

CROOKED BOOMERS AND VULTURE CAPITAL

STUPID
BOOMERS,
CRYPTO'S
FOR KIDS!

CROOKED BOOMERS AND VULTURE CAPITAL

Part I: Understanding the Boomer Mindset - Control, Debt, and Extraction

1. **Introduction: The Battle for Sovereignty in a Boomer World**
 - A new era of decentralized innovation
 - How the boomer mentality still dominates
 - The rise of Web 3 and the crypto kids
2. **Chapter 1: Debt Slavery - The Boomer Legacy of Money as Control**
 - How boomers turned money into debt
 - The financial systems of control: TradFi and indentured servitude
 - Breaking free with crypto: A new paradigm of sovereign individuals
3. **Chapter 2: The Boomer Invasion of Crypto - Old World Tactics in a New World**
 - How boomer investors are creeping into crypto
 - The threat of TradFi infiltrating decentralized systems
 - Defending against the centralization of Web 3
4. **Chapter 3: Web 2 Investment Models vs. Web 3 - Why Convertible Notes Are Trash**
 - TradFi's debt-driven fundraising methods
 - Convertible notes and their pitfalls for crypto founders
 - ICOs, SAFTs, and new crypto fundraising models
5. **Chapter 4: LARPer Crypto Funds - Boomer Capital in Disguise**
 - Fake decentralization and the threat of LARPer funds
 - How boomer LPs undermine crypto founders
 - Protecting crypto projects from boomer-backed influence

Part II: Defending Decentralization

6. **Chapter 5: Decentralized Governance - The Heart of Sovereignty**
 - Why decentralization matters in Web 3
 - DAOs and the power of community-driven governance
 - Safeguarding DAOs from boomer capital
7. **Chapter 6: The Boomer Threat to Decentralized Ventures**
 - The real estate executives and vulture capitalists trying to hijack crypto
 - Why the boomer debt mentality has no place in decentralized systems
 - How to build governance models that resist boomers
8. **Chapter 7: Real-World Assets (RWAs) - A Trojan Horse for Debt Slavery**
 - Tokenizing real estate and the dangers of boomer infiltration
 - How former real estate executives are pushing outdated investment models
 - Building sovereign, debt-free RWA platforms

9. Chapter 8: The Decentralization Revolution - Sovereign Individuals and the Global Shift

- What it means to be a sovereign individual
- Crypto's disruption of financial control, trust-based systems, and capital
- The global implications of decentralization in governance, politics, and society

Part III: Sovereignty vs. Boomerism

10. Chapter 9: The Regulatory Backlash - Governments and the Fight Against Crypto Sovereignty

- How boomers are pushing governments to regulate crypto
- The threat of centralized control and how crypto kids are resisting
- Privacy, DAOs, and decentralized governance as defense mechanisms

11. Chapter 10: The DAO Revolution - Decentralizing Power Beyond Finance

- DAOs as the ultimate expression of decentralized governance
- How DAOs are disrupting traditional power structures
- The threat of boomer interference in DAO governance

12. Chapter 11: Centralized AI and the Boomer Threat - The Battle for Control of Human Intelligence

- The danger of boomer-controlled AI
- How centralized AI could be weaponized for control and surveillance
 - Building decentralized AI systems to protect sovereignty

Part IV: Crypto Kids and the Future

13. Chapter 12: Web 3 and the Creator Economy - Reclaiming Creativity from the Boomer Media Cartels

- The boomer media monopoly and its control over creativity
- How NFTs and decentralized platforms are empowering creators
- Crypto kids reclaiming power from media gatekeepers

14. Chapter 13: Education and Knowledge in a Decentralized World - Breaking the Boomer Stranglehold on Academia

- The boomer-controlled academic system of debt and control
- Decentralized education and peer-to-peer knowledge creation
- Rebuilding education through Web 3 and blockchain credentials

15. Chapter 14: The Final Battle - The Future of Crypto Governance vs. Boomer Centralization

- The boomer attack on decentralized governance
- Resisting capital-driven governance in DAOs and Web 3 platforms
- The future of decentralized power and community-driven decision-making

16. Chapter 15: Conclusion - Building a Decentralized Future for Sovereign Individuals

- A world of sovereignty, meritocracy, and decentralization
- Rejecting boomer control once and for all
- The unstoppable momentum of the Web 3 revolution

Introduction:

The Legacy of Debt-Based Finance

For much of modern history, the financial system has been defined by a fundamental principle: **money is debt**. The evolution of this idea—now ingrained in both personal and institutional financial behavior—shaped the world economy and, by extension, human society. To understand how this idea came to dominate, we must look closely at how financial systems have developed over centuries, beginning with early banking practices and leading up to the modern debt-based economy.

The Birth of Debt as Money

The foundation of debt as the basis of money can be traced back to the rise of **fractional-reserve banking** during the Renaissance. In medieval and early modern Europe, goldsmiths, who stored precious metals for people, began issuing receipts for the gold. These receipts became an early form of paper money, circulating as currency, as they represented a claim on the gold stored in the goldsmith's vaults. However, goldsmiths soon realized they could issue more receipts than they had gold in reserve, as not everyone would demand their gold back at the same time. Thus, the practice of lending more than what was physically available became normalized.

This was the origin of **fractional-reserve banking**, a system in which banks keep only a fraction of their deposits in reserve and lend out the rest. The money lent out is not backed by actual reserves but is created out of thin air. This practice, codified into law over time, allowed for the creation of new money with every loan issued, establishing the key principle that **money is debt**. Every dollar, euro, or pound in circulation, for the most part, exists because someone, somewhere, has taken on debt.

By the time of the **Industrial Revolution**, debt-financed economic growth became the dominant model in Western economies. Nations built vast infrastructures, corporations expanded their influence, and individuals began leveraging their future earnings to buy property, businesses, and consumer goods. The economy itself became dependent on the continuous creation of debt to maintain growth.

Debt in the 20th Century: A New Normal

The **20th century** witnessed the full institutionalization of debt-based finance. The creation of central banks, starting with the **Federal Reserve** in the United States in 1913, helped solidify the role of debt as the driving force behind economic growth. Central banks became the lenders of last resort, controlling the supply of money by managing interest rates and lending to commercial banks.

This system worked symbiotically with the rise of government-issued bonds and securities, as governments themselves became deeply dependent on borrowing to fund public spending. The U.S. government's issuance of **Treasury Bonds** became one of the most reliable forms of investment in the global economy. Corporations followed suit, issuing corporate bonds and leveraging their capital to expand.

During **World War II**, nations across the globe borrowed massively to fund their war efforts. After the war, much of the Western world, particularly the U.S., enjoyed a post-war boom, financed largely by debt. This period is often romanticized as the "Golden Age of Capitalism," but it was built on the same debt model that would later lead to inflation, recessions, and financial crises. **Economic prosperity** in the post-war era became synonymous with credit expansion—this was the heyday of **consumer credit**.

The Consumer Credit Revolution

The post-war **baby boomers** came of age during a time when the consumer credit system flourished. Boomers were the first generation to experience easy access to credit cards, car loans, and home mortgages on a massive scale. Financial institutions actively promoted debt as a tool for the average consumer to achieve the American Dream. For example, in the 1950s, **Diners Club** introduced the first credit card, and by the 1960s, major banks like **Bank of America** followed suit with the **BankAmericard**, now known as **Visa**.

The American Dream became inextricably linked to homeownership, and by the 1980s, the vast majority of Americans who owned homes did so with the help of mortgages. The idea that borrowing could be a way to create wealth took root, and many boomers built their personal wealth through home ownership, enabled by mortgages and the appreciation of property values.

The cultural normalization of debt did not stop with mortgages. The idea of "**buy now, pay later**" permeated every aspect of consumer life. People took on credit card debt to pay for vacations, education, cars, and other luxuries they could not afford outright. For boomers, this became a normalized way of life. Even businesses embraced debt as a means of growth, issuing bonds and taking out loans to finance expansion.

The Downside: Debt Slavery and Indentured Servitude

What went largely unnoticed in this cultural shift was the dark side of debt-driven growth. By making debt so easily accessible, individuals, corporations, and governments alike became ensnared in a system of **debt slavery**—a modern version of indentured servitude.

Personal Debt: The Trap of Student Loans and Credit Cards

One of the most visible forms of debt slavery in modern times is the student loan crisis. In the U.S. alone, student debt surpassed \$1.6 trillion by 2020, with millions of graduates entering the workforce burdened by loans they may never be able to repay. Unlike other forms of consumer debt, student loans are notoriously difficult to discharge in bankruptcy, leaving many individuals stuck with repayments for decades. This systemic issue has a ripple effect: graduates delay buying homes, starting families, or investing in their futures because they are burdened by student loans. This is a far cry from the post-WWII era, when the GI Bill provided returning soldiers with free college education and affordable home loans.

Mortgages and the Illusion of Ownership

Even home ownership, once seen as the ticket to middle-class wealth, became a form of debt bondage. As housing prices skyrocketed, people took out increasingly larger mortgages, often with risky adjustable rates. The **2008 financial crisis**, which was fueled by the collapse of the subprime mortgage market, exposed the vulnerability of this system. Millions of Americans lost their homes in the wake of the housing bubble burst, while others were left owing more on their homes than they were worth—a concept known as **negative equity**.

This crisis wasn't just an American phenomenon. Similar housing bubbles had developed in countries such as **Spain**, **Ireland**, and the **United Kingdom**, and their collapses left millions of homeowners in financial ruin. What the 2008 crisis demonstrated was that, when entire economies are built on debt, they are vulnerable to collapse when credit dries up or when borrowers can no longer meet their obligations.

Government Debt: A Global Issue

Governments, too, are not immune from the cycle of debt. The U.S. national debt, for example, surpassed \$33 trillion in 2024. Other countries face similar challenges, with debt-to-GDP ratios exceeding sustainable levels. This has led to austerity measures, particularly in countries like **Greece**, where the debt crisis of the 2010s resulted in severe cutbacks in public services, pensions, and infrastructure spending, leading to widespread social unrest.

This cycle of borrowing to sustain growth, with little concern for long-term consequences, has led to systemic instability in the global economy. We are all participants in this debt-based system, whether we like it or not. Debt is not just a financial mechanism but has become a tool of control, shaping the choices and futures of individuals, corporations, and nations.

Systemic Risk: The Fragility of the Debt Economy

The inherent instability of a debt-based economy was exposed during the **2008 global financial crisis**. The crisis began in the United States, where years of reckless lending practices and the packaging of subprime mortgages into complex financial products (known as **mortgage-backed securities**) created a financial house of cards. When homeowners began to default on their mortgages, the entire financial system came crashing down, leading to a global recession.

Governments and central banks were forced to intervene to prevent the collapse of the financial system. Trillions of dollars were pumped into the global economy through **bailouts, stimulus packages, and quantitative easing** programs. While these interventions temporarily stabilized the economy, they did nothing to address the root cause of the crisis: the overreliance on debt.

Today, the global economy remains as fragile as ever. Many of the same practices that led to the 2008 crisis continue, with consumer debt, corporate debt, and government debt all at record levels. The system is essentially a Ponzi scheme, dependent on the continued creation of new debt to pay off existing debt.

The next crisis is not a question of **if** but **when**. And when it happens, it will expose the inherent flaws of a financial system built on the assumption that debt can grow infinitely in a world of finite resources.

Is There a Better Way?

As we will explore in the following chapters, the rise of cryptocurrency and decentralized finance (DeFi) offers an alternative to the debt-based economy. These technologies have the potential to create a financial system where individuals are not beholden to central banks, governments, or corporations. By decentralizing power and putting control back in the hands of individuals, crypto presents a path toward financial sovereignty.

Chapter 1: The Boomer Worldview – Debt as a Way of Life

The baby boomer generation, born between 1946 and 1964, emerged during a time of unparalleled prosperity and economic expansion. The boomers grew up in a world that was reshaped by post-war reconstruction, technological innovation, and the creation of a global consumer society. However, their worldview of personal finance, investing, and wealth accumulation was deeply shaped by a system that viewed **debt not only as a necessary evil but as an essential tool for success**. Over the decades, this generational mindset became the cornerstone of modern finance, deeply entrenching the concept that debt is an inevitable and desirable component of economic life.

Post-War Prosperity and the Foundation of Debt Culture

In the aftermath of World War II, the world—particularly the United States—underwent a period of dramatic economic expansion. The combination of **government investment, private sector innovation**, and a growing consumer class fueled a decades-long boom that saw the rise of suburban living, mass consumerism, and a dramatic expansion in personal wealth. But this prosperity was not built purely on production and innovation. Instead, it was underpinned by the burgeoning use of debt.

During this time, government programs like the **GI Bill** made homeownership accessible to millions of returning soldiers by providing low-interest loans. This surge in home buying fueled the suburban boom of the 1950s and '60s, forever linking the American Dream with the ability to leverage debt for homeownership. At the same time, corporations began issuing more bonds to finance their expansions, further integrating debt into the business model of the American economy.

For the boomers, debt became the key to unlocking the prosperity they saw around them. As they came of age in the 1960s and 1970s, boomers were presented with a radically different financial reality from their parents. Where the Greatest Generation had experienced the **Great Depression** and had been wary of taking on debt, boomers were actively encouraged to embrace credit. This generational shift would have profound consequences for how boomers viewed not only their own finances but the very structure of the economy itself.

The Consumer Credit Revolution of the 1960s and 1970s

The 1960s ushered in the era of **consumer credit** on a massive scale. Credit cards, initially a niche product for affluent consumers, became democratized as companies like **American Express** and **Diners Club** began offering cards to the middle class. But it wasn't until **Bank of America** introduced the **BankAmericard** (which would later become Visa) in 1958 that the credit card truly became a fixture of American financial life. By the 1970s, other major banks had followed suit, and credit card use exploded across the United States and other Western nations.

The 1970s were also marked by the growth of the financial services industry, which increasingly marketed debt as a tool of personal empowerment. Ads from that era often portrayed credit cards as a way to enjoy life now and pay later. Consumers were told that they could have the finer things in life immediately, without waiting to save up. This was an entirely new concept for the average consumer. For previous generations, purchases like homes, cars, and large consumer goods were often made with cash or substantial down payments. Now, with the rise of credit, people were encouraged to buy what they couldn't afford today and worry about paying it off in the future.

The impact of this was dramatic. Over the course of a few decades, credit card debt became a permanent fixture in the lives of millions of boomers. The **Federal Reserve** reports that by the 1980s, the average American household had thousands of dollars in credit card debt, and the total amount of consumer credit outstanding had ballooned to hundreds of billions of dollars. For boomers, debt had become a normalized part of life. It was no longer something to be avoided but rather something to be managed.

Mortgages: The Path to Middle-Class Wealth

If credit cards were the means by which boomers could live beyond their immediate means, **mortgages** were the tool by which they built their wealth. The rise of the **30-year mortgage** during the post-war era was revolutionary. It made homeownership accessible to millions of families who could not have afforded to buy homes outright. The boomers were the prime beneficiaries of this system.

Homeownership became the bedrock of middle-class wealth in the post-war era. Boomers bought homes at relatively low prices in the 1970s and 1980s, financed by fixed-rate mortgages that locked in affordable payments for decades. As housing prices steadily increased, many boomers saw their home equity rise substantially, providing them with a sense of financial security and prosperity.

The real estate market became a machine for wealth generation, driven by the availability of credit. **Fannie Mae** and **Freddie Mac**, two government-sponsored enterprises, played a significant role in this process by purchasing mortgages from banks and selling them as mortgage-backed securities (MBS). This system ensured a constant flow of capital into the housing market, making it easier for boomers to secure financing for homes.

By the 1990s, as housing prices continued to rise, many boomers began to view their homes not just as places to live but as financial assets that could be leveraged. **Home equity loans** became a popular financial tool, allowing homeowners to borrow against the increased value of their homes. The logic was simple: Why let the equity in your home sit idle when you could borrow against it to fund renovations, vacations, or even pay off other debts?

This cycle of borrowing against home equity became so ingrained in boomer financial thinking that it was rarely questioned. As long as home prices continued to rise, it seemed like a risk-free way to access cheap capital. But this system, like the broader debt economy, was built on a fragile foundation. When the housing bubble burst in 2008, many boomers found themselves with homes that were worth less than their mortgages. The strategy of leveraging home equity backfired, and millions faced foreclosure or bankruptcy.

Debt as Leverage: The Boomer Financial Philosophy

Boomers didn't just embrace debt for personal use; they also adopted it as a cornerstone of their investment philosophy. By the 1980s, **leveraged buyouts (LBOs)** and corporate raiding had become commonplace on Wall Street. This was a direct result of the growing belief that debt could be used to enhance returns. Investors and corporate managers began to realize that by borrowing money to finance acquisitions or expansions, they could amplify their profits, as long as the cost of debt was lower than the returns on investment.

This is where we see the rise of **vulture capitalists**—those who would buy struggling companies, load them with debt, strip them of assets, and sell them for a profit. This practice became emblematic of the 1980s financial culture, immortalized in movies like *Wall Street*. The mantra of the era was "Greed is good," and boomers were at the forefront of this new, debt-fueled capitalism.

