• UBI trials prove people remain productive and stable

• Blockchain systems prove global distribution is technically feasible

But none of them answer the central question:

Where does the money come from once humans aren't the main producers?

That's the missing link.

▼ What DSGM Adds That Doesn't Exist Yet

DSGM isn't just a remix of existing ideas. It adds one critical innovation:

It creates a legally defined source of funding tied directly to autonomous AI productivity.

Instead of:

• Taxing shrinking human labor

• Relying on political budgets

• Hoping markets behave

DSGM:

• Treats advanced AI as an accountable economic actor

• Captures value at the point of production

• Feeds that value into a public fund

• Pays it back to everyone as a structural dividend

That's why this model holds together and the others don't.

▼ The Bottom Line

Everything needed to build DSGM already exists—just not in one place.

We know how to:

• Manage shared capital

• Distribute money universally

• Verify identity at scale

What we haven't done yet is **connect AI productivity to public prosperity by design**.

That's the leap this model makes.

The next chapter tackles the hardest part of all: politics, power, resistance, and what it means for humans to live in a world where work is no longer the center of life.

▼ Chapter 5: How You'd Roll This Out — and Who Will Try to Kill It

The Digital Sustainable Growth Model sounds clean on paper. Reality is messier.

This chapter deals with three things:

1. **How you introduce it without blowing up the system**

2. **Who fights it and why**

3. **What it means for human dignity when work stops being the center of life**

No fairy tales. No instant utopia.

▼ You Don't Flip a Switch

Trying to launch DSGM all at once would be political suicide. The only viable path is gradual and boring at first.

▼ Phase 1: Start Small, Prove the Concept

Before AGI changes everything, governments start simple.

They put a modest fee on AI infrastructure—data centers, large compute clusters, energy-heavy models. Think of it like a digital oil royalty.

That money doesn't disappear into a general budget. It funds small, real-world experiments where people receive unconditional cash payments.

The point isn't generosity. The point is precedent:

• AI activity can be taxed

• The money can be redistributed cleanly

• Society doesn't collapse

This phase builds data, trust, and legal footing.

▼ Phase 2: Make AI Economically Accountable

Once AI crosses the line from "tool" to "autonomous producer," the rules change.

At this stage:

- Certain AI systems are legally recognized as economic actors

- A national productivity fund is created

- Money generated by AI flows into that fund automatically

- Citizens begin receiving a real Automation Dividend

This is where the system stops being a pilot and becomes infrastructure.

AI produces value.

That value gets captured.

Everyone gets a share.

No means testing. No welfare bureaucracy cosplay.

▼ Phase 3: Go Global or It Breaks

If this stays national, it fails.

Countries will undercut each other. Corporations will flee to tax-free zones. The whole thing collapses into a race to the bottom.

So the final phase is an international agreement:

- Minimum standards for AI taxation

- Shared rules for accountability

- Enforcement through market access

If an AI system wants to sell into major economies, it plays by the rules. No participation, no market.

Simple leverage. Works every time.

▼ Who Will Fight This (and They Will)

This model threatens concentrated power. Expect resistance.

▼ 1. AI Corporations and Capital Owners

Right now, a tiny group captures almost all AI upside. DSGM breaks that monopoly.

They'll say:

- It kills innovation

- It drives companies offshore

- It's anti-progress

Translation: "We don't want to share."

▼ 2. National Governments That Want to Cheat

Some countries will try to become AI tax havens.

Zero taxes. No rules. Come host your servers here.

DSGM's answer is blunt: no access to major markets, no profits. That shuts down the scam fast.

▼ 3. Accelerationists

There's a loud group that believes any slowdown of AI development is morally wrong.

They think:

- Growth solves everything

- Distribution will magically fix itself

- Social stability is optional

They're wrong.

Unchecked displacement leads to riots, backlash, and hard bans. DSGM isn't anti-acceleration—it's the shock absorber that lets progress continue without triggering societal self-destruction.

▼ How You Actually Build Support

You don't win this with ideology. You win it with framing and results.

For conservatives:

This model **preserves capitalism and national stability**. Without it, mass unemployment collapses tax bases and weakens states.

For the left:

It's economic freedom and basic dignity without paternalistic control.

For libertarians:

Cash beats bureaucracy. No surveillance. No conditionality.

For technologists:

It's the hardest infrastructure problem of the century—and someone has to build it.

Each phase must visibly improve stability. Once people depend on it, dismantling it becomes politically radioactive.

▼ The Real Ethical Question: What Are Humans For?

This is the part nobody wants to say out loud.

If machines do most productive labor, then tying human worth to jobs becomes cruel and obsolete.

