ChatGPT

Strange Attractors for a Solarpunk Future: Shifting Civilizational Path Dependency

Introduction: Path Dependency and Competing Attractor States

Modern civilization sits at a crossroads defined by **path dependence** – the tendency for initial conditions and feedback loops to lock in a trajectory [1]. Today's "default" trajectory resembles a cyberpunk dystopia, an attractor state reinforced by neoliberal institutions and unchecked technological exploitation [2]. **Cyberpunk** futures – epitomized by extreme inequality, corporate dominance, and social decay amidst high technology – are not mere fiction but the logical outcome of current systemic forces [2] [3]. In complexity terms, this is a **stable attractor**: a self-reinforcing regime of political economy that is difficult to escape without significant perturbation. To avoid being pulled deeper into this dystopian basin, humanity must identify **"strange attractors"** – unconventional leverage points – to disrupt feedback loops and guide society toward a **solarpunk** future. Solarpunk, by contrast, envisions a high-tech *utopia* of ecological harmony, decentralization, and social equity [4]. This white paper explores how strategic interventions at the system level – institutional, technological, and civic – can realign our trajectory toward a solarpunk attractor state and away from the cyberpunk default. We frame these interventions metaphorically as *strange attractors* capable of reconfiguring societal feedback loops. Throughout, we prioritize technical precision and realistic near-term steps over utopian wishful thinking, focusing on how cryptographic and complexity-informed institutions can foster a high-agency, transparent, ecologically integrated future.

The Neoliberal Attractor: Why Cyberpunk Dystopia Is "Default"

Under the prevailing **neoliberal attractor**, a confluence of systemic forces drives us toward cyberpunk-like outcomes. Key among these forces is **elite capture** – the concentration of wealth and power in a small corporate-financial elite, which then reinforces its position by capturing regulators and shaping policy to favor capital [5] [6]. Decades of neoliberal policy have **hyper-empowered corporations and weakened labor**, resulting in extreme inequality and "corporate feudalism" where company interests trump civic welfare [3] [7]. **Platform capitalism** further locks in this attractor: tech giants operate as monopoly platforms that extract rents from entire ecosystems [8]. These digital monopolies not only dominate markets but also serve as private surveillance regimes (what Zuboff calls *surveillance capitalism* [9]), commoditizing personal data and attention for profit. The result is a self-perpetuating cycle of wealth concentration and societal disempowerment – what one analyst calls "late stage capitalism as the attractor state of neoliberalism," marked by consolidated wealth and a disempowered middle class [10].

Another reinforcing variable is **AI-driven labor obsolescence**. As artificial intelligence and automation advance, capital increasingly substitutes for human labor [11]. This diminishes the bargaining power of workers and threatens mass unemployment, giving capital owners even more leverage [12] [13]. In a scenario of widespread **labor redundancy**, neoliberal logic would allocate gains to capital while leaving displaced workers with minimal support [14]. The incentive for businesses and states to care about human workers decreases when AI and robots produce value – a dynamic that could "lock in" a **permanently stratified society** with a small wealthy technocratic class and a large underclass of economically irrelevant

humans [15] [16]. Indeed, absent intervention, **automation may ossify power imbalances**: one analysis warns that transformative AI could make society "permanently static" with a locked-in ruling caste, as current power structures get amplified and entrenched [13] [17].

In cyberpunk fiction, we recognize these trends taken to extremes: wealth inequality so vast that megacorporations wield more power than governments, ubiquitous surveillance and AI used to control populations, and pervasive precarity for the masses [2] [3]. Disturbingly, many of these elements are visible already. **Big Tech platform enshittification** – the degradation of platform services to maximize profit – exemplifies how digital ecosystems prioritize corporate rent-seeking over users. **Algorithmic governance** by opaque AI systems is used to maximize engagement or productivity at the expense of privacy, labor rights, and mental health. Neoliberal ideology also valorizes *hyper-individualism* ("you're on your own" ethos), undermining collective action and public goods [18] [19]. As **public institutions erode** under market fundamentalism, more social functions are privatized or left to precarious gig markets [20] [21]. This feedback loop – weaker social safety nets -> greater reliance on private platforms -> more power to those platforms – further cements the dystopian attractor.

In summary, the current attractor state is maintained by **self-reinforcing feedback loops**: wealth begets political influence that begets more wealth concentration [5]; technological automation begets unemployment that begets political apathy and populist scapegoating rather than structural reform [14] [22]. Without redirection, these forces make a cyberpunk future the *path of least resistance*. As one commentator put it, "capital concentration plus automated production creates an attractor state that's remarkably stable – and remarkably terrible" [23]. Recognizing this dynamic is the first step; the next is to examine how past societies broke out of entrenched paths, and what leverage points might alter our present course.

Historical Shifts in Attractor States: From Enlightenment to Welfare State

History offers precedents for **civilizational phase shifts**, where prevailing "rules of the game" (social contracts, institutions, dominant technologies) were upended, moving society into a new stable state. These shifts can be seen as jumps between attractors in the phase space of socio-political possibilities. Three key transitions illustrate how intentional reforms and emergent pressures realigned path dependencies in the past:

- **Enlightenment and Democratic Revolutions:** In the 17th–18th centuries, Enlightenment ideals of individual rights, reason, and social contracts challenged the feudal-monarchical attractor that had dominated Europe. Philosophers like Locke and Rousseau popularized the notion that legitimacy comes from the consent of the governed, not divine right. This intellectual shift, combined with printing technology spreading new ideas, destabilized the old regime's feedback loop of hereditary rule. The American and French Revolutions then concretized a new attractor: constitutional democracy. This was a paradigm shift – a new strange attractor – that reconfigured institutions toward citizen sovereignty and rule of law. The importance of this shift is that it established **pluralistic governance** and the concept of rights, which proved robust and self-reinforcing (albeit imperfectly) in subsequent centuries. Enlightenment values also planted seeds for later abolitionist and labor movements by asserting universal human dignity.

- **Industrial Revolution and the Rise of Labor:** The 19th century Industrial Revolution created immense wealth but also new injustices, as early industrial capitalism was a harsh attractor state of exploited labor and rampant inequality. In response, social movements and new ideologies (e.g. socialism, trade unionism) arose to counter the worst excesses. Over time, many societies underwent reforms such as labor laws, universal education, and expanded suffrage, which started to shift the attractor. The introduction of **organized labor unions** was pivotal – it injected a countervailing force into the system's feedback loops. Workers collectively bargaining for better wages and conditions altered the distribution of power and curbed the "race to the bottom." These changes were incremental and often hard-fought (e.g. the 8-hour workday, safety regulations) but cumulatively they prevented industrial capitalism from calcifying into a neo-feudal plutocracy in many countries. Instead, by the early 20th century a new social contract was emerging, acknowledging some responsibility of the state and capitalists toward workers (however limited). The attractor was still capitalist, but gentler – a harbinger of welfare states to come.

