⊚ ChatGPT

Critical Analysis of Web3's Structural, Political, and Sociotechnical Realities

Introduction

Web3 (or Web 3.0) is often hailed as a decentralized, democratized internet owned by its users rather than by Big Tech. But beyond the glossy hype, a deeper examination – informed by Africana critical theory, algorithmic resistance, and technofeudal critiques – reveals a more complicated reality. This report, prepared for the **Anacostia Vault** counter-narrative archive, interrogates Web3's claims through four lenses: **Structural Analysis**, **Decolonial Critique**, **Technopolitical Terrain**, and **Use Case Reality Check**. We draw on academic, technical, and activist sources to uncover how power often recentralizes in Web3's infrastructure and communities. Deliverables include ScorpyunStyle summaries (poetic deconstructions), Mermaid diagrams of power flows, YAML fragments for structured archiving, and **GriotBox** tweet-length insights distilling the key points. The goal is a multidimensional critique that moves beyond surface utopian promises and grounds the discussion in real-world evidence.

1. Structural Analysis – Decentralization vs. New Centralization

Decentralization Layers: Web3's infrastructure is built on ostensibly decentralized layers – distributed ledgers (blockchains), consensus algorithms (proof-of-work or proof-of-stake), and peer-to-peer networks of nodes. In theory, no single authority controls these networks. For example, anyone can run an Ethereum node or participate in Bitcoin mining, and transactions are validated by community consensus rather than a central server. However, examining these layers reveals *de facto* concentrations of power that undermine the decentralization narrative:

- **Consensus & Validation:** In practice, a small number of entities often control disproportionate shares of mining or staking power. Bitcoin's hashrate, for instance, has long been dominated by a few large mining pools. In Ethereum's new proof-of-stake era, over 30% of all ETH staked is controlled by **Lido Finance**, with major exchanges like Coinbase contributing another ~17% [1] . At one point, Lido's dominance (over 75% of liquid staking) raised concerns that a single protocol could **censor or manipulate** Ethereum transactions [1] . Similarly, many *"decentralized"* blockchains (e.g. BNB Chain, Solana, EOS) rely on a small set of validators or block producers, often selected or influenced by centralized teams or wealthy token holders.

- **Node Infrastructure:** Running a full node is technically open to all, but in reality many users and DApps rely on a few **centralized node providers** for convenience. Services like **Infura** and **Alchemy** (both run by private companies) handle blockchain access for a vast number of Web3 applications [2] . By 2022, an estimated two-thirds of Ethereum nodes were hosted in data centers of just three cloud providers [3] – with over 50% on Amazon Web Services alone [3] . This means a **handful of tech companies (AWS, Hetzner, etc.) host the majority of nodes**, exposing Ethereum to single points of failure and control [3] [4] . Geographic concentration adds another risk: nearly 60% of Ethereum nodes are in the US and Germany [4] , making the network vulnerable to those

governments' interventions. The **Mermaid diagram** below illustrates how ostensibly decentralized user interactions often funnel through centralized choke points in the Web3 stack:

```
flowchart LR
    subgraph Users & Apps
        U(User with Wallet)
        DApp(Web3 DApp Frontend)
    end
    subgraph Blockchain Network
        RPC[[Infura/Alchemy RPC]]
        Validators(Validators / Miners)
        Chain[Blockchain Ledger]
    end
    U -- interacts via --> DApp
    DApp -- API calls --> RPC
    RPC -- submits txns to --> Chain
    Chain -- validated by --> Validators
    subgraph Control Points
        C1(Venture Capital / Investors)
        C2(Centralized Exchanges)
        C3(Node Cloud Hosts)
    end
    C1 -. funds .-> DApp
    C1 -. holds tokens .-> Validators
    C2 -. runs nodes .-> RPC
    C3 -. hosts .-> RPC
    C3 -. hosts .-> Validators
```

(Mermaid diagram: Web3 power flows – although users interface with decentralized networks, many transactions rely on centralized API providers, cloud-hosted nodes, and investor-controlled validators.)

- **Venture Capital Influence:** The ideal of community-owned networks often clashes with the reality of **VC-funded projects**. A small number of venture firms (e.g. a16z, Sequoia, Binance Labs) typically receive large token allocations early on, giving them outsized voting power and control [2] . In top projects, a few investors or founders holding the majority of tokens can effectively steer protocol decisions – the very *"opposite of decentralization"* [2] . Twitter's founder Jack Dorsey famously quipped, *"You don't own Web3. The VCs and their LPs do."* Real-world governance bears this out: in **Uniswap's** DAO, VC firm **a16z** deployed 15 million UNI tokens (its entire stake) in a single vote to try and dictate a bridge integration, raising alarms about corporate influence over a "community" decision [5] . Even though a16z lost that particular vote, it underscored how token-weighted governance lets *whales* act like shareholders, often prioritizing their interests [5] .