The Institutionalization of Debt in Corporate America

Boomers were also the driving force behind the **financialization** of the U.S. economy. In previous decades, corporate America had focused on building long-term value through production and innovation. But by the 1980s, the emphasis shifted toward using financial instruments—particularly debt—to drive short-term profits. Corporations began issuing bonds at record rates, and the stock market became increasingly reliant on leveraged trading.

The boomers, many of whom had entered the workforce in the 1970s and 1980s, embraced this new form of capitalism. They saw it as a way to increase shareholder value and generate wealth for themselves and their companies. This was the era of **junk bonds**, popularized by financiers like **Michael Milken**, which allowed companies to raise capital even if they had poor credit ratings. The riskier the bond, the higher the potential return, and for boomers looking to maximize profits, this was an attractive proposition.

Boomers also played a key role in the expansion of the **private equity** industry, where firms would use large amounts of debt to acquire companies, restructure them, and sell them for a profit. This model of **buyouts financed by debt** became a defining feature of the boomer generation's approach to business. The logic was simple: Debt was cheap, and as long as the returns were higher than the cost of borrowing, it was a winning strategy.

But this approach had its downsides. Companies that took on massive amounts of debt were often left in precarious financial positions. They were forced to cut costs, lay off workers, and sell off assets to meet their debt obligations. For the boomers in charge, this was simply good business. But for the workers and communities affected by these practices, it was devastating.

Boomer Wealth Through Debt: A Double-Edged Sword

As boomers grew older and wealthier, their relationship with debt became more complex. On the one hand, debt had allowed many of them to accumulate significant wealth, particularly through homeownership and investments in the stock market. But on the other hand, debt had also left many boomers financially vulnerable.

By the time boomers began retiring in the 2010s and 2020s, many of them were still carrying significant debt loads. A report by the **Federal Reserve** found that nearly half of all boomers carried credit card debt into retirement, and many were still paying off mortgages or home equity loans. This debt burden made it difficult for many boomers to enjoy the retirement they had planned for.

Moreover, the rising cost of healthcare, combined with the erosion of traditional pension systems, left many boomers financially insecure. While they had embraced debt as a means of building wealth, many found themselves in a precarious financial position as they aged, relying on Social Security and dwindling 401(k) savings to make ends meet.

The boomer generation's embrace of debt, both personally and professionally, had far-reaching consequences. It created an economy that was reliant on borrowing, where financial stability was increasingly dependent on the availability of cheap credit. This worldview, rooted in the belief that debt could be used as leverage for financial success, would later clash with the principles of cryptocurrency and decentralized finance (DeFi), as we will explore in later chapters.

Boomers and Debt Slavery: The Larger Impact on Society

Perhaps the most significant consequence of the boomer generation's reliance on debt is the **debt slavery** it perpetuated for future generations. Millennials and Gen Z, who grew up in the shadow of the boomer financial philosophy, inherited a world where debt was not just a tool but a trap.

Boomers, having benefited from rising home prices, access to affordable higher education, and the expansion of credit, left younger generations with a much more precarious financial landscape. Housing prices have skyrocketed, student loan debt has reached unsustainable levels, and wages have stagnated for decades. This has left younger generations with fewer opportunities to build wealth, forcing them into a cycle of debt from which it is increasingly difficult to escape.

Chapter 2: Enter Crypto

A New Paradigm for Sovereign Individuals

In the wake of the **2008 financial crisis**, the failures of the debt-based financial system became glaringly obvious. The crisis, which had its roots in reckless lending and the overextension of credit, exposed the inherent fragility of an economy built on debt. In response to this collapse, a new financial technology emerged—**cryptocurrency**. At its core, cryptocurrency promised a way to move beyond the debt-driven economy and toward a system where individuals could achieve **financial sovereignty**.

The birth of **Bitcoin** in 2009, created by the pseudonymous figure **Satoshi Nakamoto**, marked the beginning of this paradigm shift. In this chapter, we will explore the origins of cryptocurrency and decentralized finance (DeFi), the principles upon which they were built, and the ways in which they offer a new model of finance that directly challenges the traditional debt-based system embraced by boomers and the institutions they built.

Bitcoin: The Origin of a Revolution

When **Satoshi Nakamoto** released the Bitcoin whitepaper in 2008, the world was still reeling from the global financial collapse. The timing could not have been more perfect. The world had just witnessed the collapse of **Lehman Brothers**, the bailout of **AIG**, and the cratering of global stock markets. People had lost faith in the traditional financial system, and there was a growing awareness that the system itself was flawed.

Bitcoin was designed to be a **peer-to-peer electronic cash system** that did not rely on any central authority. Unlike fiat currencies, which were controlled by central banks and subject to inflationary pressures, Bitcoin was finite in supply—only 21 million coins would ever be created. This scarcity was designed to protect the currency from the inflationary policies that central banks often resorted to in times of crisis, such as **quantitative easing**.

The decentralized nature of Bitcoin was also revolutionary. In traditional finance, individuals and businesses rely on **intermediaries** like banks, payment processors, and clearinghouses to conduct transactions. Bitcoin eliminated the need for these intermediaries by using **blockchain technology**—a distributed ledger that records all transactions transparently and immutably. This meant that individuals could send and receive money without relying on third parties, thereby reducing costs and increasing security.

But Bitcoin was more than just a new form of digital money. It was a **philosophical statement**. Nakamoto's whitepaper was a manifesto against the centralized control of money, particularly the way in which central banks and governments could manipulate the supply of money through monetary policy. In a system where money is debt, individuals are beholden to the financial decisions of others. Bitcoin, by contrast, gave individuals **sovereignty over their own wealth**.

The rise of Bitcoin was slow at first, but over the years, it gained traction as more people became disillusioned with traditional finance. Early adopters were drawn to Bitcoin not just because it was a technological innovation, but because it represented a **new financial ideology**—one based on the principles of decentralization, hard money, and financial autonomy.

The Evolution of Cryptocurrency: Ethereum and DeFi

While Bitcoin was the first cryptocurrency to gain widespread adoption, it was soon followed by a host of other digital assets, each with its own unique characteristics and use cases. The most significant of these was **Ethereum**, which was launched in 2015 by a group of developers led by **Vitalik Buterin**.

Unlike Bitcoin, which was designed primarily as a form of digital money, Ethereum was created as a **decentralized platform** for building applications. The key innovation of Ethereum was the introduction of **smart contracts**—self-executing contracts where the terms of the agreement are written directly into code. This allowed for the creation of **decentralized applications (dApps)** that could run autonomously without the need for intermediaries.

Smart contracts opened the door to the world of **decentralized finance (DeFi)**. In the traditional financial system, banks and other financial institutions act as gatekeepers, controlling access to credit, savings, and investment products. DeFi, by contrast, uses smart contracts to create financial products and services that are **open, permissionless, and decentralized**. Anyone with an internet connection can access DeFi platforms, borrow, lend, trade, and earn interest without relying on a bank or financial institution.

The rise of DeFi represented a dramatic shift away from the debt-based model of traditional finance. In DeFi, there is no need for central banks or financial intermediaries to create or manage credit. Instead, individuals can interact directly with protocols and smart contracts, creating a system that is **trustless** and **transparent**.

Moreover, many DeFi platforms operate on the principle of **collateralization**, where users must lock up their assets as collateral to take out loans or participate in financial activities. This is in stark contrast to the traditional banking system, where fractional-reserve lending allows banks to lend out far more money than they actually have in reserves. In DeFi, because everything is collateralized, the risk of **over-leveraging** is reduced, creating a more stable and sustainable financial system.

Financial Sovereignty and Meritocracy

At its core, cryptocurrency and decentralized finance offer the promise of **financial sovereignty**. In a traditional financial system, individuals must rely on banks and governments to manage their money. They are subject to the whims of central banks, which can devalue their currency through inflation or restrict access to funds through capital controls. In the crypto world, individuals have full control over their assets, free from the interference of third parties.

This level of financial sovereignty also levels the playing field, creating a system where merit, rather than access to capital, determines success. In the traditional financial world, those with the most money or connections often have the most power. But in the world of crypto, power is distributed more evenly. Projects are often run by **decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs)**, where decisions are made collectively by the community rather than by a centralized board of directors.

Take, for example, the **MakerDAO** project, which created the **DAI** stablecoin. MakerDAO is governed by a community of token holders who vote on key decisions, such as interest rates and collateral requirements. This governance model ensures that no single entity has outsized control over the system. It is a true meritocracy, where decisions are made based on the contributions and expertise of participants, rather than the size of their bank accounts.

In the world of DeFi, even small investors can have a voice in the development and governance of projects. This is a radical departure from the traditional financial system, where shareholders with the most capital have the most influence. In crypto, **investors, developers, and users** are all stakeholders in the system, and their contributions are valued equally.

A New Economic Model

Cryptocurrency and DeFi are more than just financial innovations; they represent a new economic model—one that is **decentralized, permissionless, and inclusive**. In this new model, individuals are not beholden to banks or central authorities. Instead, they have the freedom to participate in financial markets on their own terms, with the potential for greater autonomy and financial independence.

Moreover, the decentralized nature of these platforms ensures that no single entity can control or manipulate the system. This is a direct challenge to the debt-based economy of the traditional financial world, where central banks and governments have the power to devalue currency and impose financial repression on their citizens.

The promise of crypto is not just financial freedom but also the opportunity to **reshape the global financial system**. By decentralizing control and creating systems that are open to all, crypto has the potential to break down the barriers that have traditionally kept people out of the financial system, particularly those in **developing countries** who lack access to banking services.

Real-World Examples of Financial Sovereignty

One of the most striking examples of crypto's potential can be seen in **Venezuela**, a country that has been plagued by hyperinflation and economic collapse. For years, the Venezuelan government has printed money to fund its deficits, leading to runaway inflation that has rendered the national currency, the **bolívar**, virtually worthless. In response, many Venezuelans have turned to Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies as a way to store value and conduct transactions outside of the government-controlled financial system.

Cryptocurrency has provided a lifeline for many Venezuelans, allowing them to protect their wealth from the ravages of inflation and government mismanagement. **LocalBitcoins**, a peer-to-peer platform for buying and selling Bitcoin, became one of the most popular platforms in Venezuela, as people sought to convert their bolívars into Bitcoin to escape the devaluation of their currency.

This is just one example of how cryptocurrency can empower individuals in countries where the traditional financial system has failed them. By providing a decentralized alternative to government-controlled money, crypto offers a path to **financial sovereignty** for those who have been marginalized by the global financial system.

In the next chapter, we will explore how the **entry of boomers into the crypto space** poses a threat to these ideals. As more traditional investors enter the world of cryptocurrency, there is a risk that they will bring with them the debt-based mindset that has dominated traditional finance for decades. This clash of ideals will shape the future of crypto, as the community grapples with how to preserve its decentralized ethos in the face of growing interest from **TradFi** (traditional finance) investors.

Chapter 3: Boomer Invasion

The Clash of Debt-Slavery and Crypto Sovereignty

For decades, **baby boomers** have dominated the business and finance worlds. Their modus operandi? Borrow to win. They built empires on debt, funded startups through strings-attached investments, and demanded ownership and control in exchange for capital. They are **debt slaves**, shackled to the same leveraged models that built TradFi (traditional finance) and Web 2. In their world, money is power, and that power is always in the hands of those with the capital—**the investors**.

Crypto kids—those native to the **Web 3** space—have had enough of this. They've watched the boomers turn the economy into a playground for the ultra-rich while leaving everyone else to pick up the pieces. But now, in 2024, as crypto disrupts everything from banking to art to governance, a new clash has emerged: boomers, with their **TradFi investment models**, are starting to sink their claws into **crypto projects**, threatening to bring their outdated, debt-based models along with them. And crypto kids aren't having it.

TradFi Fundraising – Convertible Notes, Equity, and Debt: The Boomer Playbook

Boomers built and continue to build companies based on a **hierarchical** financial structure, using models that are heavily stacked in favor of **investors** rather than **creators** or **communities**. The tools of this system—**convertible notes**, **equity investments**, and **venture capital**—reinforce a top-down system where debt and control are intertwined.

The Convertible Note Trap

At the heart of this TradFi fundraising model is the **convertible note**. A convertible note is essentially **debt** that an investor gives to a startup, which will **convert into equity** (ownership in the company) during a future funding round, typically at a discount or with additional perks for early investors. For startups, it's a way to raise money quickly without negotiating equity deals upfront. Sounds harmless, right? Wrong.

To crypto kids, this is **debt slavery** 101. Convertible notes are essentially loans with strings attached, with the promise of conversion dangling like a carrot. The startup founders are trapped—they owe money, and if they don't play their cards right, they'll either have to pay it back with interest or give away an even larger piece of their company. The system is rigged to reward the lender—the investor—who's **buying control** under the guise of helping to "fund innovation."

Here's how it works in real life: A boomer-backed VC fund swoops in with a check, promising a bright future to a couple of enthusiastic startup founders. The catch? The money comes with a **convertible note** that could be converted into a massive equity stake when the next round of funding comes in. If that next round doesn't go as planned, the founders could find themselves in a **debt spiral**, beholden to the investors who, ironically, claim to be helping them "succeed."

To crypto kids, this model is downright predatory. It's not designed to help founders build; it's designed to **own** them. It's exactly this kind of debt-slavery system that they are trying to escape.

Equity and Control: TradFi's Iron Fist

Even when convertible notes are off the table, **equity investments** in the TradFi and Web 2 models often come with brutal terms. Venture capitalists (VCs) swoop in during a company's early stages, offering capital in exchange for significant chunks of equity—often **20% to 40% ownership** right out of the gate. The problem with this model is that it creates **concentration of power**: whoever holds the most equity calls the shots. As the company grows and more funding rounds happen, the founders often end up diluted, with **minority stakes in their own companies**.

By the time a boomer-run VC fund is done with a startup, the company is no longer owned or controlled by the original team. Instead, a boardroom of investors—who are laser-focused on **maximizing their return**—runs the show, often steering the company away from the original vision. This is what Web 2 companies like **Facebook**, **Uber**, and **Airbnb** have fallen victim to. **Boomers with capital** turned them from innovative platforms into **corporate behemoths**.

Crypto kids see this as the ultimate betrayal of the startup ethos. Where's the **freedom**? Where's the **meritocracy**? How is this different from the **indentured servitude** that boomers have forced on society for decades through their debt-driven TradFi models?

Web 3 Fundraising – Sovereignty Over Debt: The Crypto Way

Crypto fundraising models flip the TradFi script on its head. Instead of debt or equity investments that lead to control, Web 3 projects raise funds in ways that prioritize **community participation, sovereignty, and meritocracy**. No more handing over control to some boomer VC who wants to reshape your project into a profit-maximizing machine. In the world of crypto, fundraising is **transparent, decentralized**, and designed to benefit all participants equally.

The SAFT Model: No Debt, No Control

In the crypto space, one of the most popular methods of fundraising is through a **SAFT (Simple Agreement for Future Tokens)**. Unlike a **convertible note**, which is a debt instrument that converts into equity, a SAFT is a **pre-sale of tokens** that will be used in the future when a project goes live. The key difference here? **There's no debt involved**. The investors in a SAFT aren't lending money to the project in hopes of converting it into something later—they're buying a stake in the project's ecosystem from the start, with no strings attached.

The beauty of SAFTs is that they maintain the **sovereignty of the project creators**. Investors aren't getting control of the company or the product. They're buying tokens that represent future utility or governance in the platform, not **ownership**. And because the project is decentralized, **governance** decisions aren't made by a board of wealthy VCs; they're made by the **community** through decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs). Power is **distributed**, not concentrated in the hands of the few.

For crypto kids, this model is a **revolution**. No more begging investors for capital and losing control of their vision. No more falling into debt traps. Instead, they raise funds in a way that empowers the **community**—the people who actually care about the product—rather than a handful of investors looking for a quick flip. It's a fundraising model designed for a **decentralized future**, not one mired in the **boomers' top-down debt game**.

ICOs and Token Offerings: Leveling the Playing Field

The **Initial Coin Offering (ICO)** was the original fundraising model in crypto, and it took the world by storm in 2017. Projects would launch tokens that represented **access** to future products, services, or governance rights within the project's ecosystem. ICOs allowed startups to raise funds directly from the community—**without VCs**, without **convertible notes**, without any of the boomer baggage that came with TradFi fundraising.

Sure, the ICO boom came with its fair share of scams, but at its core, the ICO represented a **fundamental shift** in how capital was raised. No longer was it about **who you knew** or **how much equity** you were willing to give up. Instead, it was about building something that people believed in, something they were willing to buy into not because they expected immediate returns, but because they wanted to be part of the project's future.

ICOs, and their more regulated cousins, **Initial DEX Offerings (IDOs)** and **Initial Exchange Offerings (IEOs)**, democratized fundraising. For the first time, **ordinary people** could participate in the funding process for projects they cared about. No longer were early-stage investments reserved for the wealthy and connected. Instead, anyone with a wallet could buy in, and project teams could raise funds without giving away control of their companies.

Governance Tokens: A Meritocratic Vision

One of the most innovative aspects of Web 3 fundraising is the rise of **governance tokens**. Instead of handing over equity to a few investors who call the shots, crypto projects distribute governance tokens that give the **community** a say in how the project is run. Decisions about the project's future are made by the people who actually use it—not by some suit in a boardroom who cares more about his ROI than the long-term vision.