- **Post-WWII Welfare State Consensus:** After the catastrophe of the Great Depression and World War II, Western nations converged on a **Keynesian welfare state** model – a stark shift from the laissez-faire pre-Depression paradigm. This postwar social contract is often called the **post-war consensus** (or social democratic attractor). It featured robust public institutions: strong unions, regulated markets, progressive taxation, and a safety net (public healthcare, unemployment insurance, pensions) [24] [25]. Governments actively managed demand to ensure full employment (Keynesian economics) and saw themselves as stewards of broad prosperity. The result was unprecedented middle-class growth and reduced inequality from 1945–1975 – a very different equilibrium than either the pre-war oligarchic capitalism or the neoliberal regime that followed [5] [26]. Importantly, this attractor shift was enabled by **critical junctures** – the Depression delegitimized pure laissez-faire, and WWII's shared sacrifice built momentum for collective welfare. Policy paradigms changed: whereas neoliberalism claims markets "automatically self-adjust" to full employment, the Keynesian paradigm recognized market failures and power imbalances, justifying government intervention and union empowerment [27] [28]. The institutionalization of pro-labor policies (e.g. the right to organize, minimum wages) and public goods created reinforcing feedback: a virtuous cycle where rising wages fueled demand, which fueled growth, benefiting everyone. This era shows that **alternative stable states are possible** – the mid-20th century mixed economy was far more egalitarian than the late 19th or early 21st century, because its rules and incentives differed fundamentally.

However, history also warns that attractor shifts can reverse. The Keynesian consensus gave way in the 1980s to a **neoliberal restoration**, as stagflation and intellectual divisions weakened the Keynesian paradigm, allowing a resurgence of free-market ideology [26] [5]. Neoliberal reformers systematically dismantled union power (e.g. the **1979–80 Thatcher/Reagan era**), deregulated finance, and privatized public goods [29] [21]. This engineered a return to a high-inequality, capital-centric attractor – essentially a slide back toward a cyberpunk trajectory. Path dependence kicked in: once key institutions (like unions) were eroded and capital mobility increased, feedback loops (global competition, political lobbying by the rich) made it hard to restore the old equilibrium [30] [19].

The lesson is twofold: (1) **Deliberate interventions can push society into new attractor basins** – but (2) these gains require maintenance, lest the system revert. Now, in the face of climate change, AI upheaval, and digital oligopolies, we need another paradigm shift of comparable magnitude. The Enlightenment, labor reforms, and welfare state were each responses to systemic crises or inefficiencies of prior regimes. Today's crises – ecological overshoot, inequality, the prospect of mass technological unemployment –

likewise demand new institutions. In complexity terms, our current system may be nearing **critical thresholds** (tipping points beyond which qualitative change occurs). The next section identifies such thresholds and *strange attractors* that could reconfigure our system-level feedback loops toward a solarpunk state.

Critical Thresholds for a Solarpunk Attractor State

Achieving a solarpunk future – a **prosperous, sustainable, and decentralized world** – requires tipping several interrelated system variables past critical thresholds. These are not isolated technologies, but socio-technical leverage points that can *jointly* realign the dominant feedback loops. Below, we examine key thresholds and how crossing them could shift the attractor state:

- **Abundant Cheap Renewable Energy:** Ubiquitous clean energy is foundational to solarpunk. When renewable power becomes not only cheaper than fossil fuels but **pervasive and decentralized**, it undermines the geopolitical and economic dominance of petro-states and energy monopolies. We are already nearing this threshold: solar and wind power are now *far cheaper than fossil fuels* on a per-kWh basis [31]. Solar in particular has the trait of being available almost everywhere on the planet, making energy a distributed resource rather than a scarce, centrally-controlled commodity [31]. As cheap renewables scale, they enable **localized energy sovereignty** – e.g. every town running its own microgrid with rooftop solar and storage, sharing power locally [32]. This decentralization breaks the current attractor where energy flows (and profits) concentrate in a few hands. Instead, communities could achieve **resilience and autonomy**, with microgrids providing stability against blackouts and disasters [33]. Abundant clean energy also removes a key driver of dystopia: resource conflicts and **"sacrifice zones"** of extraction [34]. In a solarpunk scenario, there are no oil wars or pipeline oligarchies – *everyone has equal access to sun and wind*, eliminating a major source of inequality and violence [34]. Crossing the renewable energy threshold creates positive feedback: cheaper energy spurs electrification (EVs, heat pumps, etc.), which further reduces costs via scale, hastening the collapse of the fossil fuel regime. The **ecological dividend** is immense – decarbonization and reduced pollution – but equally important is the power shift. Energy democracy (cooperatively owned renewables, community grids) could replace the top-down energy industries of today, aligning economic incentives with environmental and social well-being.

- **Programmable Money and Digital Currency:** The nature of money itself is a leverage point. **Programmable digital currencies** – such as Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs) or cryptocurrency alternatives – introduce the ability to embed policy logic directly into money [35]. This capability could radically improve macroeconomic and welfare interventions. For instance, a central bank or treasury could issue **programmable UBI tokens** that automatically expire if not spent, ensuring circulation (a modern take on Gesell's *demurrage* currency that discourages hoarding) [35]. In fact, China's digital yuan already experiments with expiration on certain stimulus funds [35]. Programmability allows **fine-grained control**: money can be tagged for specific uses (e.g. food-only vouchers), interest rates can be adjusted per transaction, and taxes can be auto-deducted at point of sale – all executed by code. Crucially, if designed with privacy and inclusion in mind, programmable money can increase financial **equity and stability**. For example, direct fiscal support (stimulus or UBI) can reach citizens instantly via CBDC wallets, bypassing slow bureaucracies or corrupt intermediaries. The Bahamas' Sand Dollar and other pilots show potential for CBDCs to **bank the unbanked** through mobile wallets while increasing transparency of transactions [36] [37]. Another transformative idea is using smart contracts to implement **demurrage or negative interest** on

large idle balances – effectively an automated wealth tax to prevent capital concentration. Historical experiments with demurrage currency (e.g. in 1930s Europe) found that making money "rust" over time incentivized productive investment and reduced inequality [38] [39]. In a solarpunk economy, one could imagine a public digital currency with built-in **dilution of excessive holdings**: if one wallet holds vastly more than others, the protocol could apply a higher demurrage rate or redistribute a portion periodically (a kind of token dilution to constrain runaway accumulation). Such designs need careful calibration to avoid capital flight [40], but they illustrate how **monetary systems can be redesigned as public utilities**. Programmable money thus serves as a lever to fund public goods (e.g. via *quadratic spending* or conditional grants) and to stabilize a post-growth economy. It shifts us from a neoliberal attractor where money is an instrument of speculation and control, to a solarpunk attractor where money is *infrastructure* – a tool to facilitate exchange, sustainability, and shared prosperity.