- **Platform & API Control:** Many ostensibly decentralized apps rely on centralized web platforms at critical junctures. For example, the largest NFT marketplace **OpenSea** is a private company that can delist or ban users – and it has. In 2022, OpenSea *abruptly banned Iranian artists* and collectors, citing U.S. sanctions compliance [6] . Their NFT assets, while still on the blockchain, were effectively made

illiquid by a centralized marketplace decision. Likewise, popular Web3 wallets like MetaMask **default to Infura** as their backend. Infura (run by ConsenSys) controversially **blocked entire jurisdictions** (such as Venezuela and Iran) due to sanctions – initially even sweeping up unrelated regions through an error [7] [8]. These incidents reveal how **nation-state and corporate power can reassert itself** in Web3, despite the rhetoric of censorship-resistance. Moreover, essential "decentralized" stablecoins are often centrally administered: **Circle** can freeze USDC tokens at will (and did so for addresses linked to Tornado Cash [9]), and **Tether Ltd.** similarly can lock or blacklist funds. Such kill-switches mean **central authorities still hold ultimate power** over ostensibly permissionless finance.

- **Governance Theater:** Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) were supposed to enable collective ownership and decision-making. In practice, many DAOs are **governed by small cliques or wealthy token holders** [2]. Token-based voting is often a plutocracy: those with the most tokens (founders, investors, early adopters) have the greatest voting weight, while everyday community members are effectively disenfranchised. This has led critics to dub many DAO processes *"governance theater,"* where community polling exists but decisions are preordained by whales [10]. A recent example is **Arbitrum's** governance fiasco: the Arbitrum Foundation moved roughly $1 billion in tokens to itself *before* token holders could vote on it, leading to an uproar over "decentralization" as mere optics [11] [12]. The foundation and core team retained huge influence (44% of ARB tokens were allocated to insiders [12]), blurring the line between a "community-run" DAO and a traditional corporate structure. Such episodes demonstrate how **power finds new concentrations** in Web3 – whether through economic might, technical control points, or regulatory chokeholds – even as decentralization is held forth as a guiding ideal.

ScorpyunStyle Summary – *"The New Lords of Decentralization"*

Beneath the honeyed rhetoric of decentralization lies an old pattern: new lords wearing digital crowns. Nodes and tokens scatter across the globe, yet a hidden few reign – the venture barons, cloud landlords, and protocol kings. The castle of Web3 has many gates, but most roads lead to a gatekeeper. In this technofeudal web, power doesn't die; it merely dons a hoodie and calls itself revolutionary. [2] [1]

2. Decolonial Critique – Who Owns and Who Benefits?

Web3's promise of democratization invites the question: democratization for whom? A decolonial analysis examines **who controls access** to crucial resources (minting, staking, governance) and **who is represented** in shaping this new digital economy. From an Africana and global South perspective, there are concerns that Web3 could replicate or even intensify existing inequities, amounting to a new form of *digital colonialism* if left unchecked.

- **Gatekeeping in Minting & Staking:** On paper, anyone can mint an NFT or stake tokens to earn rewards. In reality, **technical and financial barriers** limit participation by marginalized groups. High transaction fees on popular chains (e.g. Ethereum's gas costs) turn into tolls that can price out creators from the global South or working-class users. The ability to **mint art as NFTs** was hailed as a liberatory boon for artists of color, but many faced steep costs to get started and had to rely on centralized platforms (which, as noted, can ban or shadow-ban users). Staking is similarly skewed: to solo-stake ETH requires **32 ETH (tens of thousands of dollars)** – an unrealistic sum for most, forcing small holders into pooled staking services often run by well-capitalized entities. This dynamic means

the *rewards* of Web3 (block rewards, NFT sales, governance influence) accrue largely to those who already have capital or connections, raising the barrier to entry for others. **Access to protocol development** is likewise gated – real influence in core development circles or elite DAO forums often requires insider networks, fluency in technical jargon, and freedom to take financial risks, which are privileges not evenly distributed across racial and global lines.

- **Representation in DAOs and Governance:** Many Web3 communities profess inclusive values, yet studies and observations suggest **lack of diversity remains the norm**. The stereotypical "crypto bro" – young, male, often white or from the global North – still dominates many projects [13] . Governance token holdings are usually concentrated in the hands of early investors and tech insiders, demographics that rarely include Black or Indigenous communities. This means marginalized creators and users have **minimal voice** in governance decisions of DAOs or protocol upgrades. Even when invited into the space, they may find a culture that replicates the biases of Silicon Valley. *"All white males"* was a critique levied at one high-profile NFT collective, prompting belated diversity initiatives [13] . The **language of Web3** (both literally, as English dominates, and figuratively, in its libertarian-capitalist ideology) can alienate those from non-Western traditions. As Africana theorists note, systems ostensibly open to all can still carry the *"encrypted fine print"* of Western liberal values and capitalist logics [14] – values not universally empowering in all contexts. When core tenets like *decentralization, transparency, free markets* are treated as neutral and universal, we risk ignoring how different communities might define or desire digital power structures on their own terms [14] .