Governance tokens are at the heart of **DAOs**, where token holders vote on key issues, such as protocol upgrades, partnerships, or fund allocation. In many cases, **founders and early investors** have the same voting power as **ordinary users**. It's a true **meritocracy**, where decisions are made based on the collective will of the community rather than the financial interests of a few.

Take **Uniswap** as an example. Uniswap, a decentralized exchange, allows token holders to participate in governance decisions that affect the platform's future. When **VCs** like **Andreessen Horowitz** invested in Uniswap, they didn't get **board seats** or **controlling shares**. Instead, they received **tokens** that give them a vote—just like every other participant. This model is a far cry from the **control-focused** TradFi fundraising, and it's one that **crypto kids** embrace wholeheartedly.

Boomers in Crypto – The Threat to Sovereignty

Now, as **boomers** and their **TradFi VCs** enter the crypto space, they bring their **debt-slavery mentality** with them, looking to turn decentralized projects into something more familiar—something more **controllable**. They don't get crypto. They don't get the power of **distributed control**. They see tokens and SAFTs as just another **equity stake**, another way to **exert influence** over a project and bend it to their will.

For boomers, who built their wealth in a system of **leverage** and **control**, the idea of **distributed power** is alien. They want the same privileges they've always had: control over the direction of the company, influence over major decisions, and—most importantly—a **guaranteed return** on their investment.

But crypto doesn't work like that. In the world of Web 3, **value** is created through community engagement, not through control. Investors in DAOs don't get to **dictate terms**. They have to **participate**, just like everyone else. It's a **meritocracy** where contributions matter more than capital. For boomers, this is a tough pill to swallow. They're used to getting **ownership** in exchange for their money, but in the world of crypto, the playing field is leveled, and **capital doesn't buy power—participation does**.

Boomer Capital: The Trojan Horse in Web 3

The threat of **boomer capital** is real, though. As more TradFi investors pour into the crypto space, the risk is that they will **re-centralize** these projects, using their **capital influence** to skew governance in their favor. Already, we're seeing projects that started as decentralized experiments falling under the influence of major VC firms that want to shape the project's direction to suit their **bottom line**.

The fear among crypto kids is that boomers will turn **Web 3** into just another version of **Web 2**—a system controlled by a few large entities, where **decentralization** is nothing more than a buzzword, and where **community engagement** takes a back seat to the demands of **profit-seeking investors**.

To many in the crypto space, boomers represent the **old world**—the world of **debt slavery, centralized control, and financial hierarchies**. The Web 3 world they’re building is fundamentally different. It’s **sovereign, decentralized, and meritocratic**. And they’re not about to let a bunch of boomers come in and ruin it.

Conclusion: Web 3 and the Future of Fundraising

At the core of the Web 3 movement is the belief that **capital** should not **control innovation**. Crypto kids have seen what boomers did with TradFi and Web 2—how they turned **startups** into **corporate monoliths**, how they turned **entrepreneurs** into **debt slaves**, and how they turned the **internet** into a playground for **the rich**. We’re not going to let that happen to Web 3.

In the world of **crypto fundraising**, projects are built on **community**, not debt. **Tokens** replace **equity**, and **governance** is decentralized. Boomers and their TradFi friends can try to bring their **debt-slavery mentality** into the crypto space, but they’re going to find out very quickly that crypto kids don’t play by the same rules.

This is the future of finance—a future where **sovereignty trumps debt**, where **community trumps control**, and where **innovation** is rewarded, not co-opted by a few wealthy investors looking to cash in. The boomers had their time, and they built their **debt empire**. Now, it’s the crypto generation’s turn to build something better.

Chapter 4: The Fight for Decentralized Governance and the Soul of Crypto

The battle for crypto's future isn't just about how startups raise money—it's about **how they are governed**. In the old world of TradFi and Web 2, **control was everything**. VCs and investors sat on boards, made decisions, and pulled the strings. The founders were often relegated to **figureheads** as soon as their startups grew large enough to attract big money. But Web 3 is different. Or at least it's supposed to be.

Decentralized governance is the promise that **crypto kids** have latched onto as the antidote to the boomer-driven world of centralized control. In this new paradigm, **power is distributed**, not concentrated. Decisions are made through **community voting** and **DAOs (Decentralized Autonomous Organizations)**, not in stuffy boardrooms full of investors.

But now, as more TradFi money flows into Web 3 projects, the battle for **decentralized governance** is heating up. Will crypto keep its promise of **decentralization** and **sovereignty**? Or will it be co-opted by **boomer investors** who want to turn it into just another hierarchical system where **money equals power**?

Decentralized Governance: A New Model of Decision-Making

In the TradFi world, **governance** has always been top-down. Venture capitalists (VCs), private equity firms, and other big investors hold **board seats**, control **voting rights**, and essentially **dictate** the direction of the companies they fund. This system has allowed boomers to consolidate power and control within the companies they invest in, ensuring that **their interests come first**—long before the interests of employees, customers, or even the founders themselves.

This model has always worked in favor of **capital over community**. In Web 2 companies like Facebook, Uber, and Google, early VCs took control of board seats and played a **significant role** in turning those companies into global giants. However, along the way, the original visions of these platforms—whether it was Facebook's desire to "connect the world" or Uber's ambition to "disrupt transportation"—were often **sacrificed** in favor of maximizing investor returns.

For crypto kids, this model of governance is an **existential threat** to the ideals of Web 3. One of the core promises of crypto is that it would **redistribute power** away from a handful of investors and toward the community of users, developers, and participants who contribute to a project's success.

This is where **DAOs** come in.

The DAO: A Truly Decentralized System

In the world of **decentralized finance** (DeFi) and Web 3, governance isn't dictated by a board of directors or a handful of investors. Instead, governance is distributed across a wide range of stakeholders through **DAOs**. These are **self-governing organizations** where decisions are made by the community, often through a system of **token-based voting**.

Here's how it works: Projects issue **governance tokens**, which give holders the right to vote on key decisions. Unlike equity in a company, these tokens don't represent **ownership**. Instead, they represent **participation** in the project's future. Token holders vote on things like **protocol upgrades**, **fund allocation**, and **partnerships**. The idea is that anyone who contributes to the project—whether as a developer, user, or investor—should have a say in its future.

For example, consider **MakerDAO**, one of the most successful decentralized finance platforms in the crypto world. MakerDAO governs the creation of **DAI**, a stablecoin pegged to the U.S. dollar. The MakerDAO community makes key decisions about the platform's future through a system of **token-based governance**. Anyone who holds **MKR tokens** can participate in voting, ensuring that the platform's development is guided by the community rather than a single entity or group of investors.

Meritocracy vs. Capitalocracy: The Crypto Ideal

This is where the crypto ideal of **meritocracy** comes into play. In the world of TradFi, your influence over a project depends on how much **capital** you bring to the table. The more money you invest, the more control you have. But in Web 3, the goal is for **merit** to determine influence—not capital. Governance tokens, while sometimes distributed to investors, are more often distributed to **developers**, **community participants**, and **early users**. This creates a system where **contributions matter more than capital**.

In this new model, **developers** who build the project's infrastructure, **users** who provide feedback and engagement, and **contributors** who help guide its vision all have an equal stake in its success. Governance isn't determined by who has the most money but by who has done the most to support the project.

Take **Uniswap**, the largest decentralized exchange (DEX) by trading volume. The **UNI token**, which governs Uniswap's future, was distributed to users, developers, and liquidity providers. Yes, VCs like **Andreessen Horowitz** participated in Uniswap's funding round, but they didn't receive **outsized control**. Instead, they got tokens, just like every other participant, and their vote holds the same weight as that of an individual user who has contributed liquidity to the platform.

For the crypto community, this is **true meritocracy**. Decisions aren't made by wealthy investors who prioritize **profit over innovation**. Instead, the community drives the project forward, ensuring that the vision and ideals of Web 3 remain intact.

But as more **boomer capital** floods into the crypto space, there's growing concern that this model is under threat. VCs and TradFi investors are used to **control**, and they're starting to push for more **centralized governance** in the projects they invest in. This is where the **battle lines** are being drawn.

The Boomer Playbook: Re-Centralization of Web 3

For boomers and their TradFi buddies, the decentralized governance model of DAOs is a **nuisance**. These investors are used to having **total control** over the companies they invest in, and the idea that they might not have **voting power** proportional to their investment is foreign to them. In their world, **capital equals power**, and they've spent decades leveraging their money to dictate the future of the companies they invest in.

But in the Web 3 world, **VCs don't get board seats**. They don't get to veto decisions. They don't get to push for an exit strategy just because they want to **maximize their return**. Instead, they have to participate **alongside the community**. For many TradFi investors, this model is both unfamiliar and uncomfortable.

That's why we're starting to see a **push for centralization** in certain Web 3 projects. VCs, many of whom come from a **TradFi background**, are looking for ways to bring **traditional governance models** into the crypto space. They want to move away from **community-driven** decision-making and back toward **investor-driven** models where those with the most money have the most say.

The Sneaky Centralization Tactic: Governance Token Hoarding

One of the ways boomers are trying to **re-centralize** Web 3 projects is by **hoarding governance tokens**. In many DAOs, governance power is determined by how many tokens you hold. The idea is that **active participants** in the project will accumulate tokens by contributing to its success. But boomers, with their **deep pockets**, are finding ways to **buy up** large amounts of governance tokens, giving them **outsized influence** over decision-making.

Take **Compound**, one of the leading lending protocols in the DeFi space. Compound uses the **COMP token** for governance, with token holders voting on key decisions like interest rates and protocol upgrades. While the system was designed to be **decentralized**, some VCs have begun **accumulating large amounts of COMP tokens**, giving them **significant voting power** over the project's future.

For crypto kids, this is exactly what they feared. The whole point of DAOs and decentralized governance was to **prevent** a handful of wealthy investors from controlling the direction of the project. But with boomers hoarding governance tokens, there's a growing risk that the **centralization** of power will return—this time in the form of token whales who can outvote the rest of the community.

VCs and the Push for Traditional Governance

But it's not just token hoarding that's threatening the decentralization of Web 3 projects. Some VCs are actively pushing for **more traditional governance models** in the projects they fund. These investors argue that **decentralization is inefficient**—that it slows down decision-making and makes it harder to scale. They want to implement **hierarchical structures** where a small group of people (ideally, the investors) have more control over the project's future.

This is what happened with **MakerDAO**. After raising funds from TradFi investors, some began pushing for a **more centralized governance structure**, arguing that it would make the project more **efficient** and **profitable**. For the crypto kids who helped build MakerDAO into what it is today, this felt like a **betrayal** of the project's decentralized ideals.

The same thing happened with **SushiSwap**, another decentralized exchange (DEX). When TradFi investors got involved, they started pushing for **corporate-style governance** that would concentrate decision-making power in the hands of a few key players. Once again, the original vision of a **community-driven project** was put at risk by **capital-driven interests**.

Crypto kids see this as the **death knell** for decentralized governance. If boomers and their TradFi cronies succeed in bringing **traditional governance models** into Web 3 projects, the whole point of crypto will be lost. Instead of building a **decentralized financial system** where power is distributed and merit trumps money, we'll end up with **Web 2.5**—a watered-down version of Web 3 that's controlled by the same old **capitalist hierarchies** that dominate the TradFi world.

The Fight to Preserve Decentralization

But crypto kids aren't giving up without a fight. Across the Web 3 space, there's a growing movement to **preserve decentralization** and **resist the influence of TradFi investors**. These activists and builders are working to ensure that DAOs remain true to their ideals, that governance stays in the hands of the community, and that Web 3 projects don't fall victim to the **boomer mindset** of capital-over-community.

Decentralization Maximalists: The Guardians of Web 3

At the forefront of this movement are the **decentralization maximalists**—a group of developers, activists, and thought leaders who believe that the only way for Web 3 to succeed is by maintaining its commitment to **decentralization**. These maximalists argue that the moment a project starts to centralize power, it ceases to be a true **Web 3 project** and instead becomes just another **corporate entity**.

These decentralization maximalists are pushing for more **robust governance models** that prevent **token hoarding** and ensure that **power remains distributed**. Some are advocating for new **voting mechanisms**, like **quadratic voting**, where the power of each vote diminishes as you accumulate more tokens. This would prevent wealthy investors from buying up large amounts of governance tokens and dominating decision-making.

Others are working to develop **on-chain reputation systems**, where participants are rewarded for their contributions to the community, rather than just their financial investments. These systems would give **active participants** more voting power, ensuring that **governance remains meritocratic and community-driven**.

Community Ownership: A Return to Web 3's Roots

Another key pillar of the fight to preserve decentralization is the push for **community ownership**. Many crypto projects are exploring ways to **distribute tokens** more equitably, ensuring that **early users, developers, and community members** have the most influence over the project's future. This is a return to Web 3's original vision—a vision where **ownership and governance** are in the hands of the people who actually use and build the platform.

Some projects are experimenting with **token airdrops**, where governance tokens are distributed to **early adopters** for free, ensuring that those who helped build the project are rewarded with a say in its future. Others are working on models where **community members** earn governance tokens through their contributions to the platform, whether that's writing code, creating content, or participating in governance discussions.

The Power of Forking: A Crypto Kid's Trump Card

Finally, crypto kids have one last trump card up their sleeve: **forking**. In the world of crypto, if a project's governance becomes too centralized or if the community feels that the original vision is being betrayed, they can simply **fork** the project's code and start over. This is the ultimate check on centralization in the Web 3 space—if a project's leaders start to centralize power, the community can create a **new version** of the platform that stays true to the original decentralized ideals.

This happened with **SushiSwap**, which was a fork of **Uniswap** created by community members who felt that Uniswap's governance had become too centralized. The power of forking ensures that no single entity can ever fully control a decentralized project, as the community can always **take the code and create something new**.

Conclusion: The Battle for Web 3's Soul

The fight for the soul of Web 3 is only just beginning. As more TradFi money flows into the space, the risk of **centralization** grows. But crypto kids aren't going to let boomers and their capital destroy what they've built. The Web 3 vision of **decentralized governance, community ownership, and meritocratic decision-making** is too important to be sacrificed on the altar of investor returns.

The battle lines are drawn. On one side are the **boomer capitalists**, who want to bring their **debt-driven, control-based** investment models into Web 3. On the other side are the **decentralization maximalists**, who are fighting to ensure that Web 3 stays true to its ideals of **sovereignty and meritocracy**.

The future of Web 3 hangs in the balance. Will it become just another **centralized system**, controlled by a handful of wealthy investors? Or will it remain a **decentralized ecosystem**, where power is distributed and the community drives innovation? Only time will tell, but one thing is clear: the **crypto kids** aren't going down without a fight.

Chapter 5: Boomer LPs and the Rise of LARPer Crypto Funds

There's an insidious threat creeping into the heart of crypto's decentralized revolution. And it's not coming from the outside. It's coming from within—from funds that **pretend** to be part of the **Web 3 ethos** but, in reality, are deeply tied to the very TradFi principles that crypto was supposed to break free from. Enter the **boomer LPs—Limited Partners**—and their **LARPer crypto funds**, investors who claim to champion the values of decentralization and sovereignty but are really just playing a role, a facade masking their **debt-driven, control-seeking roots**.

These LPs and the funds they back present themselves as advocates of the Web 3 vision, but behind the curtain, they are bringing their **TradFi baggage** into crypto, using old tricks of capital-driven control and debt slavery to steer crypto projects in ways that fundamentally betray the decentralized, community-first ideals of the space.

For crypto founders, the danger is clear: these boomers and their TradFi-backed funds are **wolves in sheep's clothing**, pretending to support the decentralized future while pushing for the same old structures of **indentured servitude**—structures where investors rule supreme, and founders, developers, and communities are pushed to the sidelines.

LARPer Crypto Funds: The Trojan Horse

First, let's break down the concept of **LARPer crypto funds**. "LARPing," or **Live Action Role-Playing**, is what happens when someone **pretends** to be something they're not, often in a way that's obviously fake to those in the know. In the world of crypto, **LARPer funds** are VC firms that wrap themselves in the language of decentralization, community governance, and Web 3 ideals, but underneath, they're playing by the same old **TradFi playbook**.

These funds raise capital from boomer LPs—traditional wealthy investors who have little understanding of Web 3 beyond the idea that it's a new space for **speculative profits**. They hear about **Bitcoin**, **Ethereum**, and **NFTs** at their country clubs or in **CNBC specials**, and they want in, not because they believe in the ethos of decentralized sovereignty, but because they see dollar signs and want a piece of the next big thing.

Boomer LPs invest in these funds, thinking they're entering this revolutionary new world, but they're bringing with them all their **old-world expectations**: control, guaranteed returns, and, most dangerously, **ownership** over the projects they invest in. The funds, in turn, know what their LPs expect. So, while they market themselves to founders as crypto-native, Web 3-friendly supporters, they're **quietly structuring deals** that align more with **Web 2** and **TradFi investment models**—where capital equals control and debt is used as leverage to extract maximum returns.

The Old Playbook in New Clothes: Convertible Notes and “Equity Tokens”

The most obvious way these **LARPer funds** betray crypto ideals is by sneaking in **TradFi fundraising mechanisms**, often disguised as something else. One such example is the use of **convertible notes** disguised as **token agreements**.