- **Verifiable Digital Identity (Self-Sovereign Identity):** In a world where interactions are increasingly digital, having a **secure, decentralized identity system** is critical. Current identity systems (government IDs, corporate logins) are siloed and often exclusionary. **Self-sovereign identity (SSI)** offers an alternative: individuals hold cryptographic credentials that prove attributes about themselves, without reliance on a central authority for every verification [41] [42]. This is achieved through *decentralized identifiers (DIDs)* and **verifiable credentials** anchored on blockchain or other distributed networks. A practical example is the European Blockchain Services Infrastructure (EBSI) initiative, which is deploying a **cross-border digital identity and credential framework** using blockchain [41]. In EBSI's model, users store credentials (like diplomas, licenses, or ID attestations) in their own wallet, and verifiers (e.g. employers, banks) can cryptographically check their validity via the blockchain – *without* contacting the original issuer each time [42]. This design enhances privacy (no honey-pot databases of personal data) and **empowers individuals** to control their identity. In the solarpunk context, SSI is a cornerstone because it allows people to **carry their reputation and social capital across platforms and communities**. For instance, the Sovrin network (built on Hyperledger Indy) enables exactly this: individuals can possess a portable digital reputation – skills, work history, community contributions – that is not locked to any single employer or platform [43] [44]. This has huge implications for a post-labor economy. *Today, losing your job often means losing your work email, your professional network access, your proof of experience.* In a future with SSI, **professional and civic identity becomes self-owned**: you don't lose your credentials if your gig platform shuts down or if you flee a country; your qualifications and achievements are yours to keep and prove [45] [46]. Projects like **Worldcoin** even explore proof-of-personhood: giving each human a unique digital ID (World ID) via biometric proof, so that one person = one allotment of resources, solving issues like fair UBI distribution or bot prevention [47] [48]. (Worldcoin uses iris scans and zero-knowledge proofs to ensure a user is unique without revealing their identity [47].) While Worldcoin is controversial, the core idea is relevant: to deliver *global public goods* (like climate dividends or UBI), we need a **tamper-proof yet privacy-preserving identity system** so that each person can claim benefits exactly once [49]. Achieving widespread self-sovereign identity is thus a threshold after which many solarpunk policies (UBI, participatory governance, data ownership) become feasible at scale. It breaks the attractor of platform-based identity (think "Login with Facebook") which centralizes power, and replaces it with **user-centric trust networks**, arguably as fundamental to freedom as the right to one's personhood was in the labor era [50] [45].

- **DAO Legal Personhood and Institutional Reform:** Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) are a novel institutional form – internet-native organizations run by transparent rules

encoded in smart contracts [51] [52]. However, today they mostly operate in a legal gray zone. **Recognizing DAOs as legal entities** is a critical threshold to integrate them into the fabric of civic and economic life. Progress is underway: for example, the U.S. state of Wyoming passed the **Decentralized Autonomous Nonprofit Association (DUNA) law** in 2023, granting legal status to qualifying non-profit DAOs [53]. Under this law, a DAO with at least 100 members and a charitable purpose can register as a DUNA, giving it legal personhood similar to an LLC or association [54]. This is revolutionary – it means a DAO can own property, enter contracts, and be recognized by courts **without compromising its decentralized character** [53]. Such recognition enables "code-as-organization" structures to leave the sandbox of crypto and start managing real-world assets and services. Imagine city utilities run by token-holder governance, or community land trusts managed as DAOs – these become more plausible when DAOs have standing in legal systems. Wyoming's framework also importantly **limits liability** for DAO participants and provides tax clarity, making it safer to participate in decentralized projects [55] [56]. Notably, the DUNA law's ethos is to preserve decentralization: profits (if any) must go toward the nonprofit mission, and any member compensation must be for contributions, not share ownership [57] [56]. This prevents classic corporate profit-taking and encourages open participation. We can view DAO legal personhood as analogous to the invention of the **corporate charter** in earlier eras – a legal innovation that unlocked new scales of collective action (for better or worse). In a solarpunk scenario, we want **"public DAOs"** that can deliver services and manage commons transparently, with global participation. Precedents are emerging: e.g., the nation of Georgia's government partnered with a blockchain firm to put land titles on a blockchain registry [58], hinting at future DAO-managed land records. Additionally, projects like **CityDAO** (which bought land in Wyoming as an NFT and formed a DAO around governance of that land) or **Nouns DAO** exploring the DUNA structure [59] [60] show how physical and digital governance can merge. By institutionalizing DAOs, we lower the friction for communities to self-organize economic and social initiatives outside of traditional corporations or governments. The long-term vision is a **polity of DAOs** – local energy co-ops, housing co-ops, digital guilds, even city councils operating via DAO frameworks, all interoperating. Legal personhood and clarity is the bridge that can bring these from experimental to mainstream.

- **Data Unions and Data Dignity:** Data is the new oil – but today individuals see little of the value their data generates. **Data unions** are an emerging concept to remedy this by enabling people to pool their data and collectively bargain for its sale or use [61] [62]. This is directly analogous to how labor unions aggregate workers' power. For example, drivers for a ride-hailing platform could form a data union that aggregates their driving behavior data, and negotiate a deal with a mapping AI company or insurance company, selling it for a fair price and splitting the proceeds [63]. Tools like the Streamr framework and Ocean Protocol are already facilitating such models [64]. By crossing the threshold of viable data unions, we flip the script of surveillance capitalism: instead of corporations harvesting user data for free, individuals regain **property rights in their data**. Early successes include projects like **Swash**, a browser extension where users share anonymous browsing data and get paid (in crypto) as part of a collective pool [65]. The privacy of members is protected through encryption and aggregation, but buyers can get useful insights from the pooled data. Another example is **DIMO**, where car owners contribute vehicle sensor data and receive tokens in return [66] [67]. If scaled, data unions could restructure the digital economy's feedback loops: people would have a *voice and equity stake* in AI development (because AI needs data – our data). This in turn could mitigate AI's downsides, as communities might demand certain uses of their data (e.g. only non-evil AI training) or negotiate better value distribution. In a solarpunk future, *"data dignity"* – the idea that people should benefit from the data they create – becomes a norm. We might see **data cooperatives** where

citizens collectively manage health data for research, or artists pooling their works to train generative AI but on their own terms. By treating personal data as labor, data unions add a new **feedback loop of fairness** into the digital economy [61]. Just as labor unions in the 20th century improved wages and conditions, data unions could ensure the wealth generated by AI and big data is shared, not concentrated. Moreover, **consent** becomes more meaningful – instead of clicking away our rights in unread T&Cs, we actively choose what data to contribute via union governance and smart contracts, even setting prices or conditions on its use [68]. In sum, data unions help transition us from a cyberpunk attractor (Big Brother exploiting passive data subjects) to a solarpunk attractor where individuals and communities *actively participate* in the data economy with agency and reward.

These thresholds are interdependent. Cheap energy and data unions empower local communities economically; digital identity and programmable money enable new forms of coordination and social safety nets; legal DAOs provide the organizational vehicle to deploy these solutions on the ground. Hitting one threshold makes it easier to hit others – they create synergies. For instance, a self-sovereign identity system combined with programmable money could allow a **decentralized welfare system**: imagine community DAOs distributing UBI tokens to verified local residents, with smart contracts ensuring fair disbursement and demurrage to promote spending on local green goods. That scenario touches on all the above levers: identity, money, DAO governance, energy (if tokens incentivize solar adoption), etc. The overarching goal is to **reconfigure feedback loops** so that sustainable and equitable practices are reinforced. Once solar infrastructure, digital co-ops, and blockchain governance mechanisms are widespread, they will tend to *self-stabilize* the solarpunk attractor – just as the neoliberal attractor self-stabilized through corporate lobbying and network effects. We turn now to the role of blockchain and cryptographic technology in enabling this transition, as it underpins many of the aforementioned levers.