- **Colonial Patterns in Web3:** A decolonial critique highlights parallels between historical colonialism and some Web3 ventures. Just as colonial powers once extracted resources under the guise of *"civilizing missions,"* today we see **tech entrepreneurs descending on vulnerable communities with promises of crypto salvation**. Critics have termed this *"crypto-colonialism"* – wealthy, tech-savvy groups using their crypto riches to impose projects on economically weaker regions, often **without local empowerment** [15] . For example, after Hurricane Maria, Puerto Rico became a magnet for crypto investors who sought to build "Puertopia," a crypto-utopia with scant regard for local needs [16] . In countries like Vanuatu, foreign NGOs rolled out blockchain-based aid currencies that locals had no say in governing (Oxfam could unilaterally "switch on" or off the system, eroding local economic sovereignty) [17] [18] . El Salvador's president imposed Bitcoin as legal tender nationwide – a move cheered by international crypto advocates but whose benefits for everyday Salvadorans (many of whom lack internet access) are questionable, and which has drawn protests over lack of consent. These cases echo **paternalistic, extractive interventions**: outside actors choosing tools and terms of engagement, often skirting democratic processes. **NFT markets** can also perpetuate cultural extraction. There have been instances of indigenous art and African cultural heritage being turned into NFTs by outsiders, effectively commodifying sacred traditions for predominantly Western buyers. Marginalized artists who do engage the NFT space often find the **value systems** (bidding wars, speculative flipping) at odds with their communal or spiritual approaches to art. As two scholars put it, *"the economic models behind blockchain and NFTs do not allow radical change to the exploitative structures of capitalism. On the contrary, they re-reinforce them."* [19] Under the banner of *"permissionless innovation,"* Web3 can unintentionally recreate a **digital plantation** where the few harvest profits from the creative labor of the many.

- **Who Governs the "Decentralized" Future:** Decolonial analysis asks: who gets to imagine and build the future of Web3? Right now, the architects of blockchain protocols and token economies are

largely from the **global elite** – often emerging from tech hubs in North America, Europe, and East Asia, backed by Western capital. As Eduardo Navas observes, even if blockchain tech is decentralized *in principle*, the people developing and framing it "are part of, or emerged from, the ruling class," and their ostensibly subversive innovations are quickly **absorbed by the established system** [20] . In other words, Web3 is being woven into the fabric of global capitalism rather than overturning it. For truly decolonial outcomes, marginalized communities would need not just access to use Web3 tools, but **the power to set the agenda** – defining what problems are solved and how. That could mean designing blockchain systems rooted in indigenous concepts of reciprocity, or DAOs structured around communal land stewardship, for instance. Some grassroots efforts are underway (e.g. Afro-tech hubs, Indigenous NFT collectives), but these remain sidelined compared to the million-dollar profile-picture NFT drops or DeFi protocols. **Meaningful inclusion** in Web3 requires more than diversity pledges; it calls for transferring decision-making power and ownership stakes to those historically excluded. Until that happens, Web3 risks becoming a new **simulation of freedom** that leaves deeper structures of inequality untouched.

ScorpyunStyle Summary – *"Decentralization or Digital Colonialism?"*

They promised a borderless Eden, where anyone *could mint their dreams and stake their claim. Yet many arrive to find the gates patrolled by the same old powers – wealth, whiteness, Western norms. In the bazaar of Web3, the coin of the realm is still privilege. The voices of the* wretched of the earth *echo outside, asking if this new world was built* for them *or merely* on top of them*. A true people's internet cannot be minted from the master's tools.* [19] [15]

3. Technopolitical Terrain – Ideology vs. Reality in Web3 Governance

Web3 is often framed in almost revolutionary terms – a response to the ills of Web 2.0 (surveillance capitalism, Big Tech monopolies) and a bulwark against a new era of **technofeudalism**. This section compares Web3's ideological foundations to those of surveillance capitalism, and examines whether Web3's governance experiments (like DAOs) represent a genuine rupture with capitalist hierarchy or a continuation of it under new guises.

- **Web3's Ideology:** Proponents depict Web3 as the antidote to Web2's surveillance capitalism. In Web2, corporations (Google, Facebook, Amazon) amassed wealth and power by harvesting user data – a regime Shoshana Zuboff terms **surveillance capitalism** – creating walled gardens and treating users as products. Web3's rallying cry is *decentralization*: an internet where users own their data, identity, and assets, and communities control platforms via tokens and consensus. This vision explicitly pushes back on what critics call Big Tech's **"technofeudal"** model, where a handful of lords (tech giants) own the land (platforms) and everyone else rents access [21] . By **"centralizing control of digital infrastructure and weaponizing data,"** Big Tech created a vicious cycle of exploitation [22] . Web3 leaders, like Chris Dixon of a16z, cast themselves as heroic rebels "dethroning" these villains [23] . They borrow from the lexicon of open-source and cypherpunk movements, promising to *return the internet to the people.* Importantly, Web3's ideology is not typically anti-capitalist; rather, it argues that **centralization corrupted capitalism** (leading to quasi-feudal power), and that a more *pure*, competitive, decentralized market (turbo-charged by crypto property rights) will restore freedom [22] . In this narrative, tokens align network participants' incentives, blockchains provide transparency, and smart contracts remove the need to trust giant intermediaries. Web3 thus

presents itself as a kind of *techno-libertarian renaissance*, blending Silicon Valley disruption rhetoric with the ideal of digital commons.