Imagine you're a crypto founder, eager to raise funds for your decentralized platform. You approach one of these supposedly Web 3-friendly crypto funds, only to find that their offer looks eerily similar to a **Web 2 deal**. They present you with a "**Simple Agreement for Future Tokens (SAFT)**," but under the surface, the deal is structured more like a **convertible note** or a **debt instrument**. They promise you funding today in exchange for tokens tomorrow, but these tokens are pegged to **equity-like returns**, granting them **control** over key aspects of your project's future.

If your token doesn't perform as expected, they'll convert their investment into something with more **leverage**—an **ownership stake** or **veto power** in your governance process. It's the same old story as TradFi: they're not there to build with you or support your vision—they're there to control, extract, and move on to the next profitable venture. For crypto kids, this is the **antithesis** of what Web 3 is supposed to be about.

Boomer LPs love this. They don't care about **sovereign participation** or **meritocracy**. They just want **guaranteed returns** and control over how their money is used. These investors are **risk-averse** by nature, and so their goal is to ensure they always have an exit strategy that leaves them in control. In essence, **boomer LPs**—by backing **LARPer funds**—are trying to reshape the crypto landscape to reflect the same TradFi principles that led to **debt slavery** in the first place.

The Boomer LP Mindset: Sovereignty vs. Ownership

Boomers, especially boomer LPs, have spent their entire financial lives in a system where **ownership equals control**. They've been conditioned to believe that money grants them **special privileges**, and that their investments entitle them to not just **returns**, but **influence** over the direction of a company or project. They're used to having a say in how their money is spent, and they believe that their **capital** gives them more **rights** than anyone else in the room.

In the world of TradFi, this makes sense. You invest in a company, you get a seat on the board. You put up money for a startup, you own a **percentage of the company**. You hold equity, and with that equity comes control. **Convertible notes, debt instruments, preferred shares**—all of these financial tools exist to ensure that **capital investors** (usually boomers) have the final say in a company's future.

But in crypto, things work differently. Or at least, they're supposed to.

Sovereign Individuals in Web 3: The Equal Rights Ethos

The beauty of crypto—and the reason why **crypto kids** are so protective of it—is that it offers a completely different vision for how **value** and **control** are distributed. In Web 3, investors don't have **greater rights** than the rest of the community. In fact, Web 3 is built on the principle that **all participants**—whether they're developers, users, or investors—should have **equal rights** in a project's governance.

This is the essence of **sovereignty** in crypto. Investors can support a project and participate in its success, but they don't **own** it. They don't get to sit in a boardroom and dictate the terms. They don't get to hold **debt** over a founder's head and demand certain returns. Instead, they participate **alongside everyone else**—as part of the community, with equal say in how the project develops.

Take **Ethereum** as an example. **Vitalik Buterin**, Ethereum's creator, made it clear from the start that Ethereum would be **community-governed**, with decisions about protocol changes made through a combination of developer consensus and community participation. Ethereum's **decentralized structure** ensures that no single entity—whether a developer, a whale, or a VC—has outsized influence over its future. It's a **meritocracy**, where the best ideas rise to the top, not the most capital.

For boomers, this model is **incomprehensible**. They don't understand a world where **capital doesn't buy control**, and this creates a deep tension between **crypto founders** and **boomer LPs** who come into the space expecting to **call the shots**.

How LARPer Funds Betray Crypto Founders

The biggest danger to crypto founders isn't just from boomer LPs themselves—it's from the **LARPer funds** who claim to be on their side but are really **beholden** to TradFi interests. These funds often act as **middlemen**, using **crypto terminology** to pitch themselves as Web 3-friendly but ultimately structuring deals that betray the very principles they claim to support.

The Fake Crypto Ethos: LARPing Sovereignty

One of the key tactics used by these LARPer funds is to **talk the talk** of crypto while **walking the walk** of TradFi. They throw around terms like "**decentralization**," "**token governance**," and "**community participation**" when pitching to founders, but when it comes time to structure the actual deal, they revert to **TradFi models** that prioritize **investor control**.

For example, a crypto founder might be lured into signing a deal with a LARPer fund that promises **community-driven governance** through token distribution. But when the deal is finalized, the founder finds that the **majority of tokens** have been allocated to the fund itself, giving them outsized voting power over key decisions. In essence, the fund has replicated the **VC boardroom** model under the guise of tokenized governance, ensuring that the **boomer LPs** they represent have the final say over the project's direction.

This is particularly dangerous because **founders don't always see it coming**. They're told that they're working with crypto-friendly investors who support their vision, but the fine print reveals a very different reality: one where **capital dictates governance** and **community participation** is an afterthought.

The Convertible Trap: LARPer Debt Instruments in Disguise

Another tactic used by LARPer funds is to **disguise debt instruments** as crypto-native fundraising tools. They'll pitch a deal as a **SAFT** (Simple Agreement for Future Tokens), but the terms will include **convertible features** that mimic the worst aspects of TradFi financing. Essentially, the founder is given capital upfront in exchange for future tokens, but if the project doesn't hit certain milestones or if the token's value underperforms, the investors get **more control**—often in the form of **equity-like stakes** or **veto power** over governance decisions.

This is the exact opposite of what crypto fundraising is supposed to be about. **SAFTs**, **ICOs**, and **IDOs** were designed to allow founders to raise capital **without giving up control**. The idea was that tokens would represent **participation** in the project, not ownership. But boomer LPs and their LARPer funds are twisting these models to reflect **their old-world expectations**, creating traps that leave founders indebted to their investors in ways that mirror the **indentured servitude** of TradFi.

For crypto founders, these traps are especially dangerous because they're often **hidden beneath layers of jargon**. The deal might look crypto-native on the surface, but underneath, it's just another way for investors to gain control, using **debt instruments** and **convertible stakes** to **subjugate** the founders and their teams.

Boomer LPs: The Real Danger to Web 3

At the heart of this issue is the **boomer LP mindset**. These investors don't get crypto. They don't care about **decentralization** or **community participation**. All they see is a new frontier for **profit**, and they're using the same **debt-based playbook** they've used for decades to extract value and control from the companies they invest in.

For crypto founders, working with boomer LP-backed funds is a **dangerous game**. These investors will **promise the world**, talking up their commitment to the Web 3 ethos, but in reality, they'll do everything they can to **recentralize** the project and **control its future**. The founders who fall for these promises often find themselves **locked into deals** that give boomer LPs **veto power** over key decisions, turning what was supposed to be a **community-driven project** into just another **VC-controlled startup**.

But crypto kids aren't blind to this danger. Across the space, there's growing awareness of the risks posed by boomer LPs and their **LARPer funds**. Founders are becoming more discerning, rejecting deals that come with **strings attached** and seeking out **true crypto-native investors** who understand the importance of **sovereign participation** and **meritocracy**.

Rejecting Boomer Capital: The New Path Forward

For crypto to stay true to its ideals, founders must learn to **reject boomer capital**. They need to be **vigilant** in identifying **LARPer funds** that talk a good game but ultimately bring **TradFi structures** into the Web 3 space. Instead of falling for the **illusion** of crypto-friendly VCs, founders should focus on raising funds from **community-driven sources**—whether through **ICOs**, **DAOs**, or **SAFTs** that maintain the principles of **decentralization**.

The future of Web 3 depends on the ability of founders and communities to **resist the influence of boomer LPs** and their debt-slavery mentality. As long as boomers are allowed to shape the direction of crypto projects, the risk of **recentralization** will remain. But if crypto kids can hold firm to their principles—if they can stay committed to the idea that **capital doesn't equal control**—then the **Web 3 revolution** will continue, and crypto will fulfill its promise of **sovereignty**, **meritocracy**, and **community-driven innovation**.

Conclusion: The Boomer Threat to Crypto's Sovereign Future

The fight for the future of Web 3 is as much about **money** as it is about **power**. Boomer LPs, with their decades of experience in **TradFi**, are trying to impose their **debt-driven model** on a space that was designed to break free from it. They don't understand—or don't care—that crypto was supposed to be about **sovereignty** and **meritocracy**, not **control** and **indentured servitude**.

Through **LARPer funds** and disguised **debt instruments**, these boomers are pushing for a version of crypto that looks a lot like **Web 2**—where a handful of investors hold all the power, and founders are left to follow orders. But crypto kids aren't going down without a fight. They're building new fundraising models, governance structures, and community-driven platforms that prioritize **participation** over **capital** and **merit** over **ownership**.

The battle isn't over. The boomers might have deep pockets, but the crypto community has something more powerful: a vision for a world where everyone—**investors, users, developers, and founders** alike—has **equal rights** and **equal say**. If crypto kids can hold onto that vision, the boomers' debt-driven playbook will ultimately fail, and Web 3 will emerge as the **sovereign future** it was always meant to be.

Chapter 6: Protecting Sovereignty – Strategies to Defend Crypto from Boomer Capital

As **boomer capital** continues to infiltrate the crypto space, the struggle to preserve the core principles of Web 3—**decentralization, sovereignty, and meritocracy**—intensifies. The allure of big investments from wealthy **LPs** and **VC funds** is strong, but founders are quickly realizing that this capital comes with strings attached. With each round of funding, the risk of **recentralization** grows. The very projects that started as **community-driven efforts** begin to resemble the same **hierarchical, top-down models** that crypto was supposed to dismantle.

But crypto founders and **decentralization maximalists** aren't without tools to fight back. There are concrete strategies that projects can implement to protect themselves from the influence of **boomer investors** and their TradFi mentality. These strategies focus on safeguarding **governance**, ensuring **distributed control**, and building fundraising models that align with the ethos of Web 3 rather than the debt-based, control-driven structures of TradFi.

In this chapter, we'll explore these strategies in detail, offering crypto founders a roadmap for maintaining **sovereign projects** even in the face of increasing pressure from **boomer LPs** and **LARPer funds**.

Decentralization First – Building Strong Governance Models

The first and most critical step to defending against **boomer capital** is to build a **strong, decentralized governance model**. In the world of crypto, governance is everything. Without robust governance mechanisms, it's all too easy for investors to gain control over a project, whether through **token hoarding**, **off-chain deals**, or **voting manipulation**.

For founders committed to decentralization, protecting governance means creating systems that ensure **power is distributed** among the community—**developers**, **users**, **contributors**, and **investors**—without allowing any single group to dominate. This is the foundation of true **sovereignty** in Web 3.

Quadratic Voting: Mitigating Token Whales

One of the biggest threats to decentralized governance is the emergence of **token whales**—large holders of governance tokens who can sway votes in their favor simply by virtue of their **capital dominance**. This is particularly dangerous when boomer-backed funds use their capital to **hoard governance tokens**, effectively centralizing decision-making power in the hands of a few investors, rather than the community.

A powerful solution to this problem is the use of **quadratic voting**, a voting system where the power of each additional vote diminishes the more tokens you hold. In this model, individuals with fewer tokens have **disproportionately higher voting power** compared to those with larger token holdings. This prevents **wealthy investors** from dominating decisions simply by accumulating tokens. Instead, the system rewards **broad participation** and ensures that the **community** has a more equitable say in governance.

For example, if a boomer LP-backed fund holds a massive amount of governance tokens, under a **quadratic voting** system, their ability to influence votes would be severely limited compared to a standard one-token-one-vote model. This system ensures that the **voice of the community**—the smaller token holders and active participants—remains significant, even in the presence of large investors.

On-Chain Reputation Systems: Rewarding Contribution Over Capital

Another effective strategy for safeguarding governance is the use of **on-chain reputation systems**, which prioritize **contributions** over **capital**. These systems track and reward users based on their **activity** and **contributions** to the project, rather than how many tokens they own. Reputation points, earned through **development work**, **content creation**, or **governance participation**, can be used to enhance **voting power**, ensuring that the most active and engaged community members have a greater say in decision-making.

Projects like **Gitcoin** have experimented with reputation systems to reward developers who contribute code to open-source projects. In a similar vein, DAOs can integrate **reputation-based voting** mechanisms that ensure decision-making power is distributed based on **merit**, not just capital. This is a key way to prevent boomer-backed investors from buying control of a project's future.

By leveraging **on-chain reputation systems**, crypto founders can create governance structures that are inherently **resistant to centralization**, ensuring that **contributors**—those who actually build and grow the project—hold more power than **capital holders** who are simply looking to maximize their returns.

Time-Locked Voting Power: Preventing Governance Takeovers

Another common tactic used by **boomer LPs** and **LARPer funds** is to rapidly accumulate governance tokens to force through **changes in governance** that benefit investors, often at the expense of the community. To counteract this, projects can implement **time-locked voting power** mechanisms, where governance tokens gradually **unlock** their full voting power over a predetermined period.

By implementing time-locks on voting power, projects can prevent new investors—particularly those with **boomer capital** behind them—from immediately seizing control of the governance process. This gives the community time to **assess** new participants and ensure that they are aligned with the project's values before granting them significant influence over its future.

This approach not only protects against **hostile takeovers** but also ensures that **long-term participants**—those who have been with the project from the beginning—maintain significant influence over its governance. It rewards **commitment** and **long-term vision** over short-term speculative gains, further aligning the project with the ethos of Web 3.

Protecting Fundraising from Boomer Capital

While governance is the core battleground for decentralization, **fundraising** is where boomer capital can sneak in through the back door. Founders need capital to build their projects, but they don't have to resort to **convertible notes, debt instruments, or VC-backed token sales** that cede control to investors. Instead, there are decentralized alternatives that align with the **Web 3 vision of community participation** and **sovereign fundraising**.

Decentralized Fundraising Models: ICOs, IDOs, and Fair Launches

The rise of **Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs)** in 2017 and their successors, **Initial DEX Offerings (IDOs)** and **fair token launches**, have provided founders with powerful alternatives to **traditional VC funding**. These models allow projects to raise capital directly from the **community**, bypassing the need for large institutional investors or boomer LP-backed funds.

In an **ICO**, a project issues tokens to the public, often at a discounted price, giving early adopters a chance to **buy into the project** without the need for a middleman. Similarly, in an **IDO**, tokens are sold through a **decentralized exchange (DEX)**, ensuring that the sale is accessible to anyone, not just institutional investors. These models distribute tokens **equitably** and encourage **community-driven governance** from the start.

For crypto founders, this means they can raise funds while maintaining **control over their projects**. Unlike TradFi models that require giving up equity or board seats, **ICOs** and **IDOs** empower founders to build **sovereign platforms** without compromising their values. These fundraising models are inherently **decentralized**, and because the tokens are distributed to a wide range of participants, the risk of **investor control** is significantly reduced.

Fair Launches: No Pre-Sale, No Investor Control

One of the most **crypto-native** fundraising models is the **fair launch**, where tokens are distributed to the community without any **pre-sale** or **VC allocations**. In a fair launch, there are no insider deals, no backroom negotiations, and no investor control. The project is launched with full **transparency**, and tokens are distributed equally to everyone who participates, often through mechanisms like **liquidity mining** or **airdrops**.

Fair launches align perfectly with the ethos of Web 3. They ensure that power is **distributed** from the start, with no central entity controlling the majority of the tokens. This protects the project from **investor-driven takeovers** and ensures that the **community** remains in control of governance and decision-making.

For example, **Yearn Finance**, one of the most successful projects in DeFi, was launched as a **fair launch** by its founder **Andre Cronje**. There were no VCs, no pre-sale, and no insider allocations. The project's governance token, **YFI**, was distributed entirely to the community through liquidity mining, and those who contributed to the project earned governance rights. The result was a fully **decentralized protocol**, governed by its users rather than by a handful of investors.

Anti-Vulture Clauses: Protecting Founders from Debt Slavery

To protect against the **debt-driven models** that boomers are so fond of, crypto founders can also implement **anti-vulture clauses** in their token sale agreements. These clauses prevent investors from converting their tokens into **equity-like control** over the project or demanding **veto rights** over governance decisions.

For instance, a **SAFT** (Simple Agreement for Future Tokens) can be structured in a way that ensures investors receive tokens **without governance rights**—purely as utility or governance tokens that cannot be **converted into ownership**. This ensures that investors participate in the **success of the project** without gaining control over its future. These clauses act as a **firewall** between capital and control, protecting the **sovereignty of the project** from boomer-backed investors who are looking for a way to dominate governance.

Founders can also include **lock-up periods** on tokens distributed to investors, ensuring that these tokens cannot be sold or **converted** for a significant period of time, which prevents **short-term speculation** and helps to keep the project aligned with long-term goals rather than the **quick-return mindset** typical of TradFi.

Founders: Defenders of Decentralization

In the face of these challenges, crypto founders must see themselves not just as builders but as the **defenders of decentralization**. The future of Web 3 depends on their ability to resist the influence of **boomer capital** and protect their projects from the **control-driven, debt-based models** of TradFi.

Founders have the power to set the terms of their project's future, but doing so requires **vigilance** and **strategy**. They must reject deals that come with **convertible notes**, **debt instruments**, or **voting manipulation** baked into them. They must build governance models that **distribute power** and prevent **token hoarding**. They must fundraise through decentralized methods that prioritize **community participation** over **investor control**.