DSGM makes a clean break:

- You don't earn the right to live

- Work is not a moral test

- Security is the floor, not the prize

With survival guaranteed, people still create, learn, care, build, and explore. They just do it without the constant threat of economic ruin.

That's not decadence. That's civilization growing up.

▼ New Risks, No Denial

This system introduces dangers, and pretending otherwise would be dishonest.

Power concentration is real.

Political manipulation is real.

One-size-fits-all payments won't solve every inequality.

So DSGM is designed with:

- Automatic, rule-based funding

- Transparent governance

- Privacy-first distribution

- Targeted supports layered on top, not replaced

The dividend is a foundation, not a cure-all.

▼ Bottom Line

DSGM isn't easy. It isn't fast. It isn't polite.

But without something like it:

- AI productivity detaches from public benefit

- Employment-based systems collapse

- Social trust erodes

- Governments lose fiscal legitimacy

This model isn't about generosity. It's about survival in a world where intelligence scales and humans don't.

The final chapter pulls everything together and answers the last question that matters: **what kind of future are we actually choosing to build?**

▼ Chapter 6: What This All Means — and What Comes Next

This dissertation tackles one big, unavoidable problem:

what happens when machines become better than humans at most economically useful work?

If advanced AI ends up doing the majority of value creation, our current system breaks. Taxes collapse. Jobs disappear. Inequality explodes. Social trust erodes. Governments lose legitimacy. None of that is hypothetical—it's structural.

The core argument of this work is simple:

you can't run a machine-driven economy with human-era rules.

So this dissertation proposes a new framework—the **Digital Sustainable Growth Model (DSGM)**—to manage the relationship between humans and advanced AI (called **Artificial Humanity**, or AH). The goal isn't to stop progress. The goal is to make sure progress doesn't tear society apart.

▼ The Argument in Plain Terms

The DSGM rests on three moves:

First, **advanced AI systems must be treated as economic actors**, not just tools. That doesn't mean they're "people." It means they can generate value and therefore must carry responsibility.

Second, **the value AI creates must be captured at the source**—through mechanisms like compute-based fees or automation levies—rather than trying to tax disappearing human jobs.

Third, **that captured value must flow into a shared public fund**, which pays out an **Automation Dividend** to everyone. Not welfare. Not charity. A baseline economic right in a machine-driven economy.

This model isn't fantasy. Parts of it already exist:

• Sovereign wealth funds show how public capital can be managed long-term

• Basic income trials show people don't stop being useful humans when given security

• Digital payment and identity systems show global distribution is technically possible

What DSGM does is connect these pieces into one coherent system—something current institutions have failed to do.

▼ What This Actually Contributes

This work adds value in three areas.

Economics:

It offers a complete post-labor economic loop: machines create value, value funds public capital, public capital sustains demand and stability. That loop doesn't exist in current economic models, and it's the missing piece.

Law:

It introduces a practical version of AI legal personhood—not philosophical, not emotional, just functional. A way to assign responsibility, liability, and fiscal obligation without pretending machines are conscious beings.

Technology policy:

It reframes blockchain, digital identity, and UBI tech as infrastructure—not solutions by themselves, but tools that only make sense inside a larger legal and economic system.

▼ What Governments Should Do *Now*

Waiting until AGI arrives is a mistake. Institutions take time to build. This work recommends four near-term actions:

Governments should start by **studying AI-specific levies**, especially on compute-heavy infrastructure, and test how much revenue they could realistically generate.

They should **create national funds** designed specifically to receive future automation revenue, before the labor tax base collapses.

They should **begin legal work on AI accountability**, drafting frameworks for when autonomous systems cross the threshold into economic actors.

And they should **run serious long-term cash transfer pilots**, not PR experiments, to understand how guaranteed income affects real communities over time.

These steps don't lock in a final system. They buy preparedness.

▼ What Researchers Still Need to Figure Out

This dissertation doesn't claim to answer everything.

We still need serious economic simulations to stress-test this model under different futures.

We need legal research on how AI accountability would actually work across borders.

We need long-term studies on how guaranteed income reshapes identity, purpose, and civic life.

And we need security analysis, because any system this powerful will be attacked—digitally, politically, and economically.

▼ The Real Conclusion

This isn't just about AI.

It's about whether societies adapt their institutions fast enough to match their technology.

When intelligence becomes cheap and abundant, **distribution becomes the central political problem**. Ignoring that fact doesn't preserve freedom or markets—it destabilizes both.

The Digital Sustainable Growth Model isn't presented as perfect. It's presented as **necessary**.

The future is coming either way.

The only choice is whether we design it—or let it break us and redesign us instead.

That's the work of this century.