- **Surveillance Capitalism vs. Web3:** On the surface, Web3 does address some excesses of surveillance capitalism – for instance, decentralized social networks aim to let users control their content and even profit from it, rather than handing all value to Facebook/Meta. However, a critical look shows that Web3 often *changes the form of exploitation, not necessarily the fact of it*. Web2 platforms profited by *monetizing personal data and attention*; Web3 platforms tend to monetize *ownership and speculation*. Instead of being tracked and advertised to, users in Web3 are induced to financialize every aspect of their online life (posts as NFTs, interactions gamified with tokens). As one critic put it, **Web3 is more a "financialization layer" on top of the internet than a radical new paradigm** [24] . The risk is that Web3's drive for "user ownership" simply turns individuals into mini-capitalists competing in tokenized marketplaces – a continuation of the market logic of surveillance capitalism, just without the centralized overseer. Moreover, Web3 has its own surveillance vectors: blockchains are transparent ledgers, so a *new* breed of watchers has emerged (analytics firms like Chainalysis) that can trace transactions and de-anonymize users. Far from an escape from surveillance, crypto can create **permanent, publicly visible records of our transactions** – a panopticon of a different sort, unless privacy measures are added. In DeFi, every move is recorded on-chain; in NFT communities, one's entire purchase history and net worth can be looked up. Meanwhile, Big Tech isn't disappearing – companies like Meta and Google are investing in Web3 or offering blockchain cloud services, aiming to maintain influence. This raises a poignant question: does Web3 truly *liberate* us from surveillance capitalism, or just decentralize the surveillance and intensify the commodification of our digital lives? Some argue it risks ushering in **"hyper-financialized digital capitalism"** where *everything* is an asset and community is measured in coin – a different dystopia, arguably as alienating as the last.

- **Technofeudal Tendencies:** The term *technofeudalism* has gained traction to describe a system where technology platforms behave like feudal lords – controlling infrastructures and extracting rents, rather than operating in competitive markets. Ironically, even as Web3 champions fight feudal Big Tech, parts of the crypto ecosystem exhibit **feudal characteristics** of their own. In medieval feudalism, power was based on land ownership and vassalage; in technofeudalism, power is based on control of platforms and chokepoints. Consider large crypto exchanges (Coinbase, Binance) – they are centralized gatekeepers for millions entering the crypto world, akin to forts on the digital frontier charging tolls (trading fees) and dictating terms. Major token holders can resemble a nobility: **whales** who hold vast governance power and claim a lion's share of protocol rewards (yield farming sometimes literally calls earnings "rent"), while smaller holders ("serfs") have little say and often rely on big players' "protection" (e.g. following whales' trading signals or accepting centralized custodianship for convenience). The rise of *"play-to-earn"* games in Web3 even created arrangements where wealthy players or guilds lend NFTs to poorer players in exchange for a cut of their earnings – a model some have likened to **digital sharecropping**. In one stark example, during the Axie Infinity craze in the Philippines, less affluent players worked as *scholars* grinding in-game tasks to earn tokens, under contract to *managers* who owned the NFT characters – a hierarchy not unlike feudal tenant farming. These dynamics prompt the question: Is Web3 building digital communes, or **new fiefdoms** where power brokers still rule? Evgeny Morozov noted that both Web3 boosters and critics of surveillance capitalism ultimately diagnose the problem as centralization warping capitalism into "feudal" patterns [21] . Web3's solution is decentralization via markets – but if those markets are quickly dominated by a few (be it by wealth, hashpower, or influence), the specter of

technofeudalism remains. True *algorithmic resistance* – using technology to resist domination – may require deeper changes, such as built-in limits on accumulation (e.g. quadratic voting to reduce whale influence, or protocols that favor egalitarian distribution of rewards).

- **DAOs: Communal Governance or Shareholder Simulacra? Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs)** encapsulate the technopolitical debate. Optimists view DAOs as **revolutionary new governance**: internet-native co-ops where people around the world pool funds and make decisions collectively, without CEOs or politicians – a potential model for everything from managing commons to running companies in a post-capitalist way. There are DAOs experimenting with co-ownership of land, funding public goods, and other novel missions. However, **in practice many DAOs operate like corporations with extra steps**. Most give voting rights in proportion to tokens held, a direct analog of shareholders in a company (one token, one vote, instead of one share, one vote). This *plutocratic* basis means DAOs often end up mirroring capitalist power structures rather than subverting them [10] . A small group of founders and investors typically holds a supermajority of tokens (especially from initial allocations), essentially functioning as a board of directors. The wider token-holding community might be more like non-voting shareholders or at best minor shareholders who can voice opinions on forums. Even the language betrays it: terms like "token **governance**" often mask what is essentially *equity stake management*. There have been instances of **"governance attacks"** where an entity buys up a majority of tokens to push through their agenda, akin to a hostile takeover. In other cases, teams introduce *governance tokens* not to democratize control but to cash in on speculation; governance then becomes performative while the core team retains actual power through code commits or admin keys (so-called *"decentralization theater"*). All of this can make DAOs appear less like the **communal, egalitarian collectives** imagined, and more like simulations of shareholder democracy – *simulacra* that adopt the form of distributed governance but not the substance of equal empowerment. As one analysis notes, major crypto projects are *"not a new paradigm, but a financial skin over the old one,"* turning communities into markets and social capital into economic capital [24] . Still, it's important to note that DAO frameworks are evolving – some DAOs experiment with one-person-one-vote on certain matters, or weighted voting that balances large holders against community sentiment. The question is whether these experiments can overcome the inherent pull of capital concentration. **Will DAOs become the digital** kilombo**** (maroon community) that escapes the empire, or will they just replicate boardroom politics on the blockchain? The jury is out, but early evidence suggests caution: radical governance needs more than tokens and code; it needs intentional design for justice and inclusion.