Cryptographic Institutions as Strange Attractors: Transparency, Participation, Decentralized Agency

A defining feature of the solarpunk transition is the replacement of many **legacy power structures** with **cryptographically guaranteed institutions**. Blockchains and related technologies act as a new kind of socio-technical substrate: they enforce rules *transparently and autonomously*, which can engender trust and coordination at scale. In a world where the traditional disciplinarian (the labor market) is weakening, cryptographic systems can provide an *alternative source of order and incentive alignment* – essentially taking up the "disciplinary role" in a way that empowers rather than oppresses. Here's how:

1. Transparency and Trust through Open Ledgers: Blockchains are often called *"trust machines"* because they make it possible for diverse participants to agree on a single source of truth without a central arbiter. This property is invaluable for creating **auditable, tamper-proof records** of transactions, contracts, or votes. For example, consider financial governance: MakerDAO, a decentralized stablecoin issuer, automatically enforces collateral rules via smart contracts, so that no insider can secretly change leverage limits or bail out a friend – *everything is constrained by code* [69]. Even regulators have noted this *"new paradigm of rule enforcement by code"* that operates without human discretion [69]. In a solarpunk society, many functions of traditional bureaucracies or corporations could be handled by *transparent algorithms* executing on public ledgers. This dramatically reduces corruption and the principal-agent problem. When rules are encoded in smart contracts visible to all, **cheating requires consensus** (everyone can see proposed changes) rather than being done in back rooms [70] [71]. One vivid illustration: we could implement environmental regulations as smart contracts that automatically charge factories for emissions

if IoT sensors report pollution above a threshold – no need for trust in an environmental agency that could be bribed; the code enforces the fine impartially [72] [73]. Blockchain immutability means these rules *"cannot be quietly bypassed"*, and any change requires transparent collective consent [70] [71]. This moves society from *regulation by after-the-fact punishment* (often unevenly applied) to **protocol-based regulation** – continuous enforcement that *prevents* violations (or at least catches and penalizes them in real-time). The effect is a **feedback loop of trust**: as people see that rules (for finance, environment, etc.) are consistently applied, their faith in institutions can be restored. Additionally, transparency undercuts propaganda and disinformation; for instance, public blockchain records can expose fraud or confirm proper use of funds, which in turn builds credibility for collective projects.

2. Participatory Governance and the Exit/Voice/Fork Triad: Cryptographic systems not only enforce rules, they also offer new modes of **participation and choice** in governance. In traditional politics, citizens have two main avenues per Hirschman's classic framework: *voice* (staying in a system and trying to change it) or *exit* (leaving for an alternative) [74]. Blockchain ecosystems introduce a powerful third option: **forking**. A *fork* occurs when a subset of participants create a diverging copy of a blockchain or DAO, implementing new rules and leaving the original governance behind [75] [76]. Forks effectively **combine voice and exit** – the threat or act of forking is a form of exit that carries voice, because the possibility forces the original group to consider dissenting demands or else lose members [76]. This triad (exit, voice, fork) can serve as the *democratic substrate* in a post-labor society. When people are no longer bound together as workers in a firm (the industrial-era basis of collective power), they can instead coalesce as *users or contributors of a protocol*. If they are unhappy, they can voice grievances through on-chain governance (voting, proposals). If overruled, they can exit by forking the code and community, potentially taking value and network members with them [77] [78]. This dynamic **holds incumbents accountable** in a new way: monopolies can't easily stagnate when a disaffected minority can split off and compete by copying the open-source code [79] [80]. As Kevin Kwok noted, forks serve as **"credible checks"** on developers and leaders, ensuring they remain responsive to the community [81]. We've already seen this in practice: when powerful interests tried to steer Bitcoin in a certain direction, the community split into Bitcoin vs. Bitcoin Cash – an example of a dispute being resolved by exit rather than endless voice conflict. In Ethereum's case, after The DAO hack, the community exercised a one-time *voice override* (hard fork) to rectify an exploit, but dissenters exited to Ethereum Classic, keeping both options in play [82] [83]. The broader point is that **decentralized networks embed pluralism**: there is always an escape hatch (forking) if consensus cannot be reached, which ironically encourages more good-faith voice (since exit is costly but real). In solarpunk governance, we can harness this for everything from software protocols to local communities – imagine if a city's digital civic platform had a minority unhappy with budget decisions; they could propose an alternative budget on a forked platform, and if enough citizens followed, it would compel the city to reconcile or adapt. The *threat* of a fork (like the threat of strike in labor terms) rebalances power toward the "governed" and away from entrenched authorities.

3. Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) and Smart Contracts for a Post-Labor Economy: As mentioned, DAOs enable collective action without centralized management – they are ruled by algorithms and member votes, not bosses. In a future where formal employment is scarcer, people will need new ways to organize and contribute meaningfully outside traditional jobs. DAOs can fill that gap by providing structure for *contributors, not employees*. For example, a global DAO could handle funding and maintaining an open-source solar panel design, paying contributors in tokens for their work. **Smart contracts** within the DAO automate the payouts when certain conditions are met (e.g. code passes tests, or a design meets specs), thereby ensuring fair compensation without a human manager. This mimics how gig platforms operate but without the rent-extracting intermediary. Moreover, DAOs are **transparent and**

meritocratic by design: all proposals, rules, and transactions are on-chain for members to inspect [52] [84]. This transparency is not just a buzzword – it fundamentally changes the incentive landscape. Malicious or self-serving actions are harder to hide, and members can collectively veto or leave (as discussed) if the DAO's direction turns adverse. "*This powerful transparency means you simply cannot structure a DAO that has perverse incentives against members' interests, as they can see it in real time and, due to low switching costs, leave for more appealing opportunities*" notes one legal analysis [84]. In other words, **exploitative dynamics tend to be self-correcting** in an open setting – a stark contrast to traditional firms where information asymmetry often lets abuse fester. DAOs also have the advantage of **scale without centralization**: they can coordinate thousands of people globally to work on a common goal (like Wikipedia or open source projects), but now with economic mechanisms (tokens) to reward participation. This could lead to a Cambrian explosion of "crypto-cooperatives" tackling everything from maintaining public parks to curating educational content. Crucially, DAOs can replace many functions of government or corporations *while aligning with solarpunk values*: they are borderless (suited to global issues like climate), transparent (reducing corruption), and **inclusive by default** (anyone with an internet connection can join and contribute, subject to the DAO's rules). They also offer *continuous governance*, as opposed to periodic elections or board meetings – proposals can be voted on any time, and token-weighted voting or more novel forms (quadratic voting, conviction voting) can be used to enhance fairness. Of course, challenges remain (e.g. preventing plutocratic token control, ensuring security of smart contracts), but these are being actively worked on. The key is that **cryptographic governance enables participation at scale without central trust**, which is vital in a future where we cannot rely on employment hierarchies or nation-states alone to organize society.