In the end, the battle for the soul of Web 3 is being fought on the ground, project by project, founder by founder. Those who remain committed to the ideals of **sovereignty**, **meritocracy**, and **decentralization** will emerge victorious, while those who give in to **boomer capital** and **LARPer funds** will see their projects turned into just another **Web 2** clone, driven by profit and controlled by a handful of wealthy investors.

Real-World Examples of Defending Decentralization

Let's take a moment to highlight some **real-world examples** of projects that have successfully defended their **decentralization**:

1. **Uniswap** - Uniswap's governance model ensures that no single entity has outsized control, despite heavy investment from VCs like Andreessen Horowitz. The **UNI token** distribution was designed to empower the community, with liquidity providers, developers, and users having a strong voice in governance.
2. **Yearn Finance** - With its **fair launch**, Yearn Finance became a symbol of decentralization. By distributing its governance token, **YFI**, to the community without any pre-sale or insider allocation, Yearn ensured that power would remain in the hands of those who contributed to the protocol.
3. **MakerDAO** - Despite pressure from investors, **MakerDAO** has remained committed to its **decentralized governance** model. The **MKR token** allows the community to make key decisions about the protocol, from interest rates to collateral requirements, ensuring that the project stays aligned with the values of decentralization.

These projects are **blueprints** for how crypto founders can protect their governance structures and resist the influence of **boomer capital**. By building strong governance models, rejecting TradFi fundraising mechanisms, and prioritizing community participation, founders can ensure that Web 3 remains true to its **decentralized roots**.

Conclusion: The Road Ahead for Crypto Founders

As we move deeper into the world of **Web 3**, the threat posed by **boomer capital** and **LARPer crypto funds** will only grow. These investors see crypto as a new frontier for profit but bring with them the **debt-slavery mentality** that has dominated TradFi for decades. For crypto kids, the stakes couldn't be higher. The future of **sovereignty**, **decentralization**, and **community-driven innovation** is at risk.

But there's hope. **Founders** have the power to shape the future of their projects. By building robust governance models, implementing **quadratic voting** and **reputation systems**, and choosing decentralized fundraising methods like **ICOs**, **IDOs**, and **fair launches**, they can protect their projects from the **indentured servitude** that boomers seek to impose.

The path forward won't be easy, but with the right tools and strategies, **crypto founders** can ensure that Web 3 stays true to its vision. They can reject **control-driven capital** and build platforms that empower **sovereign individuals**—a future where **capital doesn't equal power**, and **merit always comes first**.

Chapter 7: The Decentralization Revolution – Sovereign Individuals and the Global Shift

The rise of cryptocurrency is far more than just a technological evolution in finance. At its core, crypto represents a **philosophical shift**, a revolution that challenges not only traditional financial systems but also the way we understand **power**, **governance**, and **human autonomy**. In the past, individuals have largely been beholden to centralized systems—whether those be governments, corporations, or financial institutions—that dictated the terms of economic and social engagement.

The concept of the **sovereign individual** within the crypto space marks a radical departure from this. No longer dependent on centralized authorities for security, currency, or governance, individuals empowered by **decentralized technologies** like blockchain are breaking free from the structures that have defined human society for centuries. This is the **decentralization revolution**, and it's poised to reshape not just finance but every aspect of how humans organize themselves.

The Sovereign Individual: What Does it Mean?

In crypto, the term **sovereign individual** refers to the idea that people should have **complete control** over their own assets, data, and even governance. This idea draws heavily on **libertarian principles**, emphasizing personal freedom, autonomy, and minimal reliance on centralized institutions like governments or banks. But crypto takes it a step further. It's not just about personal autonomy—it's about creating entire systems where **centralized control is obsolete**.

A **sovereign individual** in the crypto space doesn't need to trust a bank to hold their money, doesn't need to trust a company to protect their data, and doesn't need to trust a government to guarantee their freedom. Instead, blockchain technology provides the **tools** to build systems where trust is **distributed**—where power lies with individuals and communities rather than **institutions**.

The Death of Trust-Based Systems

Historically, societies have been built on **trust-based systems**. Whether it's trusting the bank to hold your money, trusting the government to maintain a stable currency, or trusting corporations to manage data and privacy responsibly, centralized systems are built on the assumption that some higher authority will act in the interests of the individual. But as countless crises have shown—whether it be the **2008 financial meltdown, privacy violations** by big tech, or **hyperinflation** destroying national currencies—**trust in central authorities** is easily broken.

Crypto challenges this very foundation. By using **decentralized technology**, such as blockchain, trust is no longer required because the system itself is **trustless**. Transactions are validated by the network, not by an intermediary. Governance decisions are made through **community consensus**, not by a CEO or government official. And assets are secured through **private keys** that no bank or centralized entity can seize or manipulate.

For crypto kids, this marks a **revolution**. They don't want to place their faith in **institutions** that have repeatedly failed. They want to build systems where the individual is **empowered**, where data and assets are owned and controlled by the person, not the state or corporation. And this shift has massive implications for **finance, politics, and society**.

The Sovereign Individual in Finance: Freedom from Debt Slavery

As we explored in previous chapters, the **boomer mindset** in finance has long revolved around the idea that **money is debt**. Banks issue loans, governments print currency backed by debt, and individuals are trapped in cycles of borrowing just to maintain their standard of living. This system has created what many now call **debt slavery**—a structure where individuals, corporations, and even nations are **beholden to creditors**, forever working to pay off loans, mortgages, and interest.

The concept of **crypto sovereignty** shatters this model. Instead of money being tied to debt, crypto introduces the idea of **hard money**—digital assets like **Bitcoin** that are finite, non-inflationary, and **decentralized**. With crypto, individuals can control their own money in a way that's **independent of banks, governments, or economic crises**. They can send, receive, and hold wealth without ever needing to rely on a **centralized third party**.

This is a profound shift. It means that individuals no longer need to worry about **inflation** eroding their savings, as governments can no longer print money at will. It means that people in countries with unstable currencies, like **Venezuela** or **Argentina**, have a lifeline—a way to protect their wealth from being destroyed by irresponsible fiscal policies. It means that **unbanked populations**, especially in developing nations, can now participate in the global economy without needing access to traditional banking services.

The End of Capital Control: Sovereign Money in Action

In 2024, as the global financial system continues to face **inflation**, **currency manipulation**, and **political instability**, the appeal of sovereign money is growing. One of the most powerful examples of this is seen in countries with strict **capital controls**—where governments attempt to restrict the flow of money across borders, often to prevent wealth from leaving the country during economic turmoil.

Take **China**, for example. The Chinese government tightly controls the flow of **renminbi** in and out of the country, making it difficult for Chinese citizens to invest abroad or protect their wealth from government intervention. The same is true in countries like **Argentina**, where exchange rates are manipulated by the government, forcing citizens to exchange their hard-earned pesos at **artificially low rates**.

In these cases, **cryptocurrency** is a way out. Citizens in countries with **capital controls** are increasingly turning to **Bitcoin** and other cryptocurrencies as a way to **circumvent government control** and move their wealth freely across borders. Bitcoin, in particular, has become known as "**digital gold**," offering a safe haven for wealth that can be transferred globally, instantly, and without the need for **government approval**.

This isn't just about **wealth protection**. It's about **freedom**. By using crypto, individuals can **reclaim control** over their own financial destiny. They are no longer tied to the whims of a central bank or government. They are **sovereign**.

Beyond Finance: The Sovereign Individual in Politics and Governance

But the implications of the sovereign individual model go beyond finance. The **decentralization revolution** is fundamentally reshaping how we think about **governance**, **political power**, and **human rights**. With **decentralized governance systems** like DAOs, we are seeing the emergence of a **new model of governance**—one where individuals participate directly in decision-making, without the need for **politicians** or **bureaucracies**.

The DAO Revolution: Decentralized Autonomous Organizations

In a world where **corporate boards, parliaments, and government agencies** are the norm, DAOs represent a radical shift in governance. In a **DAO**, decisions are made by the community through **token-based voting**, with no single individual or group holding outsized control. This model is **transparent, open, and inherently democratic**—and it's already being used to govern **multi-billion-dollar protocols** like Uniswap, MakerDAO, and Aave.

But the potential of DAOs goes far beyond **DeFi protocols**. Imagine a world where entire **communities, cities, or even nations** are governed through DAOs. In this future, citizens would hold **governance tokens** that give them a say in how resources are allocated, how laws are written, and how disputes are resolved. This model could replace traditional **political systems**, which are often plagued by corruption, inefficiency, and **centralized power**.

For example, **ConstitutionDAO** was an early experiment in this direction. Although the DAO ultimately failed in its goal of purchasing a rare copy of the U.S. **Constitution**, it demonstrated the power of **crowdsourced governance**. Thousands of people came together, pooling their resources and voting on how to allocate funds, proving that a decentralized community could organize itself to achieve a common goal—something that was previously only possible through centralized entities like corporations or governments.

In the future, DAOs could be used to govern **everything from housing cooperatives to school boards to municipal budgets**. They represent a future where individuals participate directly in governance, without needing to rely on **elected representatives or government agencies**.

Decentralization in Action: Global Case Studies

One of the most exciting aspects of the **sovereign individual model** is how it's already being put into practice around the world. Let's look at a few real-world examples of how decentralization is reshaping governance, politics, and human freedom.

1. **El Salvador and Bitcoin Adoption:** In 2021, El Salvador made headlines by becoming the first country to adopt **Bitcoin as legal tender**. This move was driven by a desire to give citizens greater control over their money, especially in a country where many people lack access to traditional banking services. By using Bitcoin, Salvadorans can bypass the fees and inefficiencies of the traditional financial system, sending and receiving money **directly** without relying on banks or money transfer services.

But the implications go beyond finance. By adopting Bitcoin, El Salvador is challenging the very notion of **state control** over money. The government has effectively relinquished its **monopoly on currency** in favor of a decentralized system that empowers individuals. For crypto enthusiasts, this is a **huge step** toward the future they've been advocating—a world where individuals are truly **sovereign** over their wealth.

2. **Taiwan's vTaiwan Project:** Taiwan's **vTaiwan** platform is another example of decentralized governance in action. vTaiwan is an open-source, online platform where citizens can participate in the law-making process, submitting proposals, voting on issues, and engaging in policy debates. This platform is used to inform government policy, ensuring that laws are shaped by the **collective will** of the people, rather than by a small group of elites.

While vTaiwan isn't a fully decentralized system like a DAO, it demonstrates the potential of **direct, digital democracy** in governance. By allowing citizens to participate directly in the decision-making process, Taiwan is moving toward a more **transparent** and **inclusive** model of governance that aligns with the ideals of the **sovereign individual**.

3. **Decentralized Justice with Kleros:** **Kleros** is a decentralized platform that aims to solve disputes through **community-driven arbitration** rather than traditional legal systems. Using blockchain technology, Kleros allows users to submit disputes to a network of decentralized jurors, who vote on the outcome of the case based on evidence presented.

This model represents a new form of **justice**, one that is not controlled by **governments or legal professionals** but by the **community**. It's a direct challenge to traditional legal systems, which are often slow, expensive, and biased in favor of those with power and resources. By decentralizing justice, Kleros is giving individuals the ability to resolve disputes **fairly, transparently**, and without the need for centralized courts.

The Political Implications of Sovereignty

The rise of the **sovereign individual** doesn't just affect finance and governance. It has profound political implications, especially in authoritarian regimes or countries where **freedom of speech, privacy, and human rights** are under threat. By empowering individuals with decentralized tools, crypto offers a way to **resist censorship, protect personal data, and organize outside of state control.**

Censorship Resistance: Free Speech in the Decentralized World

One of the most powerful applications of blockchain technology is its ability to resist **censorship**. Traditional platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and Google are centralized, meaning they can easily be controlled by governments or corporate entities. If a government wants to suppress dissent or censor certain topics, it can pressure these companies to **remove content or de-platform users**.

But in a decentralized world, **censorship becomes nearly impossible**. Platforms like **Mastodon, Minds, and Peepeth** offer decentralized alternatives to traditional social media, where users have full control over their data, and no single entity can remove content or block accounts. These platforms are built on **blockchain technology**, ensuring that once content is published, it cannot be taken down or altered by any centralized authority.

In **authoritarian countries** like **China or Iran**, where the government tightly controls the flow of information, decentralized platforms offer a way for dissidents to organize, share information, and resist state censorship. Similarly, in countries like **Turkey and Russia**, where crackdowns on free speech are increasingly common, decentralized technologies provide a vital lifeline for activists and journalists who need to communicate without fear of government reprisal.

Privacy and Data Sovereignty

In the Web 2 world, **data privacy** is an illusion. Companies like Facebook, Google, and Amazon collect massive amounts of data on their users, often without their knowledge or consent. This data is then sold to advertisers, shared with governments, or used to influence elections. The result is a world where individuals have **no control** over their personal information, and where their online activity is constantly **monitored and manipulated** by centralized entities.

In the world of Web 3, however, **data sovereignty** is a core principle. Using **decentralized identity protocols**, users can control who has access to their data and how it is used. They can choose to remain anonymous, or they can selectively share information with specific parties, all without relying on centralized servers or data brokers.

Platforms like **Secret Network** and **Ocean Protocol** are building the infrastructure for this new **privacy-focused internet**, where individuals are in full control of their data, and where privacy is protected by the underlying technology itself, rather than by corporate promises that can easily be broken.

Conclusion: The Global Decentralization Revolution

The **decentralization revolution** isn't just about finance. It's about **human freedom**. By empowering individuals to become **sovereign**, crypto and blockchain technologies are challenging the very foundations of **centralized power**, whether in the form of governments, corporations, or banks. This is a **global movement**, and its implications are profound.

As we move further into the 21st century, the battle for **sovereignty** will become more intense. Governments and corporations won't relinquish control easily. We will see continued efforts to regulate, co-opt, and suppress decentralized technologies. But the genie is out of the bottle. Crypto has already proven that **decentralized systems** can work, and the demand for **sovereignty** is only growing.

For the **crypto kids**, this is the fight of a lifetime. It's not just about making money or building the next big startup—it's about reshaping the world, creating systems where **power is distributed** and where individuals are truly **free** to control their own destinies. The rise of the **sovereign individual** is just the beginning. The revolution is here.

Chapter 8: Real-World Assets (RWAs)

Yet Another Trojan Horse of Boomer Debt Slavery

As crypto continues to evolve, a new trend is emerging that many in the community are heralding as a bridge between traditional finance (TradFi) and decentralized finance (DeFi): the tokenization of **Real-World Assets (RWAs)**. In theory, RWAs represent an exciting new frontier for DeFi—allowing physical assets like **real estate**, **commodities**, and **bonds** to be tokenized and traded on the blockchain. The promise is that these assets will bring **stability** and **liquidity** to the crypto market, enabling a new class of investors to participate in the DeFi revolution.

But beneath the surface, the rise of RWAs in crypto also represents a potential **attack vector** for boomer investors—particularly former **real estate executives**—to infiltrate the space with their outdated **debt slavery ideology**. For decades, these executives have profited off the idea that **ownership** and **control** should belong to investors, while the rest of the population remains trapped in cycles of **indentured servitude**. They see the tokenization of real estate and other RWAs as an opportunity to bring this same **exploitative mindset** into the crypto world—one where **debt** and **leverage** are the ultimate tools for **control**.

Crypto kids are well aware of this threat. While the tokenization of RWAs may appear as a step toward **mass adoption**, it also opens the door for boomers to **sneak in their capital-driven models** under the guise of innovation. What's more, their **attitudes**—fueled by decades of real estate speculation and **investment-as-servitude** thinking—are not only outdated but downright **laughable** in the world of **sovereign individuals** that crypto is building.

The Rise of Real-World Assets: A Trojan Horse?

At first glance, the concept of **tokenizing real-world assets** seems like a logical next step in the evolution of DeFi. By bringing **physical assets** onto the blockchain, proponents argue that we can make real estate, commodities, and even traditional bonds more accessible to a **global pool of investors**. Suddenly, anyone with an internet connection can invest in a fractionalized piece of a **skyscraper** or a **warehouse**, and these assets can be traded just as easily as cryptocurrencies.

This idea of turning **illiquid assets** into **liquid tokens** has obvious appeal. It aligns with the crypto ethos of **democratizing access** to financial markets and removing **middlemen** from the equation. No longer would you need to rely on brokers, banks, or traditional real estate firms to gain exposure to real-world investments. Instead, you could buy and sell **tokenized real estate** through decentralized platforms with minimal friction.

But the **real estate boomer class**, always on the lookout for the next speculative frontier, sees tokenized RWAs as a way to bring their **debt-driven models** into crypto. For decades, these former real estate executives have operated in a world where **leveraging debt** to finance large-scale property acquisitions was standard practice. They would load up on debt, extract **value from renters**, and sell off properties for massive profits, leaving tenants and smaller stakeholders in the dust.

Now, as they see the potential to tokenize real estate on the blockchain, they're salivating at the idea of bringing these same models of **indentured servitude** to the DeFi space. And make no mistake—many of these real estate boomers see crypto as just another vehicle to **reimpose their outdated beliefs about debt slavery and ownership**.

Boomer Real Estate Executives and Their Debt-Driven Mindset

The real estate industry has long been dominated by a mindset where **control** over property is the ultimate goal. In the boomer-dominated world of **real estate investment**, the name of the game was always **leverage**—using **borrowed money** to buy property, then forcing tenants to pay **rent** that would cover both the debt service and generate profit for the investor. This system of **rent extraction** is, in essence, a form of **indentured servitude**, where the tenant works to pay off the investor's debt while getting little in return except for temporary shelter.