ScorpyunStyle Summary – *"Rebels or New Pharaohs?"*

Web3 strides onto the stage as the hero to slay surveillance capitalism's hydra, crying freedom through code. And yet, in the cryptopolis, one sees familiar silhouettes: profiteers and pontiffs, robed in jargon of "decentralization." *Is the revolution here, or have the banners of revolt simply been hoisted on castles new-built? DAOs convene in the town square, but whose voice carries? The chain ledgers shine with promise – or perhaps they only etch our chains in eternal digital stone. In the court of Web3, the dream of communal power duels with the gravity of old hierarchies, and the soul of the internet hangs in the balance.* [22] [5]

4. Use Case Reality Check – NFTs & DeFi through a Critical Lens

Beyond theory, Web3's real impact on marginalized communities can be assessed by examining prominent use cases. Two of the most hyped are **NFTs (non-fungible tokens)** – marketed as empowering artists and

creators – and **DeFi (decentralized finance)** – promoted as banking the unbanked. How do these hold up under a critical, anti-colonial lens?

- **NFTs: Liberatory Tools or Digital Neocolonial Assets?** NFTs enable unique digital items (art, music, etc.) to be bought and sold on blockchain. Optimists argued this would **liberate artists** from traditional gatekeepers (galleries, labels) and allow direct support from fans. There have indeed been success stories of Black and global South artists finding buyers via NFTs, raising funds that bypass entrenched biases of the art world [25] [26] . However, the broader NFT ecosystem often mirrors existing inequities and even introduces new forms of exploitation:
- **Concentration of Wealth:** A small number of collections and creators (often already wealthy or well-connected) dominate earnings. In 2021, it was reported that *the top 10% of NFT sellers accounted for the vast majority of revenue*, indicating that "crypto-art" has its own 1%. Marginalized creators on the fringes find it hard to get visibility in a sea of tens of thousands of tokens – unless they align with trends that mostly **cater to Western collector tastes**.
- **Speculation Over Art:** Rather than patronage or cultural exchange, much NFT activity is driven by speculative flipping and "Ponzi-nomics." Many buyers are *not* engaging with the art or cultural narrative but treating NFTs like lottery tickets. This dynamic can reduce artists – including artists of color – to mere providers of *"content"* for speculative profit, a dynamic not unlike how colonial markets treated exotic goods. **Digital objects tied to marginalized cultures risk being appropriated** as novelty collectibles without proper context or benefit to their origin communities. There have been controversies over ethnographic photos or indigenous designs minted as NFTs by people outside those communities, rightly decried as a form of **digital pillaging**.
- **Pyramid Dynamics:** Observers like Gustavo Romano note that NFTs create a "new capitalist pyramid" where a few influencers (often early adopters or celebrities) sit atop masses of latecomers hoping to strike it rich [27] . Those who join the party late – often everyday folks enticed by success stories – are likely to lose money, *"feeding the pyramid and validating its dynamics,"* as Romano says [28] . This pyramid scheme aspect has drawn parallels to multilevel marketing, which has historically preyed on disadvantaged communities with dreams of financial freedom.

- **Community and Cultural Impact:** For Black and brown artists, NFTs present a double-edged sword. They *can* provide a platform to bypass institutional bias – for instance, some African and diasporic artists have sold works as NFTs that might never have made it into Eurocentric galleries. But at the same time, these artists enter a marketplace that may **value their cultural output only as the "next trending asset."** There's a risk of self-exoticization, where creators feel pressured to mint the kind of work that crypto collectors expect (e.g. Afrofuturistic sci-fi themes became trendy, potentially pigeonholing the range of Black expression). The volatility of NFT markets also means an artist's income and reputation can seesaw with the speculative whims of crypto financiers – hardly a stable foundation for creative autonomy. In summary, **NFTs have not unequivocally empowered marginalized creators**; they have given some new opportunities, but within a system that still often amplifies inequality and commodification. As one group of scholars bluntly put it, marginalized groups may turn to NFTs out of necessity – *"excluded from or exploited by traditional markets"* – but *"the economic models behind… NFTs… re-reinforce"* capitalist exploitation rather than overthrowing it [19] . In this sense, an NFT representing, say, a piece of Diaspora history could be seen as a **neocolonial object** – extracting value from culture and history, potentially by and for outsiders, under the banner of innovation.

- **DeFi for the Unbanked: Opportunity or Trap?** Decentralized Finance (DeFi) refers to blockchain-based platforms offering lending, savings, trading, and other financial services without traditional

banks. Advocates argue DeFi can **bank the unbanked** – for example, allowing people in under-served communities to borrow or earn interest using just a smartphone. Could DeFi be a boon for Black communities historically redlined by banks, or for populations in the global South lacking access to credit? There is potential, but a sober look raises several red flags:

- **Financial Inclusion Gaps:** Thus far, the profile of DeFi users skews towards crypto-savvy, already-banked individuals seeking high yields, not the unbanked single mother in Chicago or the rural farmer in Kenya. The on-ramps to DeFi (getting crypto in the first place) often require access to banks or exchanges, ID verification, and internet literacy. Those most excluded by traditional finance are often **less equipped to navigate** the complex, risk-filled world of DeFi apps. A Brookings analysis noted that while **Black and Latino Americans are disproportionately unbanked**, the subset of those groups engaging with crypto tend to be younger and higher-income than the truly unbanked [29] [30] . In other words, crypto isn't yet reaching the *poorest of the poor* in these communities; it's reaching a segment of frustrated but somewhat better-off individuals looking for alternatives.
- **Risk and Volatility: "Heightened risks"** accompany crypto products, and these risks are magnified for historically marginalized groups [31] [32] . If you don't have generational wealth or a safety net, gambling on volatile tokens or unaudited smart contracts can be devastating. Data suggests that Black and Latino crypto holders often have a larger share of their relatively smaller wealth tied up in crypto than white holders do, meaning a market crash hits them harder [32] . When crypto prices collapse (as in 2022), those who hoped crypto might be a ticket out of poverty can end up worse off than before – with no FDIC insurance, no lender of last resort. The DeFi "interest rates" that sound attractive often come with **smart contract risk** or are paid in tokens that can plummet in value. Moreover, predatory scams have proliferated in the crypto space, some explicitly targeting communities of color with false promises (e.g. opportunists holding "seminars" on coin investing in churches or neighborhoods that have seen decades of predatory financial schemes). Without robust consumer protections, DeFi can become a digital Wild West where **the most vulnerable are the easiest prey**.
- **No Safety Nets:** Traditional finance, for all its failings, has some protections (fraud detection, legal recourse, deposit insurance, etc.). In DeFi, if a protocol is hacked or a user is tricked into a phishing scam, the money is just *gone*. This is a heavy ask for communities that have already been systematically denied financial security – to trust their scarce savings to an irreversibly austere system. As Tonantzin Carmona of Brookings put it, **crypto's potential benefits have yet to materialize, while its downsides already pose dangers to vulnerable groups** [33] [34] . Policymakers caution that we should be wary of viewing crypto as a cure-all for financial inclusion in the absence of evidence [31] [34] . In fact, there's a fear that hyping crypto in these communities could **distract from or delay more tangible solutions** (like postal banking, credit unions, or fair lending programs) and even siphon funds from individuals who can least afford losses.

- **Success Stories and Limitations:** That said, there are some grassroots DeFi initiatives trying to serve the marginalized – for example, lending circles using stablecoins, or community DAOs pooling funds for mutual aid. These are promising, but often they simply use crypto rails to do things communities have long done informally (savings clubs, etc.), raising the question of whether blockchain adds value or just complexity. In countries with unstable currencies or repressive regimes, crypto has indeed helped some people **preserve value or access funds** (e.g. activists in Nigeria or Belarus using crypto when banks were shut down for political reasons). Stablecoins have been a lifeline in places like Venezuela for those with access. However, reliance on stablecoins introduces centralization (as with USDC freezes) and other risks (algorithmic stablecoin failures). In

short, DeFi can be *part* of a financial empowerment toolbox, but it is no silver bullet – and if implemented without care, it can amount to **financial experimentation on vulnerable populations**. Critics have warned against making the poor into "guinea pigs" for unproven tech solutions [35] [18] , recalling painful histories where marginalized communities were subject to grand experiments (from colonial economics to 20th-century urban renewal) that didn't pan out in their favor. The term **"crypto-colonialism"** is apt here: pushing crypto as salvation in contexts of poverty may serve the ideological and profit motives of crypto evangelists more than the real needs of those communities [18] [15] .

- **Real-world Example – The** "SuSu" **on the Blockchain:** In some Black communities, traditional rotating savings and credit associations (ROSCAs, known as "sou-sou" in Caribbean and African-American culture) have long been a way to pool and share funds. Imagine a DeFi app that tokenizes a susu – it could, in theory, provide transparency and smart-contract enforced payouts. But if that app is built by outsiders who charge fees or issue a volatile token around it, it might distort the very social fabric that made the susu work, turning a trust-based community practice into a fintech product. This encapsulates the balance between **community innovation and external extraction**. The ethos of Africana solidarity economics – cooperation, mutual aid, skepticism of predatory lending – would need to be baked into the *code* and *governance* of such a platform for it to truly serve the community. Otherwise, the buzzwords of "decentralized finance" risk repackaging age-old ideas with slick interfaces that ultimately siphon value upward.

ScorpyunStyle Summary – *"Chasing Freedom or Chasing Its Tail?"*

NFTs carried the hopes of artists on their backs – and the price tags of speculators on their face. A new patronage, or just a new **auction block**? In the ledger's cold glare, culture becomes token becomes tradeable trinket. DeFi opened its doors to the unbanked – but who stands at those doors, profiting from each entrant? A double-edged coin: on one side, liberation; on the other, a trap. The promise of Web3 flickers in the distance like a neon oasis. But as the weary travelers of history approach, they must ask: is this water, or another mirage?* [27] [32]

YAML Fragments (Anacostia Vault Ingestion)