4. Circuit Breakers and Resilience in Automated Systems: While blockchain institutions bring automation and immutable rules, the solarpunk ethos is not naive about code. *Unstoppable code* executing bad logic can be catastrophic – as seen in the 2016 DAO hack where rigid adherence to a buggy contract forced a community crisis [85] [82]. Therefore, an important design principle is **"circuit breaker" governance** – the ability to halt or override smart contracts in emergencies or when they produce obviously unintended outcomes. This is analogous to electrical grid circuit breakers that prevent overloads. Many DeFi protocols already implement such features: for example, MakerDAO introduced a governance-triggered circuit breaker that can freeze certain transactions (like halting borrowing against a stablecoin if it's breaking its peg) [86]. Aave (a lending protocol) has proposed standard smart contract circuit breakers (EIP-7265) to pause all token outflows if abnormal conditions are detected [87]. In DAO practice, we see use of **emergency multisigs** – a small trusted committee that can hit the "pause button" on a contract if a critical bug or attack is detected [88]. Far from undermining decentralization, these *safety valves* are what make widespread adoption of blockchain governance viable, by preventing single points of failure from cascading. As one guide on DAOs explains, having emergency stopgaps like the ability to **halt transactions during detected issues** is crucial to protect member assets and the integrity of the system [89]. In a solarpunk government context, we might have *constitutional smart contracts* that normally auto-execute policies (like the emission fines or UBI distribution mentioned earlier), but a democratically elected *oversight DAO* can delay or veto execution if something is clearly wrong. Additionally, employing **formal verification** and rigorous audits of critical smart contracts (already a best practice in DeFi [90] [91]) will be standard procedure when people's rights and resources are at stake. This blend of rule-by-algorithm and human oversight yields a *cybernetic governance* – self-correcting and resilient. It reflects complexity science wisdom: maintain feedback loops but also incorporate fail-safes to handle unexpected perturbations. By designing cryptographic institutions with both **autonomy and adaptability**, we ensure they can function as reliable public infrastructure rather than brittle single-purpose tools.

5. Enforcement of Commons and Public Goods Funding: Cryptographic mechanisms shine in enabling new ways to fund and manage public goods. A prime example is **quadratic funding (QF)** for community projects. Quadratic funding (a concept from Glen Weyl and Vitalik Buterin) uses a matching pool to amplify small contributions from many individuals, thus favoring projects with broad support over those with a few wealthy backers [92] [93]. This mechanism has been successfully implemented by **Gitcoin**, which has distributed millions in funding to open-source projects using QF. Gitcoin's smart contract takes into account not just how much money a project raised, but how many people contributed, allocating matching funds so that a project with 100 people donating $1 each gets more match than a project with one person donating $100 [94]. The math is handled transparently on-chain, guaranteeing that **matching funds are allocated strictly according to the formula** without backroom influence [95]. This is important because it allows communities to collaboratively fund what they value (e.g. local environmental monitoring, open datasets, educational materials) in a way that traditional markets and governments often fail to. It's a "wisdom of the crowd" approach that cryptography makes credible: everyone can verify the donations and the computed matches on the blockchain, building trust that the process is fair. In a solarpunk future, we could see *quadratic voting* used for collective decision-making (where people allocate voice credits to vote on issues they care most about) and quadratic funding used for participatory budgeting in cities or even globally for climate action. These cryptographic voting/funding schemes solve coordination failures by eliciting true preferences and lowering the barrier for individuals to have impact [96]. Essentially, they operationalize more nuanced democratic principles (like proportional voice rather than one-dollar-one-vote or one-person-one-vote only) in a way that was not possible without cryptography to prevent fraud and sybil attacks. The result is **greater public participation in resource allocation** and an incentive structure that rewards *pro-social projects*. Over time, widespread use of QF could shift the attractor state by steadily growing a well-funded commons sector alongside (or in place of) the profit-driven sector. Projects that used to languish due to "market failure" (like open-source medicine research, or maintenance of local parks) would find sustained support, altering the feedback loops that currently undervalue public goods.

In summary, cryptographic institutions provide the **technical substrate for a solarpunk society**. They ensure honesty (through transparency and immutability), encourage broad participation (through novel voting and forking dynamics), and embed **decentralized agency** into the very code of our organizations. By doing so, they can replace or augment traditional mechanisms like corporate management, bureaucratic fiat, or labor relations that are fading or flawed in the cyberpunk trajectory. However, they must be implemented with care – *with circuit breakers, with inclusive governance models, and with legal and ethical guardrails* – to truly benefit society. The theoretical scaffolding behind these choices comes from understanding path dependence and coordination: we are effectively **re-wiring the incentives and information flows** that drive system behavior. Instead of opaque, top-down control yielding apathy or rebellion, we get transparent, bottom-up input yielding engagement and adaptation. This sets the stage for the final section: envisioning how these pieces come together in a coherent solarpunk state – a scenario that is high-agency, high-transparency, and ecologically integrated.

A Forward Vision of the Solarpunk State

Imagine a society a few decades from now that has successfully navigated the transition. This **solarpunk state** is not a centralized nation-state as we know it, but a network of locally self-sufficient communities interconnected by global digital institutions. Key features of this future include:

- **Localized Energy Sovereignty:** Cities and towns operate on **renewable microgrids**, achieving near total energy independence [32]. Every building is a passive solar collector or has **rooftop**

photovoltaics and battery storage, making most communities net energy producers [97]. Excess energy is shared in local grids via smart contracts that trade power peer-to-peer, balancing supply and demand efficiently. Because energy is cheap and abundant, basic needs like heating, cooling, and clean water are met universally at low cost. Regions no longer fight over oil or gas; instead they collaborate on sunlight and wind harvesting techniques. The economy benefits from what was once called "*energy internet*" – think Uber for electrons, but owned by cooperatives. This autonomy fosters resilience: if a natural disaster strikes, microgrids **island** themselves and still keep the lights on at hospitals and homes [33]. Politically, energy sovereignty breaks the back of petrodollar oligarchies and **empowers local governance**, as communities directly control a vital resource. It also means a huge reduction in carbon emissions, helping stabilize climate – the ecological foundation of solarpunk.

- **Reputation-Anchored Self-Sovereign Identity:** People hold **holistic digital identities** that reflect their skills, contributions, and trustworthiness – *a kind of reputation ledger under their control*. From early education onward, individuals accumulate verifiable credentials: academic achievements, professional certifications, community service, creative works, governance participation. These credentials live in their personal wallet (secured by cryptography and biometrics) and can be selectively disclosed. Crucially, many credentials are **community-awarded** and reflect **pro-social behavior**: e.g. a neighborhood DAO issues badges for those who organize recycling drives, an open-source community issues tokens for valuable code contributions, a disaster relief effort gives attestations to volunteers. This creates a **rich tapestry of reputation** that is not reducible to a single credit score or government ID. It also forms a basis for **post-labor social status**. In the 20th century, one's job title or employer often defined social identity; in solarpunk, it's one's verified contributions to society (paid or unpaid) that matter [98] [99]. For instance, someone might not have a formal job, but their wallet shows they have designed 5 open-source vertical farming patterns, mentored 10 new contributors, and helped mediate disputes in a local DAO – a rich resume that any community would value. This **portable reputation** enables fluid movement between projects and communities; it also feeds into governance, as voting weight or leadership roles can be tied to demonstrated merit or expertise (possibly via soulbound tokens that confer voting boosts to subject-matter experts, etc.). Importantly, this identity system is **self-sovereign** (no Big Brother surveillance scoring) – users consent to share what they want, and zero-knowledge proofs allow them to prove claims (like "I live in this city" or "I'm certified in permaculture") without revealing unrelated data [47] [48]. The outcome is a high-trust society where people can interact peer-to-peer (for transactions, lending, collaboration) based on cryptographically vouched reputations, reducing the need for middlemen or prejudicial heuristics. It's a realization of what some have called *"Web of Trust"* or *"proof of character"*. This ties back to replacing labor's role: where once employers vouched for employees (you were legible if you had a job), now the **community vouches for the individual** via credentials and endorsements [43] [44]. One's social capital is thus untethered from corporations or state – a true empowerment.