Boomers who built their wealth in real estate are **entrenched** in this mindset. For them, the idea that **money equals control** is second nature. They view property ownership not as a way to create **shared value or community wealth**, but as a way to **subjugate** others through **debt-based systems**. The relationship between **landlords** and **tenants** has always been one where **capitalists** extract value from the working class, reinforcing **economic inequality**.

Now, as these same executives move into the **tokenized RWA space**, they bring with them their outdated views on **ownership, leverage, and control**. For them, the idea of tokenizing real estate is just a new way to continue this **exploitative cycle**—except now, they can do it on the blockchain, under the guise of innovation.

Debt Slavery in Real Estate: How It Worked

The traditional real estate boomers built their empires on **leveraged debt**. Here's how their system worked:

1. **Leveraging Debt to Acquire Properties:** Boomer real estate moguls would take out massive loans to buy properties. The more debt they could take on, the more properties they could acquire. This model was entirely based on the assumption that **property values** would continue to rise, allowing them to sell off assets at a profit down the line. In the meantime, tenants were expected to **service this debt** through **rent payments**.
2. **Rent Extraction:** Once properties were acquired, boomers would extract value from renters. The goal wasn't just to break even on the loan payments but to generate **excess cash flow** through higher rent charges. This model turned tenants into **indentured servants**, working to pay off the investor's debt with no possibility of ever gaining **ownership or equity** in the property.
3. **Selling for Profit:** When the real estate market reached a peak, boomers would sell off their properties, pocketing the **profit** created by the rising asset values. Tenants, who had paid into the system for years, were left with nothing—no equity, no ownership, no claim to the property they had helped maintain and pay for.

This system of **debt slavery** worked well for boomers, who accumulated vast wealth using the labor and rent payments of others. But for tenants and workers, it was a **raw deal**. They were constantly paying into a system that offered no way out—no opportunity for ownership, no chance for sovereignty.

Bringing This Attitude to Crypto: An Outdated, Laughable Model

The **boomer attitude** toward real estate investment is not only **outdated**, but it's downright **laughable** in the context of crypto's decentralized future. The idea that these former real estate executives can bring their **debt slavery mindset** into the world of tokenized RWAs is a testament to how little they understand about the **philosophy** driving Web 3.

Crypto kids—those building and participating in the Web 3 ecosystem—aren't interested in perpetuating systems of **indentured servitude**. They're not looking to replicate the **landlord-tenant dynamic** on the blockchain, nor are they eager to embrace the **leveraged debt** that boomers love so much. Instead, they're focused on creating systems where **ownership** is distributed, where value is **shared** by the community, and where **debt** is no longer the dominant form of economic exchange.

When boomers talk about **tokenizing real estate** as an "innovation," crypto kids see it for what it really is: an attempt to use blockchain technology to perpetuate the same **exploitative systems** that have kept people trapped in cycles of **rent** and **debt** for decades. These boomers want to tokenize buildings and land, but their real goal is to **recreate the same landlord-tenant dynamics**, except now they'll use tokens instead of deeds, and leverage instead of mortgages.

For crypto natives, this model is not only **outdated**—it's **laughable**. Why would anyone want to bring the toxic culture of **leveraged debt** and **ownership-as-servitude** into a space that was designed to liberate people from those very things?

Tokenized Real Estate: A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing

Let's break down how **tokenized real estate** specifically serves as a **Trojan Horse** for the boomer debt-slavery ideology:

1. **Fractionalized Ownership, Not Sovereignty:** Boomer-backed RWAs often pitch **fractionalized ownership** as a way to make real estate investment more accessible. In reality, this is just another way to divide the asset pie into **tiny slices**, while the bulk of **control** and **decision-making** remains with the wealthy investors who hold the majority of the tokens. Token holders may own a fraction of a building, but they still have no **sovereignty** over how the property is managed or developed.

2. **Debt Structures Disguised as Innovation:** Many tokenized real estate projects continue to use **debt structures** to finance acquisitions, disguising these deals with blockchain buzzwords like “**DeFi for real estate**” or “**tokenized lending markets**.” But at the end of the day, they’re still using **leverage** and **debt** to extract value from property, just like they’ve done for decades. The only difference is that now, they can trade these debts on decentralized platforms.
 3. **Rent Extraction, Now on the Blockchain:** Some tokenized real estate projects even propose **tokenizing rent payments**, turning **tenants** into participants in a **DeFi ecosystem** that’s still designed to **extract rent** from them. These projects pitch this as a way to “democratize” rent collection, but in reality, it’s just a **modern veneer** over the same old boomer model of rent extraction—where capital owners make money, and tenants remain trapped in a cycle of **paying off someone else’s debt**.
 4. **Centralized Governance Wrapped in Decentralized Terms:** Despite being tokenized, many RWA projects still operate under **centralized governance models**, where decisions about property management, upgrades, and rent pricing are made by **centralized entities** (often the same boomer-backed funds or firms that tokenized the asset). Token holders are left with **little to no say** in how the asset is managed, meaning they’re effectively just **passive investors**, not sovereign participants.
-

The Future of Real-World Assets: Sovereignty or Slavery?

As RWAs become more prominent in crypto, the battle over their **implementation** will become a key battleground in the fight between **sovereignty** and **slavery**. The boomer class wants to **reframe tokenized RWAs** in a way that mimics the TradFi real estate world—where debt, rent extraction, and leveraged ownership are the norm. But the crypto community has the power to **reshape** this trend in a way that aligns with Web 3’s core principles.

Reclaiming RWAs for Sovereign Individuals

Instead of allowing boomer-backed funds to dominate the RWA space, crypto founders and communities can build models where **sovereignty** and **decentralization** remain central. Here’s how:

1. **True Distributed Ownership:** Instead of creating systems where RWAs are **fractionalized** but still controlled by a few wealthy investors, projects should focus on building **truly distributed ownership** models, where **governance rights** are shared equally among all token holders. This could be achieved through **DAO governance** structures, where decisions about property management and rent pricing are made by the **community**, not by a central entity.
 2. **Debt-Free RWA Models:** Rather than using **leveraged debt** to finance tokenized real estate, crypto projects should explore **debt-free models** where properties are financed through **crowdsales** or **community investment pools**. By eliminating debt from the equation, these models can ensure that token holders are not trapped in cycles of rent extraction and debt repayment. This would allow for **long-term value creation** rather than short-term speculation.
 3. **Tenant Ownership and Participation:** One of the most revolutionary ideas for tokenized real estate is to include **tenants** as active participants in governance and ownership. Instead of being **renters** who pay off someone else's debt, tenants could earn **governance tokens** for their participation in the upkeep and success of the property. This would turn traditional rent extraction on its head, allowing tenants to **share in the value they create** and ensuring that they are part of the ownership structure, not just passive payers.
 4. **Blockchain Transparency and Accountability:** By using blockchain's **immutable ledger**, tokenized RWA projects can ensure **full transparency** in how properties are managed, how rent is allocated, and how profits are distributed. This transparency can help protect against the **exploitative practices** that boomers have traditionally used in the real estate world, ensuring that governance is **community-driven** and **accountable** to all participants.
-

Conclusion: The Battle Over Real-World Assets in Crypto

The rise of **RWAs** in crypto represents both an opportunity and a threat. On the one hand, it's a chance to bring **physical assets** onto the blockchain in a way that aligns with the **decentralized ethos** of Web 3. But on the other hand, it's an opportunity for **boomer investors**, particularly those from the real estate world, to bring their **debt-slavery mentality** into the space under the guise of innovation.

For crypto kids, the goal is clear: **resist the influence of boomer capital** and build RWA models that are truly **sovereign, debt-free**, and **community-driven**. This is the only way to ensure that RWAs don't become a Trojan Horse for the same old **exploitative systems** that have defined real estate and TradFi for decades.

The future of **tokenized assets** will depend on who controls their implementation. Will it be the **crypto-native builders**, focused on creating systems where **power** and **ownership** are distributed equally among the community? Or will it be the **boomer-backed real estate moguls**, looking to bring their **outdated, laughable** model of **debt servitude** into the decentralized world?

The battle is just beginning. And as with every other aspect of Web 3, it's a fight for the **soul of the decentralized revolution**.

Chapter 9: The Regulatory Backlash

Governments and the Fight Against

Crypto Sovereignty

As the **decentralized revolution** continues to gain momentum, it is no surprise that **governments** and **regulatory bodies** around the world are beginning to take notice—and they are not happy. For decades, governments have maintained control over their populations through **centralized financial systems**, controlling the flow of money, regulating markets, and ensuring that **economic power** remains in the hands of the state and its closely tied corporate allies.

But crypto, with its promise of **sovereign individuals**, **peer-to-peer transactions**, and **decentralized governance**, represents a direct threat to that control. It's not just about disrupting finance; it's about **undermining the very fabric** of centralized authority. And now, in 2024, as **DeFi** grows into a multi-trillion-dollar industry and the rise of **Real-World Assets (RWAs)** on the blockchain starts to reshape traditional sectors like **real estate**, governments are gearing up for a full-blown **regulatory crackdown**.

For **crypto founders** and enthusiasts, this growing regulatory scrutiny isn't just an inconvenience—it's an existential threat to the core ideals of **decentralization**, **sovereignty**, and **financial freedom**. In this chapter, we'll explore how governments are trying to **rein in** the crypto revolution and the strategies that crypto advocates are using to **resist centralization**, defend **individual sovereignty**, and protect the future of **Web 3**.

The Regulatory Response: Governments Fight Back

Governments around the world have long used **regulation** to maintain control over **financial systems**, markets, and institutions. Central banks control the supply of money, financial regulators enforce the rules of the banking system, and governments collect taxes to fund their operations. But crypto threatens to disrupt all of that by creating **parallel financial systems** that exist outside the reach of governments and traditional regulators.

Since the launch of Bitcoin in 2009, regulators have been slow to respond. Many dismissed crypto as a niche market for tech enthusiasts and anarchists. But as the industry grew, particularly with the explosion of DeFi in 2020 and beyond, regulators began to realize the profound threat that crypto poses to their ability to control financial markets.

The Power of Decentralization: Why Governments Are Worried

At the heart of government concerns is the realization that decentralization could undermine the traditional command-and-control mechanisms that governments rely on to maintain order in the financial system. Here's why decentralization scares them:

1. **Loss of Financial Control:** Governments and central banks control the supply of money through policies like **interest rates** and **quantitative easing**. With decentralized cryptocurrencies like Bitcoin, this control is gone. Bitcoin's fixed supply and decentralized nature mean that no central authority can inflate the currency or manipulate its value. This terrifies governments, as it removes one of their primary tools for controlling the economy.
2. **Tax Evasion and Capital Flight:** Cryptocurrencies make it easy for individuals to **move money across borders**, bypassing traditional banking systems. This means that wealthy individuals, businesses, and even entire nations could use crypto to **evade taxes** or **flee** from capital controls imposed by governments. For governments that rely on tax revenue to fund their operations, this presents a major threat to **fiscal stability**.
3. **Undermining Sanctions and Economic Pressure:** Countries like **Iran**, **North Korea**, and **Venezuela** have increasingly turned to crypto to bypass **economic sanctions** imposed by Western nations. This reduces the effectiveness of sanctions as a tool of foreign policy, which relies on the ability to control the global banking system. As more countries and individuals adopt decentralized currencies, the ability of governments to **wield economic pressure** as a political tool weakens.
4. **Threat to Fiat Currencies:** Governments are also worried that the widespread adoption of cryptocurrencies could undermine **fiat currencies** like the **U.S. dollar**, **euro**, or **yuan**. If individuals and businesses start to prefer cryptocurrencies over fiat, central banks could lose their ability to control **domestic monetary policy**. This could lead to economic instability, inflation, and a breakdown of the traditional financial order.

Early Crackdowns: The Regulatory Playbook

To understand the threat that governments pose to the crypto space, it's important to look at some of the early moves they've made to **regulate and control** the industry:

1. **China's Crypto Ban:** In 2021, China shocked the crypto world by imposing a complete ban on cryptocurrency mining and trading. While the government justified the move as a way to prevent **financial instability** and **fraud**, the real reason was clear: China's government saw crypto as a direct threat to its control over the financial system. The ban was an attempt to stifle the industry before it could grow too powerful.
2. **U.S. SEC Crackdowns:** In the United States, the **Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)** has become increasingly aggressive in regulating crypto projects, particularly **Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs)** and **DeFi platforms**. The SEC has gone after high-profile projects like **Ripple (XRP)**, alleging that they violated securities laws by offering unregistered securities. The agency is also exploring ways to regulate **stablecoins** and other aspects of the crypto ecosystem, arguing that they pose risks to **financial stability**.
3. **Europe's MiCA Regulation:** The **European Union** has introduced a comprehensive regulatory framework for crypto assets called the **Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) Regulation**. While the regulation aims to provide legal clarity for crypto businesses operating in the EU, it also imposes strict rules on **stablecoins**, **wallet providers**, and **crypto exchanges**, making it harder for decentralized projects to operate without complying with **centralized regulatory frameworks**.
4. **India's Flirtation with a Ban:** India has repeatedly considered a full-scale ban on crypto trading, driven by concerns over **capital flight** and **tax evasion**. While the country has not yet implemented a ban, its government has imposed **heavy taxes** on crypto transactions and is exploring ways to regulate or eliminate decentralized exchanges.

These early crackdowns represent a **coordinated effort** by governments to **recentralize control** over the crypto space, undermining the core principles of **sovereignty** and **decentralization** that drive the industry.

Boomer-Led Regulatory Pressure

Behind these regulatory moves is a familiar force: **boomer capital** and the entrenched interests of **traditional finance**. Just as boomer LPs and LARPer crypto funds seek to reshape Web 3 from within, boomer-led financial institutions and **corporate lobbyists** are pressuring governments to clamp down on decentralized technologies. These boomers, who grew rich and powerful under the TradFi system, see **decentralized finance** as a direct threat to their wealth and influence.

The Boomer Lobby: Pushing for Regulation to Protect TradFi

Boomers who have spent their careers in **banking, finance, and real estate** understand that crypto is a threat to their way of life. As a result, they're using their wealth and connections to lobby for **regulatory frameworks** that protect the **status quo**. They don't want to see a world where **DeFi protocols** replace banks, where **tokenized real-world assets** exist outside of their control, or where **sovereign individuals** can move their wealth freely across borders without paying fees to centralized institutions.

Many of these boomers are backing **regulatory campaigns** designed to slow the growth of crypto, arguing that decentralized finance is **too risky**, that it promotes **money laundering**, and that it will destabilize the global economy. They frame their arguments as being in the interest of **consumer protection** or **financial stability**, but in reality, they're trying to protect their own **wealth and control**. After all, decentralized systems don't need banks, brokers, or real estate moguls—so where does that leave the boomers who made their fortunes in those industries?

Real estate executives—who have long been the gatekeepers of **property ownership** and **investment markets**—are also eyeing crypto as a threat. The rise of **tokenized real-world assets (RWAs)** on the blockchain could make it possible for **ordinary people** to invest in real estate without going through brokers, agents, or traditional financing structures. This undermines the **leverage-based, debt-driven model** that boomers built their careers on, and they're pushing regulators to **reassert control** over the tokenized asset space.

Former Fed Officials and Central Bankers: Defenders of Fiat

It's not just the private sector that's feeling the pressure—**former central bankers**, many of whom are now deeply entrenched in **corporate finance**, are also driving the regulatory backlash. **Former Fed officials** like **Ben Bernanke** and **Janet Yellen** have publicly voiced concerns over the impact of decentralized finance on the **fiat currency system**. They argue that without strong regulation, crypto could lead to **capital flight**, **tax evasion**, and even **sovereign default**, as governments lose control over the flow of money.

Boomer-backed financial institutions, such as **JP Morgan** and **Goldman Sachs**, are similarly lobbying for **stringent regulations** on crypto, not because they care about consumer protection, but because they see DeFi as a direct threat to their control over **global capital markets**. These firms have made billions by acting as the **middlemen** in traditional finance, taking fees and commissions for services that decentralized technologies can now do for a fraction of the cost—or for free.

These boomers know that if crypto continues to grow unchecked, they risk losing their **gatekeeper roles** in finance, real estate, and investment. That's why they're leveraging their influence over regulators to push for rules that will bring crypto back into the **centralized framework** they've controlled for decades.

The Sovereign Response: Crypto's Fight Against Regulation

In response to these regulatory pressures, the **crypto community** is mounting a fierce resistance. While governments and boomer-backed institutions push for centralization, **decentralization maximalists** are fighting to protect the sovereignty of Web 3. This battle is being fought on several fronts, from **legal challenges** to **technological innovations** designed to circumvent regulation.

Decentralized Protocols and Unstoppable Code

One of the most powerful weapons in the fight against government control is **unstoppable code**. At its core, blockchain technology is designed to be **immutable**, meaning that once a smart contract is deployed on a blockchain, it cannot be **altered** or **taken down** by any centralized authority. This makes decentralized finance protocols, like **Uniswap**, **Aave**, and **Compound**, virtually immune to regulatory shutdowns. Even if a government were to ban these platforms, the underlying code would continue to operate, as long as there are users and miners to support the network.