Below are structured data fragments summarizing key insights from this analysis, formatted as YAML for archival in the **Anacostia Vault** knowledge base:

```
Web3CriticalAnalysis:
  structural_analysis:
    decentralization_layers:
      - "Consensus mechanisms distribute control in theory, but a few entities
often dominate mining/staking (e.g. Lido ~76% of ETH staking at one point) [1] ."
      - "Node infrastructure is decentralized on paper, yet ~69% of Ethereum
nodes run on 3 cloud providers (over half on AWS) [3] , creating central points
of failure [4] ."
      - "Real-world governance is frequently centralized: venture capital firms
and founders hold majority stakes in "community" networks, influencing
decisions off-chain."
```

```
  recentralization_points:
    - "VC-owned tokens give outsized influence to early investors [2] (e.g.
a16z wielding 15M UNI votes in Uniswap governance) [5] ."
    - "Centralized API/infra: Many dApps rely on Infura/Alchemy, meaning
ConsenSys or similar entities can cut off access (as seen in MetaMask Infura's
country blocks) [7] ."
    - "Custodial chokeholds: Stablecoin issuers freeze funds (Circle froze
Tornado Cash-linked USDC) [9] ; marketplaces ban users (OpenSea barring Iranian
accounts) [6] ."
    - "Whale governance theater: Token voting often lets large holders
(whales) decide outcomes, marginalizing small token holders [10] ."
  decolonial_critique:
    power_dynamics:
    - "Access to Web3 creation is gated by cost and knowledge – high gas fees
and technical barriers exclude many in the Global South and marginalized
communities."
    - "Staking and mining require capital or hardware, tilting rewards toward
wealthier (often Western or East Asian) participants."
    - "Protocol governance lacks diversity: Web3 leadership and developer
circles are dominated by Western, male voices [13] , echoing tech's existing
inequality."
    crypto_colonialism:
    - "Wealthy crypto actors impose projects on vulnerable regions under the
guise of innovation (e.g. post-hurricane Puerto Rico "Puertopia") [16] ."
    - "Blockchain aid experiments run by outsiders (e.g. Oxfam's Vanuatu
crypto-relief) can undermine local sovereignty, effectively recentralizing
power in foreign hands [17] [18] ."
    - "Black and Indigenous cultural outputs are sometimes appropriated as
NFTs by non-community members, raising IP and consent concerns (digital
extraction of cultural value)."
    quotes:
    - ""The computing phenomenon itself is inherently colonial… NFTs…
certainly reinforce the legacy of colonial structures." – *Soraya Mostéfaoui &
V. Neumann, via Right Click Save* [36] [19] ."
    - ""Marginalized groups use NFTs… to secure a living… However, the
economic models… do not allow radical change to… capitalism. On the contrary,
they re-reinforce them." [19] ."
  technopolitical_terrain:
    ideology_vs_reality:
    - "Web3 adopts the language of decentralization and ownership to counter
Big Tech's 'surveillance capitalism' [21] , aiming to replace corporate
intermediaries with transparent protocols."
    - "However, Web3 often financializes digital life instead of truly
democratizing it [24] – turning online interactions into tokenized assets can
reproduce exploitative market dynamics."
    - "Web3's privacy trade-offs: replacing Big Tech surveillance with
pervasive on-chain data that companies and governments (via analytics firms)
```

```
can track, unless privacy tech is used."
    technofeudalism:
      - "Web3 critics note new feudal patterns: major token holders act as
lords (controlling protocol votes and fees), while everyday users become akin
to serfs chasing rewards set by others."
      - "Central exchanges and large DeFi platforms can function like fiefdoms,
where power concentrates in platform owners who earn rents (fees) and set
rules, echoing the gatekeepers Web3 meant to bypass."
      - "Yanis Varoufakis and others argue that today's digital economy is
sliding into 'techno-feudalism'; Web3's challenge is to avoid replicating the
old lord-and-vassal structures under a decentralized veneer."
    DAO_governance:
      - "DAOs promise flat, communal governance, but many default to plutocracy
(token-weighted voting) – effectively a shareholder system on-chain [10] ."
      - "Recent controversies (e.g. Arbitrum Foundation moving funds pre-vote,
Uniswap's a16z vote drama) highlight how 'decentralized' governance can be
overridden or manipulated by insiders [11] [5] ."
      - "Some DAOs experiment with novel models (one-person-one-vote, quadratic
voting, community veto rights) to resist pure capitalist dynamics – with mixed
success so far."
  use_case_reality_check:
    NFTs:
      - "NFTs have enabled new revenue streams for some marginalized artists
(bypassing traditional gatekeepers) [25] , but overall NFT wealth is concentrated
and driven by speculation."
      - "NFT markets can commodify cultural heritage and reinforce
exploitation: e.g., a few influencers profit, latecomers (often from
marginalized groups) bear losses in a "capitalist pyramid" structure [27] ."
      - "Cases of cultural appropriation via NFTs (selling Indigenous art or
Black historical images as NFTs without community consent) point to 'digital
neocolonialism' in the art world."
    DeFi:
      - "DeFi offers theoretical access to financial services without banks
(loans, savings, remittances), which could benefit unbanked communities if
designed and implemented well."
      - "In practice, DeFi's user base and benefits skew toward the already
tech-literate or financially comfortable. Those truly unbanked face hurdles:
tech access, education, volatility risk, scams."
      - "Lack of safety nets in DeFi means failures hit marginalized users
hardest – no insurance or legal recourse, and wealth gaps mean Black and Latino
investors suffer outsized harm from losses [32] ."
      - "Regulators and researchers warn that crypto's inclusion benefits are
unproven and may be oversold [31] [34] ; improving equitable access to finance
likely requires parallel reforms outside crypto."
```

(The YAML above captures key points for archival, including source citations in context where applicable.)