- **DAO-Mediated Public Services:** Public services in this future are run by **DAO-like entities with citizen participation**. Consider city services: budgeting, urban planning, libraries, sanitation could all be managed by *CityDAOs*. Residents hold tokens (earned perhaps through local taxes or participation) that allow them to vote on proposals – e.g. how to allocate the park maintenance fund this quarter, or which contractor to hire to repave a road. Smart contracts ensure **budget transparency**: every expenditure is logged on the city blockchain, traceable by anyone [100] [101]. This eliminates corruption like skimming funds or nepotistic contracts – if it's not on the ledger, it didn't

happen. Some decisions are automated: streetlights might be IoT-connected and if sensors show bulbs are out, a contract auto-triggers a repair order and payment from a maintenance pool. But crucially, *oversight* is decentralized – citizen-elected committees (which are open membership DAOs themselves) can pause or adjust such algorithms if needed (the circuit breaker concept applied to city ops). Beyond city infrastructure, consider **welfare services**: unemployment benefits or UBI distribution might be handled by a national DAO which verifies eligibility via SSI credentials and disburses CBDC-UBI monthly. If there's a dispute (say someone was incorrectly marked ineligible), the case can be raised on an open arbitration platform (another DAO) where randomly selected jurors or AI-assisted judges (with human review) resolve it, and the logic update is proposed to the welfare smart contract. This drastically reduces bureaucratic overhead while improving fairness (rules are consistent and auditable) and **inclusion** (services adapt quicker since feedback flows directly through citizen governance rather than up a chain of command). Some pioneering efforts hint at this future: Estonia's e-government, though not a DAO, showed how digital ID and services can make interactions with the state seamless (99% of services online). Add DAO governance and you turn e-government into **we-government** – citizens co-steering the ship day-to-day, not just every election. On a larger scale, entire **public utilities** (water, energy, public transit) could be managed by multi-stakeholder DAOs: workers, consumers, local officials all hold some governance tokens, aligning interests. The overall effect is that public services become more like *commons* – managed by the stakeholders with open books – rather than top-down administered monopolies. This fosters a sense of **collective agency**; people see tangibly how their votes and proposals improve their environment, countering the alienation of the late neoliberal era. Additionally, DAO governance is flexible: communities can **fork services** if needed. If one city's education DAO becomes dysfunctional, a group of teachers and parents could fork into a new schooling DAO and petition the city to fund them via vouchers, creating competitive innovation while maintaining public accountability. This fluid, experimental approach is how solarpunk continuously adapts and improves its institutions.

- **Checks on Capital Concentration:** Despite high automation, this society avoids the dystopian outcome of all wealth accruing to AI owners. Mechanisms like **demurrage currency and token dilution** ensure that capital circulates and *does not stagnate in a few wallets*. For example, the national digital currency might have a built-in **holding tax**: perhaps 5% of any balance is "melted" each year and redirected to public funds or universal dividends, implementing an ongoing redistribution (as Gesell envisioned) to prevent wealth hoarding [38] [102]. In the crypto domain, many DAOs might adopt **inflationary token models** where new tokens are continuously issued to active contributors, thereby diluting inactive large holders over time. This encourages capital to be invested in productive or community endeavors rather than sitting idle (since idle wealth loses value relatively). There could also be **upper bounds** on ownership encoded in certain systems: for instance, quadratic voting naturally limits the influence of big token holders because the cost of additional votes scales quadratically. In decentralized finance, protocols could include *governance caps* – if any one address holds more than X% of governance tokens, its voting power is throttled or additional tokens are automatically distributed to others (this would combat plutocratic control). Another approach is **Harberger taxes** on assets: one always pays a tax based on self-assessed value of an asset (and must be willing to sell at that price), which recirculates wealth from property owners to the public. These economic designs, once fringe ideas, are implementable at scale with smart contracts. They represent a conscious choice to encode *egalitarian principles* into the economic infrastructure. The solarpunk society thus inoculates itself against the runaway feedback of wealth = power = more wealth. It treats *excessive accumulation as a bug, not a feature*, and uses algorithmic

policy to correct it continuously. The result is a high-commonwealth scenario: plenty of private enterprise and innovation, but gains are broadly shared, and **mega-concentrations of capital are transient** and kept in check. Socially, this means far less power asymmetry: no trillionaires lording over billions of poor. Everyone has a stake, and even the richest cannot stray too far from the mean without their wealth naturally flowing back into community circulation unless they keep contributing productively.

- **Ecologically Embedded Economy:** Lastly, the solarpunk state deeply integrates economic activity with ecological health. This is facilitated by **data-driven feedback loops** enabled by IoT and blockchain. For example, a *carbon coin* (proposed by Kim Stanley Robinson and others) might reward entities for sequestering carbon; IoT or satellite oracles feed data on carbon capture (tree growth, direct air capture metrics) into smart contracts that automatically issue carbon coins. These coins are recognized by the global economy (perhaps via taxes that must be paid in them) so there's always demand. This creates a self-reinforcing loop where *being green is profitable*. On the flip side, automated fines for pollution (as described earlier) or overuse of common resources ensure that externalities are internalized in real time [72] [73]. Local communities might have **DAO-managed environmental trusts** – say a river basin DAO that monitors water quality and usage rights via sensors, using smart contracts to enforce sustainable quotas and collect usage fees that fund conservation. Because transparency is high, polluters can't hide; because governance includes local stakeholders, there's collective vigilance. Over time, this yields an economy that operates within planetary boundaries by design, not as an afterthought. The attractor state has shifted such that the *cheapest and easiest path is the sustainable one*, due to all these embedded incentives. Culturally, solarpunk prioritizes "*prosperity*" over "*growth*" – quality, resilience, and wellbeing metrics replace GDP fetishism. Cryptographic measurement and community voting can track indices like biodiversity, mental health, free time, etc., and public dashboards (open data) keep the system oriented toward genuine progress. This normative change is both cause and effect of the new attractor: as people see that technology and institutions are serving life (not exploiting it), a positive vision of the future replaces cynicism. Solarpunk aesthetics – green cities, DIY gardens, art and play – flourish, reinforcing collective optimism and creativity in a virtuous cycle.