The crypto community understands that **decentralized protocols** are their greatest defense against government overreach. By building systems that don't rely on any central party, they can create platforms that governments simply **cannot control**. This is the essence of **sovereignty** in crypto—the ability to operate **outside the reach** of centralized powers.

Privacy Coins and Decentralized Identity Solutions

Another key battleground is **privacy**. As regulators push for greater **surveillance** of crypto transactions under the guise of anti-money laundering (AML) and counter-terrorism financing (CTF) measures, the crypto community is doubling down on **privacy solutions**. **Privacy coins** like **Monero** and **Zcash** offer users the ability to transact anonymously, ensuring that their financial activity is not tracked or monitored by governments or corporations.

In addition to privacy coins, new projects like **Tornado Cash** and **Secret Network** are building **privacy layers** for decentralized applications (dApps), allowing users to interact with DeFi protocols without revealing their identities or transaction histories. These tools are critical for maintaining **financial privacy** in a world where governments are increasingly using surveillance to control their populations.

Decentralized identity (DID) protocols are also being developed to give individuals **sovereign control** over their identities, without relying on centralized governments or corporations to verify who they are. Projects like **Ethereum Name Service (ENS)** and **IDEN3** are building systems where individuals can prove their identities on-chain, without needing to rely on traditional identification methods like passports or driver's licenses. This gives individuals greater autonomy over their personal data and prevents governments from using identity verification as a tool for control.

The Power of DAOs: Fighting Regulation with Decentralized Governance

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) are another key weapon in the fight against government regulation. By building **governance structures** that are entirely decentralized, crypto projects can avoid being classified as **securities** or **corporations**, which would subject them to regulatory oversight.

In a DAO, decisions are made by **token holders** through a **voting system**, ensuring that no single entity has control over the organization. This allows DAOs to operate in a **decentralized manner**, making them harder for governments to regulate or shut down. DAOs like **MakerDAO**, **Uniswap**, and **Yearn Finance** are pioneering this model, creating governance systems that are fully decentralized and immune to **traditional corporate regulations**.

As governments push for more control, the DAO model offers a powerful way to resist centralization. By creating **community-driven** governance systems that don't rely on **corporate structures**, crypto projects can maintain their **sovereignty** and **decentralized ethos**.

The Global Regulatory Battle

The fight between governments and the crypto community is now playing out on a **global stage**. In some regions, governments are embracing crypto and blockchain technology, seeing it as an opportunity for **innovation** and **economic growth**. Countries like **El Salvador**, which adopted Bitcoin as legal tender, are positioning themselves as **crypto-friendly havens**, offering **low taxes** and **regulatory certainty** to crypto entrepreneurs.

In other regions, governments are cracking down hard, imposing strict regulations or outright banning crypto activities. China's ban on crypto mining and trading is the most extreme example, but other countries like **India**, **Nigeria**, and **Turkey** are also moving to restrict the use of decentralized technologies.

As governments seek to exert control, the crypto community is fighting back by **building unstoppable systems**, **advocating for regulatory clarity**, and **pushing back in courts** to protect their right to innovate. The outcome of this global battle will shape the future of crypto for decades to come.

Conclusion: Sovereignty vs. Centralization in the Age of Regulation

The rise of **real-world assets (RWAs)**, **DeFi**, and **decentralized governance** represents a new era for crypto, one that is both exciting and fraught with danger. On one side, **sovereign individuals** are pushing for a world where they control their wealth, data, and governance. On the other, **boomer capital** and **government regulators** are fighting to protect the centralized systems that have enriched the few at the expense of the many.

The battle for **crypto sovereignty** is just beginning. Governments, pressured by **boomer-led institutions**, will continue to push for **centralized control** over decentralized technologies. But the crypto community, armed with **unstoppable code**, **privacy solutions**, and **decentralized governance**, has the tools to resist.

As we move deeper into the age of **regulation**, the future of Web 3 will depend on the ability of crypto enthusiasts to **outmaneuver governments**, protect their **sovereignty**, and build systems that are truly **decentralized**. The stakes are high, but for the **crypto kids** fighting for a **decentralized future**, the battle is worth it.

Chapter 10: The DAO Revolution

Decentralizing Power Beyond Finance

As the decentralized revolution reshapes finance through DeFi, cryptocurrencies, and tokenized assets, a parallel transformation is unfolding in the realm of governance.

Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) are emerging as the cornerstone of this new world—a model for collective decision-making that transcends traditional corporate and governmental structures. Initially conceived as a tool for governing blockchain protocols, DAOs are now rapidly evolving into a powerful force that has the potential to disrupt social organizations, non-profits, and even political movements.

For crypto maximalists, DAOs represent the ultimate expression of decentralization. They are a new kind of organization—one that is transparent, immutable, and governed by the community rather than by a central authority. DAOs are also a direct challenge to the boomer-led systems of hierarchical control, which have long dominated finance, corporations, and governments. As DAOs grow in influence, they are opening up new possibilities for decentralized governance—a world where decision-making is driven by merit, participation, and community consensus, rather than by wealth or power.

In this chapter, we will explore how DAOs are redefining power structures, reshaping organizations, and even challenging political systems by providing a model for decentralized governance that aligns with the core principles of sovereignty and decentralization. We'll also dive into the challenges and opportunities that come with this radical new form of governance, including how boomer-backed interests may try to co-opt DAOs for their own purposes.

The Emergence of DAOs: From Protocol Governance to Social Movements

At their core, DAOs are organizations that run on blockchain technology, using smart contracts to automate governance decisions. These smart contracts encode the rules of the DAO and ensure that decisions are made according to community votes rather than through the dictates of a central authority. In this way, DAOs provide a transparent and decentralized alternative to traditional corporations, governments, and non-profits, all of which rely on hierarchical decision-making.

DAOs in Protocol Governance: A Decentralized Foundation

The first wave of DAOs emerged within the world of blockchain protocols and DeFi platforms, where decentralized governance was seen as a way to ensure that the community had a say in the future of the platform. DAOs like MakerDAO, Compound, and Uniswap pioneered this model by distributing governance tokens to participants, allowing them to vote on everything from protocol upgrades to fee structures. These governance tokens represent a share in the decision-making process, ensuring that power is distributed across the network rather than concentrated in the hands of developers or investors.

For example, MakerDAO—the decentralized protocol behind the DAI stablecoin—is entirely governed by its community of MKR token holders. These token holders vote on key issues such as collateral types, interest rates, and the introduction of new features to the protocol. MakerDAO's governance model ensures that decisions are made in a decentralized and democratic manner, rather than being dictated by a central authority or board of directors.

This form of decentralized governance is not only more transparent than traditional systems but also more resilient. Because DAOs operate on immutable smart contracts, the rules of governance are hardcoded into the blockchain and can only be changed through community consensus. This eliminates the risk of centralized manipulation and ensures that decisions reflect the will of the community.

Beyond Protocols: DAOs in Social Organizations and Non-Profits

While DAOs initially emerged as a tool for governing DeFi platforms and blockchain protocols, their potential extends far beyond the world of finance. DAOs are now being used to govern social organizations, non-profits, and community projects, providing a new model for distributed decision-making that could revolutionize a wide range of industries.

For example, *Gitcoin DAO* is a decentralized organization that funds open-source development through community-driven grant programs. Gitcoin allows developers, users, and supporters to vote on which projects should receive funding, ensuring that resources are allocated based on the needs and priorities of the community. This DAO model is particularly powerful in the context of open-source development, where traditional funding mechanisms are often dominated by corporate interests or government grants.

Similarly, *Charity DAO* is experimenting with a decentralized model for funding charitable initiatives. Instead of relying on large, centralized organizations to distribute funds, Charity DAO uses community voting to decide which projects should receive support. This not only democratizes the funding process but also ensures that the community has a direct say in how resources are used, aligning with the crypto ethos of decentralized participation.

These examples highlight the potential for DAOs to transform non-profit organizations and community initiatives by creating transparent, participatory governance structures that eliminate the need for central control. In a DAO, anyone can participate in governance by acquiring and staking tokens, and decisions are made through a voting system that is visible to the entire community.

DAOs vs. Traditional Power Structures: A Direct Challenge to Centralized Control

The rise of DAOs presents a direct challenge to the traditional power structures that have long dominated corporations, governments, and non-profits. These traditional institutions are built on hierarchies, where decisions are made by a small group of executives, politicians, or board members who hold the majority of power. In contrast, DAOs distribute power to the community, ensuring that governance is driven by the collective will of participants rather than by a handful of wealthy or influential individuals.

Corporate Governance: Replacing CEOs with Community Consensus

In the corporate world, power is typically concentrated in the hands of CEOs, executive boards, and major shareholders. These individuals make decisions about the future of the company, often without consulting the broader workforce or customer base. This top-down model has led to a culture of corporate control where a small group of elites wields immense power, while employees and consumers have little to no say in the direction of the company.

DAOs offer a radical alternative to this model. By distributing governance tokens to a wide range of participants, DAOs give power back to the community. Instead of a CEO or board making decisions behind closed doors, DAOs allow token holders to vote on everything from business strategy to fund allocation. This ensures that governance is transparent and accountable to the people who are directly affected by the organization's decisions.

Take Uniswap DAO, for example. Uniswap, the largest decentralized exchange (DEX) by trading volume, is governed entirely by its community of UNI token holders. These token holders vote on key issues like protocol upgrades, fee structures, and liquidity incentives, ensuring that decisions reflect the interests of the community rather than the priorities of a centralized leadership team. Uniswap's DAO model represents a new form of corporate governance where power is distributed across the network, making it more democratic and transparent than traditional companies.

For boomer executives who spent their careers operating in a top-down system, the rise of DAOs is a direct threat to their control. They are used to a world where money buys influence—where shareholders with the most capital get the most votes, and the CEO holds ultimate decision-making power. DAOs turn this model on its head, creating a world where power is distributed and community participation trumps capital.

Non-Profits and Social Movements: A New Model for Grassroots Governance

Non-profits and social movements are often constrained by the same hierarchical power structures that dominate the corporate world. Even well-meaning organizations are frequently controlled by executive boards or wealthy donors who dictate how resources are used and what priorities the organization should focus on. This can lead to misalignment between the goals of the organization and the needs of the communities it serves.

DAOs offer a way to decentralize non-profit governance, ensuring that decision-making is driven by the community rather than by a small group of elites. For example, a climate-focused DAO could distribute governance tokens to community members who actively participate in environmental initiatives, allowing them to vote on which projects should receive funding. This creates a system where grassroots movements are empowered to make decisions based on their needs and priorities, rather than relying on centralized organizations or wealthy donors to dictate their agenda.

In this way, DAOs offer a path toward decentralized governance for social movements, empowering participants to collectively manage resources, make decisions, and implement solutions without the need for hierarchical structures.

Political Movements and Decentralized Governance

Perhaps the most radical application of DAOs is in the realm of political movements and governance systems. As dissatisfaction with traditional political institutions grows, particularly among younger generations, DAOs offer a compelling alternative to representative democracy. In a DAO, governance decisions are made through direct participation, allowing token holders to vote on policy proposals and resource allocation without the need for elected representatives.

This model is particularly appealing to crypto kids, who are deeply skeptical of traditional political systems, which they view as corrupt, inefficient, and controlled by wealthy elites. In contrast, DAOs offer a form of direct democracy where decisions are made by the community, and where power is distributed rather than concentrated.

Political DAOs: Governance Without Politicians

Imagine a world where local governments, school boards, or even national governments are governed through DAOs. In this future, citizens would hold governance tokens that give them the right to vote on key decisions, from budget allocation to policy implementation. There would be no need for politicians or bureaucrats to act as intermediaries—decisions would be made directly by the people through a transparent and immutable voting system on the blockchain.

This model is already being tested in small communities and decentralized organizations. For example, CityDAO is experimenting with the idea of a decentralized city where land ownership and governance are managed entirely through a DAO. CityDAO participants use governance tokens to vote on land use decisions, infrastructure projects, and community development initiatives. This represents a new form of urban governance that could eventually replace traditional city governments with decentralized systems that are more transparent, inclusive, and efficient.

While the idea of political DAOs may seem radical, it's an idea that is rapidly gaining traction, especially as dissatisfaction with traditional governance systems grows. In countries with corrupt governments or ineffective political systems, DAOs offer a way to decentralize power and give individuals a direct say in governance. This could be particularly impactful in countries with authoritarian regimes, where political power is concentrated in the hands of a few elites.

Challenges and Opportunities: The Future of DAOs

While DAOs offer a powerful alternative to traditional governance structures, they are not without their challenges. As with any new technology, there are growing pains and vulnerabilities that need to be addressed. Some of the key challenges facing DAOs include:

Coordination and Scalability

One of the biggest challenges for DAOs is coordination—how to ensure that a large and diverse community of token holders can effectively make decisions. While DAOs excel at distributing power, they can struggle with scalability as the number of participants grows. Decision-making processes can become slow and cumbersome, and without strong coordination mechanisms, it can be difficult to reach consensus on complex issues.

Voter Participation and Apathy

Another challenge facing DAOs is voter apathy. While DAOs are designed to be inclusive, many token holders do not actively participate in governance. This can lead to low voter turnout, which in turn can lead to decisions being made by a small group of highly active participants rather than the broader community. Ensuring that DAOs remain engaged and active is a critical challenge for decentralized governance.

Security and Exploitation

DAOs are also vulnerable to security exploits. Because DAOs operate entirely on smart contracts, they are only as secure as the underlying code. In the past, we've seen high-profile examples of DAOs being hacked or exploited due to vulnerabilities in the code. Ensuring that DAO contracts are secure and audited is essential to the long-term viability of decentralized governance.

Boomer Influence and Centralization Threats

As DAOs grow in influence, there is also the risk that boomer capital and centralized interests will attempt to co-opt DAOs for their own purposes. Just as we've seen boomer-backed funds infiltrate crypto through LARPer funds and Real-World Assets (RWAs), there is a growing concern that wealthy investors will use their capital to accumulate governance tokens and exert control over DAOs.

For example, venture capital firms could buy up large amounts of governance tokens in popular DAOs, effectively centralizing control in the hands of a few investors. This would undermine the core principles of decentralization and community governance, turning DAOs into little more than tokenized versions of traditional corporations.

To combat this, crypto founders and decentralization maximalists are exploring ways to mitigate token hoarding, such as implementing quadratic voting or reputation-based governance systems that reward participation over capital.

Conclusion: The DAO Revolution and the Future of Decentralized Governance

The rise of DAOs represents a profound shift in how we think about governance, power, and decision-making. By decentralizing control and distributing power to the community, DAOs offer a transparent, inclusive, and democratic alternative to the centralized institutions that have dominated human society for centuries. From DeFi protocols to non-profits to political movements, DAOs are already reshaping the way we organize ourselves and make decisions.

However, the future of DAOs is not guaranteed. As DAOs grow in influence, they will face increasing challenges from government regulators, boomer-backed capital, and centralized interests. The fight for decentralized governance is just beginning, and the crypto community must remain vigilant in protecting the sovereignty and decentralized ethos that DAOs represent.

In the next chapter, we'll explore the intersection of AI and blockchain and how the combination of these two technologies could create even more powerful decentralized systems that reshape not only governance and finance but also knowledge creation, artificial intelligence, and human collaboration.

Chapter 11: Centralized AI and the Boomer Threat – The Battle for Control of Human Intelligence

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) represents the next frontier of technological advancement. While AI has the potential to revolutionize industries and improve human lives in countless ways, it also presents one of the most serious existential threats to human freedom—especially if it falls into the hands of centralized powers like governments, corporations, and yes, boomers. In this chapter, we'll examine how centralized AI systems, controlled by boomer elites and traditional power structures, represent a massive threat to the principles of decentralization, sovereignty, and even global security.

The future of AI is not just a question of technological innovation; it's a question of who controls it. As the development of centralized AI systems accelerates—often driven by boomer-led corporations and military-industrial interests—the risks of AI authoritarianism, surveillance, and even AI-assisted warfare are becoming increasingly clear. These risks are particularly troubling given the boomers' track record of using technology for control, domination, and self-enrichment at the expense of the broader population.

The potential consequences are nightmarish: AI systems controlled by boomer politicians and corporate executives could be weaponized to maintain their control over the economy, society, and even nuclear arsenals. In a world where boomer-controlled AI can deploy autonomous military systems, surveillance technology, and financial manipulation, the very idea of sovereign individuals and decentralized freedom may be at risk of extinction.

But as we'll explore, there's another path: a world where AI is built on decentralized infrastructures, aligned with the crypto ethos of sovereignty, meritocracy, and community participation. In this world, AI is decentralized, governed by DAOs, and used to empower individuals, not enslave them. This chapter will examine both the dangers of boomer-controlled AI and the opportunities for building a future where AI serves humanity, rather than ruling over it.

The Danger of Centralized AI: Boomers with Nukes and AI-Powered Control

For boomers who grew up during the Cold War, the idea of nuclear weapons as a tool for global control has been embedded in their worldview. As they aged into positions of power—whether in governments, corporations, or military leadership—they have continued to see technology as a means of maintaining power. But while the nuclear arms race defined the boomer era, a new race is now taking place: the race for artificial intelligence supremacy.