GriotBox Deconstructions – Tweet-Thread Insights

GriotBox distills the above analysis into tweet-length provocations, channeling the griot's role of truth-telling in concise rhythm:

1. **Web3 wears the mask of decentralization**, but look closely – power has just traded hands. The same capital that ruled Web2 often sits atop Web3's most prized networks [2] . New tech, old empires.
2. **The decentralization illusion**: Thousands of nodes worldwide, yet a few data centers and cloud providers host the majority [3] . Code is law, until Amazon pulls the plug or a venture fund pulls the strings.
3. **Who is *not* at the table?** The DAO "community" may be global, but turnout is low and tokens gravitate to the wealthy. The voices of the marginalized get drowned in governance token weightings [10] . Democracy needs more than an airdrop.
4. **Decolonizing Web3 is an uphill battle**. When crypto projects parachute into vulnerable communities touting "financial freedom," sometimes it's just colonialism in code [15] . Empowerment can't be airdropped; it must be built with, not for, the people.
5. **NFTs: Liberation or extraction?** They said artists could finally own their market, but many NFTs turned culture into a speculative stock. [27] For every Black artist who sells a piece, how many others watch their heritage get resold by strangers?
6. **DeFi's double edge**: It promises banking for the unbanked – and delivers risk without safety nets. In Black and brown communities, a bad bet on crypto isn't just a lesson, it's a livelihood on the line [32] . Who carries the burden of this grand experiment?
7. **Technofeudalism 2.0** – In Web3, we've dethroned the kings of data, only to crown the kings of crypto. A future where **whales** and **validators** rule isn't the decentralized dream we ordered. It's a new castle on the same foundation.
8. **Algorithmic resistance or algorithmic supremacy?** Web3's creed was *"trust math, not men."* But when the math is set by men with money, the result can look awfully familiar. True resistance means redesigning the game, not just replaying it on a blockchain.

Sources: This analysis drew on critical perspectives and current case studies from 2022-2025. Key references include: evidence of centralization in Web3 infrastructure [2] [3] , decolonial critiques of blockchain's power structures [19] [15] , comparisons of Web3 ideology to Big Tech capitalism [22] , and evaluations of NFTs/DeFi impacts on marginalized groups [27] [32] , among others. The full list of sources and citations is embedded throughout the text above, supporting each claim and example with academic, technical, and journalistic evidence.

---

[1] Staking in Crypto: A Comprehensive Comparison of the Best Staking Pools for 2024 - BlockApps Inc.
https://blockapps.net/blog/staking-in-crypto-a-comprehensive-comparison-of-the-best-staking-pools-for-2024/

[2] [10] [24] The idea that Web3 is a false narrative is a criticism that's gained traction among certain... | by Retro fusion Gmes | Mar, 2025 | Medium
https://medium.com/@3monkeygames/the-idea-that-web3-is-a-false-narrative-is-a-criticism-thats-gained-traction-among-certain-082ad5cf56d7

[3] [4] 3 cloud providers accounting for over two-thirds of Ethereum nodes: Data

https://cointelegraph.com/news/3-cloud-providers-accounting-for-over-two-thirds-of-ethereum-nodes-data

[5] Uniswap Vote on BNB Deployment Ends With Silicon Valley's A16Z on Losing Side

https://www.coindesk.com/tech/2023/02/10/uniswap-vote-on-bnb-deployment-ends-with-silicon-valleys-a16z-on-losing-side

[6] OpenSea Bars Iranian Users as US Sanctions Talk Ramps Up

https://www.coindesk.com/policy/2022/03/03/opensea-bars-iranian-users-as-us-sanctions-talk-ramps-up

[7] [8] MetaMask, Infura Block 'Certain Areas' Amid Crypto Sanctions Fury

https://www.coindesk.com/policy/2022/03/03/metamask-infura-block-certain-areas-amid-crypto-sanctions-fury

[9] Understanding Tornado Cash, Its Sanctions Implications, and Key Compliance Questions - Chainalysis

https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/tornado-cash-sanctions-challenges/

[11] [12] Arbitrum Co-Founder Addresses DAO Vote Fiasco, Waves Off Allegations of 'Decentralization Theater'

https://www.coindesk.com/tech/2023/04/27/arbitrum-co-founder-addresses-dao-vote-fiasco-waves-off-allegations-of-decentralization-theater

[13] 'All White Males:' Proof Opens Up on Moving Beyond Stereotypes

https://nftnow.com/news/web3-companies-are-striving-for-diverse-communities-heres-how/

[14] NFTs and the Risk of Perpetual Colonialism

https://www.rightclicksave.com/article/nfts-and-the-risk-of-perpetual-colonialism

[15] [16] [17] [18] [35] Crypto-Colonialists Use the Most Vulnerable People in the World as Guinea Pigs

https://www.vice.com/en/article/crypto-colonialists-use-the-most-vulnerable-people-in-the-world-as-guinea-pigs/

[19] [20] [27] [28] [36] Is it Possible to Decolonize the Blockchain and NFTs?

https://www.rightclicksave.com/article/is-it-possible-to-decolonize-the-blockchain-and-nfts

[21] [22] [23] Expansive and extractive networks of Web3

https://research.monash.edu/files/477566443/448468281_oa.pdf

[25] [26] What is the Value of African Art? NFTs and Web3 Experimentation

https://theflip.africa/newsletter/african-nft-art-web3

[29] [30] [31] [32] [33] [34] Debunking the narratives about cryptocurrency and financial inclusion

https://www.brookings.edu/articles/debunking-the-narratives-about-cryptocurrency-and-financial-inclusion/