Case Studies & Precedents: While this vision may sound idealistic, many pieces are in motion today. The European Union's experiments with **EBSI** and national e-ID (e.g. Estonia's e-residency) point toward viable digital identity frameworks [41]. **Sovrin** and other SSI networks have shown in pilot programs (e.g. refugee ID or university credentialing) that decentralized identity works and increases user agency [50] [43]. **Gitcoin** has proven that quadratic funding can galvanize global communities to fund public goods [95]. **MakerDAO** and other DeFi projects have demonstrated unstoppable financial contracts, but also the need for safeguards which they are adopting (e.g. Maker's new "circuit breaker" to halt runaway borrowing in a crisis) [103] [91]. **Wyoming's DUNA law** provided a legal template now being studied by other jurisdictions (e.g. Tennessee and Malta also moved on DAO recognition). And the **Republic of Georgia's blockchain land registry** (operational since 2016) has registered hundreds of thousands of land titles, giving citizens immutable proof of ownership and reducing corruption in property transactions [58] [100]. Additionally, countless grassroots projects embody solarpunk principles: community microgrid co-ops in Germany, data union startups like Swash and DIMO paying people for their data, DAO experiments like RadicalxChange's localized voting pilots, and city governments (e.g. Taipei, Seoul) testing participatory budgeting with blockchain to ensure integrity. These are all **proto-strange attractors** – early signals of the larger shift. They teach us about implementation challenges and the importance of inclusive design (for instance, to avoid reproducing bias in digital ID or plutocracy in token governance).

The path forward is not without obstacles. Incumbent powers will resist many of these changes; regulatory battles will be fierce (e.g. over who controls digital currency or identity platforms). There are also genuine risks: poorly governed DAOs could collapse, privacy breaches could harm users, overly aggressive demurrage might spook investors, etc. The approach must therefore be **pragmatic and pluralistic**. We should deploy these innovations in parallel with reforms to existing institutions (for instance, using blockchain audits to complement government accountability, not expecting governments to disappear overnight). Early successes in one domain (say energy or digital finance) can build confidence and momentum for others. The endgame, however, is not a patchwork of pilots, but an **integrated high-equilibrium state** where the default behaviors and incentives lead to sustainability, equality, and resilience.

Conclusion: Reconfiguring Feedback Loops for a Regenerative Future

Complex systems theory tells us that to change the behavior of a system, we must change its structure – its feedback loops and parameters. The solarpunk vision articulated here is essentially a proposal to **re-engineer the global system's feedback loops** using emerging technologies and institutional innovations. By introducing *strange attractors* like decentralized energy, programmable money, self-sovereign identity, DAOs, and data unions, we create new reinforcing loops that favor collaboration, equity, and ecological alignment. For example, as more people gain agency through DAO governance and UBI, they have capacity to participate in local sustainability projects, which improves environmental and social conditions, which in turn reduces scarcity and conflict, enabling even more cooperation – a virtuous cycle replacing the vicious cycles of the neoliberal dystopia.

It is crucial to emphasize that this is not a deterministic technological fix or a utopian fantasy. Each leverage point comes with design trade-offs and demands **epistemic clarity** in deployment. We must avoid **techno-libertarian hubris** – the goal is not to abandon all hierarchy or expertise, nor to put blind faith in code. Rather, it's to **harness cryptographic tools to enforce the values** that democratic societies hold dear: accountability, consent, and fairness [104] [95]. In the industrial age, labor unions and civic institutions provided a check on raw capitalist dynamics. In the 21st century, as labor's power wanes, *cryptographic institutions can step into that role*, enforcing social contracts in novel ways. They can ensure, for instance, that everyone receives a baseline income (via transparent monetary policy) and that no one can secretly pollute the commons without automatic penalties. They offer **credibly neutral platforms** where the rules cannot be selectively bent for the powerful [104] [95]. This creates a new kind of social contract – a "civic contract" – where **auditable trust replaces blind trust**. When citizens can see the code and even help shape it, legitimacy increases. When systems are interoperable and open, exit is easier, forcing voice to be heard. The result is a higher level of **agency for individuals and communities** than either the laissez-faire or bureaucratic welfare models allowed.

Will this transition happen smoothly? Likely not – there will be turbulent periods where the old and new clash (we see glimmers of this in today's regulatory fights over crypto, or gig workers protesting algorithmic bosses). Complexity science suggests phase transitions often come with oscillations and uncertainty. But it also teaches that once a system finds a **better attractor basin**, it will settle there and resist moving backwards, because the new feedback loops reinforce the new equilibrium. A solarpunk future, once in place, could be **remarkably stable and resilient** – much more so than our current precarious trajectory. Diversity (energy sources, local economies), redundancy (many DAOs vs. single points of failure), and adaptive governance (continuous feedback, forks) make the system robust to shocks. High transparency

and inclusion make it robust to internal decay (it's hard to hijack a system that everyone can watch and challenge). In essence, we shift from a brittle system chasing infinite growth to a **flexible system cultivating shared flourishing**.

The path-dependent nature of our current dilemma means time is of the essence. Each passing year of deepening inequality and ecological damage narrows the options. However, the same path dependence can work in our favor once we tilt the slope – small initial nudges can avalanche into big changes if aligned with positive feedback. We are seeing early nudges: the continuing drop in renewable costs, the rapid advancement of blockchain tech, the demographic changes in values (younger generations favor sustainability and openness). Policy and civic action should focus on tipping those levers: e.g., massive investment in clean energy R&D and grid upgrades, regulatory support for digital currency experiments (with privacy protections), legal reform to recognize new organizational forms, and education to equip people with digital literacy and cooperative mindset. By pushing on these fronts simultaneously, we increase the chance of a synchronized shift.

In conclusion, avoiding a cyberpunk dystopia is not only about averting a negative outcome; it is about *deliberately choosing and building a positive one*. Solarpunk's promise lies in showing that advanced technology and social progress need not be at odds – if technology is embedded in **empathetic institutions** and guided by **community values**, it can be a tool of liberation rather than oppression [105] [106]. Our task is to identify the institutional "strange attractors" that can reshape the system's phase space and to actively steer into them. It is a grand experiment in **civilizational design**, requiring engineers, policymakers, artists, activists, and everyday people to collaborate. But if we succeed, the reward is nothing less than a **reimagined social contract** – one where auditable trust, shared governance, and ecological harmony form the stable foundation of society. In that future, the word "punk" in solarpunk – originally signifying rebellion – might come to symbolize an achieved triumph: the reclamation of our collective destiny from the clutches of dystopia, and the making of a world that is transparently, participatorily, *ours*.

Sources:

- Fox, Jason. *Move Quietly and Plant Things – Solarpunk Sensibilities*. *Foxwizard blog* (2020) – Describes the default "cyberpunk" narrative of a neoliberal, high-tech dystopia of inequality and collapse [2].
- Shapiro, David. *From Cyberpunk Dystopia to Post-Labor Utopia: Escaping the Neoliberal Trap*. *Medium* (Aug 25, 2023) – Analyzes how unchecked neoliberal capitalism and AI trends drive a cyberpunk-like future [107] [15] and advocates decoupling human well-being from labor via new social contracts [22] [108].
- **FPIF – Keynesianism to Neoliberalism**: Explains the post-WWII social contract (Keynesian full-employment policies, strong unions) and its reversal in the 1980s neoliberal shift [24] [5].
- Lee, Adam. *Glimpses of the Solarpunk Future*. *OnlySky* (Oct 22, 2024) – Highlights the transformative impact of cheap solar energy: now "far cheaper than fossil fuel" and inherently decentralized [31], enabling local microgrids and equitable energy access [34].
- Hussain, Monsur (Fitch) quote in BSR (2022) – Notes that CBDCs can be designed to be *"more interoperable, inclusive, transparent, and efficient,"* allowing direct UBI payments with programmable tokens that expire if not spent [35] [37].
- EBSI (European Blockchain Infrastructure) documentation (2024) – Describes a decentralized **Verifiable Credentials** framework where users control their data and trust is established without big tech or central governments [41] [42].

- Braumiller Law (Holbein, 2023) – *Wyoming's DUNA Law – Legal Framework for DAOs*: Wyoming recognizes Decentralized Autonomous Nonprofits, allowing DAOs ≥100 members with charitable purpose to register as legal entities [53] [54], providing legitimacy without sacrificing decentralization.
- Dataunions.org (Ekinci, 2022) – *What is a Data Union?*: Explains how data unions redistribute data's value back to people using decentralized tech. Members earn for crowdsourced data, flipping the model of big tech monetizing user data [61] [109]. Example: Swash browser extension pays users for their browsing data in a privacy-preserving way [65].
- Kwok, Kevin. *The Future is Forked* (2018) – Discusses how **forks** add a new dimension to Hirschman's exit/voice: forks *"combine voice and exit"*, lowering friction to leave and thus holding networks accountable [110] [78]. Forking serves as an internal check in crypto ecosystems, preventing unchecked monopolies [79].
- Medium (Coinmonks, 2021) – *DAOs Explained*: Emphasizes DAO security practices like *"Emergency Pauses"* – the ability to halt transactions when issues are detected, to protect against hacks [89]. Stresses layering technical controls (time-locks, multisigs) to minimize risks in decentralized finance.
- Emerging Europe (Abrams, 2022) – Reports that **Georgia's national land registry** has used blockchain since 2016, allowing public verification of property deeds and improving security/transparency [58]. Notes other countries (Sweden, Poland) also integrating blockchain for land and public records [111].
- *Blockchain and the New Civic Contract in a Post-Labor Economy* (user-provided PDF, 2025) – A comprehensive report detailing how blockchain tools (Ethereum/DAOs, Gitcoin quadratic funding, Worldcoin proof-of-personhood, Sovrin SSI) can replace labor's role in the social contract. Notably, it explains Sovrin's model: a public global SSI ledger run by a nonprofit coalition, enabling individuals to carry **social reputation and credentials independent of employers or governments** [44] [98]. It also describes how Sovrin IDs let gig workers port their ratings across platforms, or communities issue credentials for volunteering, forming the basis of a non-labor "social credit" system in a positive sense [98] [99]. The report advocates *auditable "freedom as code"*: smart contracts enforcing rules like pollution fines or bank leverage limits automatically, under public scrutiny [72] [104]. It highlights the need for **circuit breakers** (multi-sig escape hatches) after The DAO hack, to allow pauses/upgrades when code behaves in unintended ways [90] [91]. Overall, it paints a picture of blockchain-based governance as a means to redistribute power to individuals and communities when traditional labor leverage is gone [50] [112].

---

[1] Path-dependent institutions drive alternative stable states in ... - PNAS
https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1806852116

[2] [18] Move Quietly and Plant Things
https://www.foxwizard.com/move-quietly-and-plant-things/

[3] [6] [7] [20] [21] [22] [29] [107] [108] From Cyberpunk Dystopia to Post-Labor Utopia: Escaping the Neoliberal Trap | by David Shapiro | Medium
https://medium.com/@dave-shap/from-cyberpunk-dystopia-to-post-labor-utopia-escaping-the-neoliberal-trap-648253517ce5

[4] [105] [106] Planetary Infrastructure as Resistance: Solarpunk and Web3 – ZORA ZINE
https://zine.zora.co/solarpunk-web3-kareola

[5] [19] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [30] From Keynesianism to Neoliberalism: Shifting Paradigms in Economics - FPIF
https://fpif.org/from_keynesianism_to_neoliberalism_shifting_paradigms_in_economics/

8 9 Platform capitalism - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Platform_capitalism

10 Just let go and dance: A crash course in Attractor States
https://daveshap.substack.com/p/just-let-go-and-dance-a-crash-course

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 By default, capital will matter more than ever after AGI — LessWrong
https://www.lesswrong.com/posts/KFFaKu27FNugCHFmh/by-default-capital-will-matter-more-than-ever-after-agi

23 David Shapiro - X
https://x.com/DaveShapi/status/1850161065067245618

31 32 33 34 97 Glimpses of the solarpunk future
https://onlys.ky/glimpses-of-the-solarpunk-future/

35 36 37 Central Banks Embrace Digital Currencies | Emerging Issues | Sustainable Business Network and Consultancy | BSR
https://www.bsr.org/en/emerging-issues/central-banks-embrace-digital-currencies

38 39 102 Demurrage currency - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demurrage_currency

40 The Case for Demurrage Tokens - Robert M.C. Forster
https://robertmcforster.medium.com/the-case-for-demurrage-tokens-be64619a888d

41 42 EBSI Verifiable Credentials - EBSI -
https://ec.europa.eu/digital-building-blocks/sites/display/EBSI/EBSI+Verifiable+Credentials

43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 62 63 64 68 69 70 71 72 73 82 83 85 90 91 95 98 99 104 112 Blockchain and the New Civic Contract in a Post-Labor Economy.pdf
file://file-7GcQEz8hAQw58hkoh33zG7

51 52 53 54 55 56 57 59 60 84 Wyoming’s DUNA Law is a Legal Framework for Non-Profit DAOs
https://www.braumillerlaw.com/wyomings-duna-law-a-legal-framework-for-non-profit-daos-and-open-source-blockchain-networks/

58 100 101 111 How European countries are using blockchain to reform the land registration process
https://emerging-europe.com/opinion/how-european-countries-are-using-blockchain-to-reform-the-land-registration-process/

61 65 66 67 109 What is a Data Union?
https://dataunions.org/what-is-a-data-union/

74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 110 The Future Is Forked - kwokchain
https://kwokchain.com/2018/05/01/the-future-is-forked/

86 103 MakerDAO Passes Emergency Measures To Reduce USDC ...
https://thedefiant.io/news/defi/makerdao-reduces-usdc-exposure

87 [GRANT PROPOSAL] - Implementing EIP-7265 (Circuit Breakers) to ...
https://governance.aave.com/t/grant-proposal-implementing-eip-7265-circuit-breakers-to-improve-protocol-security/14174

88 Lido dual governance explainer (research distillation)
https://research.lido.fi/t/lido-dual-governance-explainer-research-distillation/7132

89 Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) Explained: Your Go-To Guide for Understanding Blockchain Governance | by Blockchain Today | Coinmonks | Medium
https://medium.com/coinmonks/decentralized-autonomous-organizations-daos-explained-your-go-to-guide-for-understanding-95d5e0c9dde0

92 96 Quadratic Funding — A Better Way to Fund Public Goods
https://woodstockfund.medium.com/quadratic-funding-better-way-to-fund-public-goods-76f1679b2ba2

93 WTF is Quadratic Funding?
https://www.wtfisqf.com/

94 An Introduction to Gitcoin Grants and Quadratic Funding
https://www.cryptoaltruism.org/blog/an-introduction-to-gitcoin-grants-and-quadratic-funding