The convergence of AI and military power is deeply troubling, especially when it is driven by the boomer elite—the same generation that has already proven willing to sacrifice the future for short-term control. The idea of boomer-controlled AI isn't just about centralized systems for profit maximization. It's about the terrifying potential for AI weaponization, AI-driven surveillance, and even AI-assisted warfare with nuclear arsenals.

AI Weaponization: The New Frontier of Boomer Control

Imagine a world where boomers with outdated Cold War mentalities are in control of AI systems capable of launching autonomous weapons, conducting cyberattacks, and using predictive analytics to control financial markets and geopolitical power dynamics. This isn't a far-off dystopian future; it's happening right now.

As AI technology becomes more sophisticated, the military-industrial complex—largely driven by boomer-led companies—is increasingly interested in developing AI-driven weaponry. These AI systems are capable of analyzing vast amounts of data, making decisions in real-time, and autonomously executing military operations. In the wrong hands, they could be used to exert control over entire populations or even engage in unpredictable escalations of conflict.

The idea of boomers with nukes is terrifying enough. But boomers with AI-enhanced nuclear capabilities is an even more dangerous proposition. If AI systems are integrated into nuclear command-and-control structures, we could see scenarios where AI-powered systems make life-and-death decisions without human oversight—all controlled by boomer-era generals and politicians who may still be operating on 20th-century assumptions about geopolitics and power.

AI-Driven Surveillance States: The Boomers' Final Power Play

The surveillance state is nothing new, and boomers have been instrumental in building the digital panopticons we now live in, where every click, purchase, and conversation is monitored by corporate and government entities. But AI is poised to take this surveillance to the next level. With the ability to process and analyze massive amounts of data in real-time, AI could be used to create totalitarian surveillance systems that track every aspect of human life, leaving individuals with no privacy, no autonomy, and no escape from constant monitoring.

For boomer elites, AI surveillance offers a way to maintain control over younger generations, especially those who are increasingly critical of the status quo. AI systems could be used to predict dissent, track activists, and suppress political movements before they even have a chance to gain traction. In China, we're already seeing AI-powered surveillance used to monitor and control the population through social credit systems—and it's only a matter of time before boomer-run governments in the West adopt similar technologies.

As boomers continue to cling to power, AI surveillance provides them with a powerful tool to control the narrative, suppress opposition, and maintain the systems of indentured servitude that have defined their generation's legacy.

Financial Manipulation: AI, Central Banks, and Boomer Control

While AI in finance is often talked about as a way to optimize markets and improve efficiency, it also presents a new risk: AI-powered financial manipulation. With boomers already controlling much of the world's financial infrastructure through central banks, hedge funds, and investment firms, the introduction of AI into the financial system gives them even more control over the economy.

AI systems can process vast amounts of financial data, make trades in milliseconds, and manipulate markets in ways that human traders could never achieve. This kind of AI-driven financial power is already being used by hedge funds and investment firms to create massive wealth inequalities and rig the system in favor of those with access to these technologies.

The danger is that boomers, who have spent their lives leveraging debt, manipulating markets, and enriching themselves at the expense of younger generations, will now use AI to further centralize financial control. With central banks already exploring the use of central bank digital currencies (CBDCs), we could see a future where AI-powered monetary policy is used to maintain control over the global economy, leaving sovereign individuals with little room to escape the boomers' financial grip.

The Boomer Threat to AI: Why Centralized AI Must Be Stopped

The development of centralized AI, driven by boomer-controlled corporations and government agencies, represents a massive threat to the principles of sovereignty, freedom, and decentralization. But the boomer mindset is particularly dangerous when applied to AI, because AI systems have the potential to scale control mechanisms in ways that are unprecedented in human history.

Boomer AI and the Maintenance of Power

Boomers have always used technology to maintain power, whether through financial systems, corporate hierarchies, or military dominance. Now, as AI becomes more powerful, they see an opportunity to use it as a tool to preserve their control over society.

The boomer-controlled AI systems being developed today are not designed to empower individuals or promote innovation. Instead, they are designed to protect the status quo. Whether through AI-driven market manipulation, AI-powered surveillance, or autonomous military systems, the goal of centralized AI is the same: to maintain the hierarchical structures that have benefited boomers for decades.

But the crypto community is fighting back. Just as decentralized finance (DeFi) offers an alternative to the boomer-controlled financial system, decentralized AI offers a way to break free from the centralized control of AI systems. By building AI on decentralized infrastructures, governed by DAOs and controlled by the community, we can create systems that serve humanity, rather than dominate it.

Decentralized AI: The Alternative to Boomer-Controlled Systems

The answer to boomer-controlled AI is clear: decentralize it. Just as blockchain technology has enabled the development of decentralized finance, it also offers a path toward building decentralized AI systems that are aligned with the principles of sovereignty, transparency, and meritocracy.

In a decentralized AI system, data and processing power are distributed across the network, ensuring that no single entity controls the AI. Instead of a boomer-run corporation building an AI system that makes decisions for the entire population, a decentralized AI could be governed by a DAO, where community members vote on how the AI is used, what data it processes, and what goals it prioritizes.

This model would prevent the centralization of AI in the hands of corporate elites or government agencies and ensure that AI serves the needs of individuals and communities, not the interests of those in power.

For example, a decentralized AI DAO could be used to create systems that enhance individual privacy, improve healthcare, or even manage environmental resources—all without relying on centralized governments or corporations to dictate how the AI operates.

AI and DAOs: A New Model for Governance

One of the most promising intersections between AI and blockchain technology is the integration of AI systems into DAOs. By building AI that is governed by decentralized communities, we can ensure that these systems operate transparently and with the consent of the people they affect.

For example, a DAO could govern an AI system that manages a city's infrastructure, using data analysis to optimize traffic, energy usage, and waste management. But instead of the AI being controlled by a centralized corporation or government agency, decisions about how the AI operates would be made by citizens, who hold governance tokens and vote on key issues.

This kind of decentralized AI governance would create systems that are accountable to the community, not to boomers or corporate elites. It would also align with the crypto ethos of sovereignty, ensuring that AI is used to empower individuals, not enslave them.

The Global Struggle for AI Sovereignty

The battle for AI sovereignty is just beginning, and it's a battle that will define the future of human freedom. As boomer-led corporations and governments race to develop centralized AI systems, the crypto community must fight to ensure that AI remains decentralized, transparent, and governed by the people, not by a handful of elites.

Building Decentralized AI Infrastructures

One of the most important steps in this fight is building the infrastructure for decentralized AI. This means developing AI systems that are powered by distributed networks, rather than centralized data centers. Projects like SingularityNET are already working to create decentralized platforms where AI services can be built, traded, and governed by the community, not by corporate monopolies.

By building AI on decentralized platforms, we can ensure that AI development is open-source, transparent, and collaborative. This prevents the concentration of AI power in the hands of a few boomer-led companies, while also allowing for innovation and creativity to flourish.

The Role of Blockchain in AI Governance

Blockchain technology will play a crucial role in ensuring that AI governance remains decentralized. By using smart contracts and DAOs, we can build governance structures that allow community members to vote on how AI systems are developed and used. This ensures that AI is accountable to the people it affects, rather than being controlled by boomers or government agencies.

For example, a global AI DAO could be used to govern AI systems that are used for healthcare or environmental protection, ensuring that these systems operate in a way that benefits the global community, rather than a handful of powerful corporations or governments.

Conclusion: Decentralized AI as the Future of Sovereignty

The future of artificial intelligence is at a crossroads. On one side, we have centralized AI systems controlled by boomer elites, corporations, and governments, which threaten to create a world of AI-driven authoritarianism, financial manipulation, and autonomous warfare. On the other side, we have the opportunity to build a future where AI is decentralized, governed by DAOs, and used to empower individuals rather than enslave them.

The crypto community must rise to the challenge of decentralizing AI before it's too late. By building AI on decentralized infrastructures, governed by the community, we can create systems that are transparent, accountable, and aligned with the principles of sovereignty and decentralization.

The fight for AI sovereignty is not just about technology—it's about the future of human freedom. Will AI be a tool for boomer control and centralized power? Or will it be a tool for liberation, driven by the sovereign individuals of the crypto revolution? The answer depends on the decisions we make today.

Chapter 12: Web 3 and the Creator Economy – Reclaiming Creativity from the Boomer Media Cartels

For decades, boomer-led media conglomerates have ruled the creative industries with an iron grip, turning art and creativity into nothing more than a commodity to be exploited. From record labels to film studios to streaming platforms, boomers have perfected the art of turning creators into indentured servants—trapped in exploitative contracts, forced to hand over their creative freedom in exchange for scraps of revenue.

But that's all changing with Web 3. The creator economy is being revolutionized by decentralized technologies, allowing artists, musicians, and content creators to bypass the middlemen, reclaim control over their work, and finally get paid what they deserve—without the interference of sleazy real estate moguls masquerading as media executives.

Boomers who spent decades turning real estate into a casino think they can walk into the world of Web 3 and continue extracting rent from artists. Well, guess what? The crypto kids aren't renting! They own. And we're not talking about some over-leveraged, crumbling high-rise filled with unhappy tenants. We're talking about sovereign ownership over the future of art, music, and creativity.

The Boomer Media Playbook: How They Turned Art into Indentured Servitude

For decades, boomers have turned creative talent into their personal cash cow. Want to make a living off your music? Sure, just sign this contract and hand over 90% of your royalties for life. Want to get your film distributed? Cool, just give the studio creative control and watch them turn your masterpiece into a soulless blockbuster sequel.

It's no secret that boomer media executives have turned the entertainment industry into a machine for maximizing profits—often at the expense of creativity and individualism. Much like their cousins in real estate, they love nothing more than taking beautiful things—whether it's art or land—and monetizing the life out of them until the original creators are left with nothing but pennies and broken dreams.

The boomer mantra in the creative industry has always been the same: "**Pay me first, and you might get something later.**" Sound familiar? It's the same indentured servitude that **real estate slumlords** perfected by extracting **rent** for years without offering anything in return—except maybe peeling paint and a faucet that never stops leaking.

The Crypto Kid Counterattack: NFTs, DAOs, and Direct-to-Community Models

Enter **crypto kids**, armed with **NFTs, decentralized platforms**, and the belief that creators should actually get paid for their work. Revolutionary, right?

With **non-fungible tokens (NFTs)**, artists are finally able to **sell their work directly to fans**, cutting out the **middlemen** who have long profited off their backs. Musicians are creating their own **NFT albums**, visual artists are selling digital art without having to deal with **gallery owners** taking a massive cut, and filmmakers are funding their projects through **community-driven DAOs**—all without giving up creative control to some **boomer suit** who thinks the height of cinema is a **reboot of the 1970s**.

DAOs (Decentralized Autonomous Organizations) are now allowing communities to **fund, vote on, and govern** creative projects, putting control back into the hands of the fans and creators, rather than some **boomer-led media cartel** that spent the last 40 years squeezing every last dime out of the **entertainment industry**. It's a future where **talent gets paid, the audience has a say**, and the middlemen are sent packing—just like the **slumlords** who thought they could keep crypto kids renting forever.

Crypto Artists and the Boomer Slumlords of the Internet

Boomer **real estate slumlords** made their fortunes by holding people hostage to their **overpriced rental properties**. Now, **boomer media executives** have done the same thing with the **internet**. They think they can keep creators dependent on platforms like **YouTube** and **Spotify**, taking their **revenue** and **creative control** while offering nothing in return.

It's the same old slumlord mentality: "**You create, I collect the rent.**" But the **crypto creator economy** is giving artists the tools to tell these boomers to take their **fake NFTs** and **tokenized parking garages** and shove them where the sun doesn't shine.

In **Web 3**, creators own their work. They can sell it directly to fans without having to give up **80% of the profits** to some **middle-aged executive** who hasn't had an original idea since they discovered **Starbucks** in the '90s.

Chapter 13: Education and Knowledge in a Decentralized World – Breaking the Boomer Stranglehold on Academia

Boomers have long held a **monopoly** over the world of **academia** and **knowledge creation**. Universities, publishing companies, and academic journals have become **cash cows** for a generation that turned **education** into a **pay-to-play system**, leaving younger generations in **crippling debt** while **boomer professors** and **administrators** pocket six-figure salaries.

Want to get ahead in life? Sure, just **take out six figures in student loans**, spend the next **30 years paying it off**, and maybe you'll get a degree that'll help you break even. If that sounds familiar, it's because the boomer strategy is the same across all sectors—whether it's **real estate**, **finance**, or **education**, their answer is always **debt slavery**.

But with the rise of **decentralized knowledge platforms**, that boomer stranglehold on **academia** is finally starting to crack. Crypto kids are turning to **blockchain-based education systems**, **peer-to-peer learning**, and **decentralized knowledge networks** to bypass the boomer-run institutions that think **knowledge** is something to be locked away behind **paywalls** and **tuition fees**.

The Boomer Education System: Pay-to-Play Degrees and Overpriced Textbooks

Boomers perfected the art of turning **education** into a business. For decades, they turned universities into **factories** for producing **debt-ridden graduates**, all while hiking up the cost of tuition, forcing students to pay for overpriced textbooks, and building useless **student lounges** and **tennis courts** to justify the skyrocketing fees.

The typical **boomer professor** loves to lecture on the value of **hard work** while sitting in their **tenured office**, collecting paychecks and making students do all the work for free. These are the same professors who haven't updated their PowerPoints since the **Clinton administration**, but somehow, they still have the nerve to charge \$300 for a **textbook** they wrote 20 years ago.

Boomers, of course, think this is just the way things should be. After all, they got their degrees when tuition cost less than a **gallon of milk**, and they think the **\$100,000 price tag** that crypto kids face today is just part of “**paying your dues.**” How convenient, right?

The Decentralized Education Revolution: Taking Knowledge Back from the Boomers

Web 3 is putting an end to the **boomer education cartel** by creating **decentralized learning platforms** that allow anyone to access **knowledge, skills, and expertise** without the need for **student loans or predatory universities**. Using **blockchain-based credentials**, decentralized education platforms can offer **peer-to-peer learning opportunities**, where students can learn from **industry experts, community members, or even DAOs**—all without having to pay exorbitant tuition fees to some **boomer-run university** that’s more interested in building a new gym than actually educating people.

With **decentralized platforms** like **LearnDAO** or **Academia3**, crypto kids are bypassing the old boomer education model entirely. Instead of being trapped in **overpriced degree programs**, students can now **earn micro-credentials, proof of knowledge, or skills certificates** on the blockchain—credentials that are **immutable, trusted, and verifiable** by anyone.

And the best part? The **gatekeepers of the boomer academic world**—those textbook publishers, university admins, and aging professors—can’t do a damn thing about it. The **tuition-slumlord days** are coming to an end, and **Web 3** is building a future where knowledge is **accessible, decentralized, and free from boomer control**.

Chapter 14: The Final Battle - The Future of Crypto Governance vs. Boomer Centralization

As **crypto governance** continues to evolve, the **final battle** is looming—a battle between the **decentralized future** promised by Web 3 and the **centralization** that boomers have spent their lives building. Whether it's in **finance**, **education**, **media**, or **real estate**, the boomers' time is coming to an end, but they're not going down without a fight.

Boomers think they can take over **DAOs**, **tokenize real estate**, and bring their **debt-slavery model** into the world of **crypto governance**, all while sipping cocktails at **country clubs** and pretending they know what an **NFT** is. But crypto kids see through the **LARPer funds**, the **fake decentralization**, and the **boomer attempts** to hijack the future.

Boomers Try to Hijack DAOs: The Centralization Threat

Boomer-backed **VC firms** and **real estate executives** are circling around **DAOs**, thinking they can pull the same tricks they've always used—**buy up votes**, **manipulate governance**, and **install themselves as the new landlords of the decentralized future**. They dream of a world where **crypto DAOs** are just tokenized versions of the same **corporate boards** they've dominated for decades.

But the **crypto community** isn't having it. They know that if they allow boomers to take over governance, they'll be right back where they started—except instead of slumlords collecting rent on overpriced apartments, we'll have **token whales** dictating the future of **blockchain platforms**.

The boomer playbook is simple: buy up governance tokens, vote themselves into **positions of power**, and slowly **centralize control**—just like they did with every **company**, **university**, and **media platform** they touched. But the crypto kids are onto their tricks, and **decentralized governance models** like **quadratic voting** and **reputation-based voting** are making it harder for **boomer capital** to take over the system.

Crypto Kids Fight Back: The Future of Decentralized Governance

In the final battle for crypto governance, the future is still unwritten. But one thing is clear: **crypto kids** aren't going to let **boomer slumlords** and **capitalist vultures** turn their DAOs into **tokenized versions** of TradFi institutions. Instead, they're building **robust governance models**, fighting off **boomer-backed VCs**, and using the tools of **decentralization** to ensure that Web 3 remains in the hands of the people who **build** and **support** it—not the ones looking to **profit off of it**.

The future of **crypto governance** is one where power is distributed, communities drive decision-making, and **capital doesn't dictate control**. Boomers can keep their **overleveraged real estate empires** and **crumbling corporate boards**—the world of **Web 3 governance** belongs to the people, and the **boomers** can't push crypto kids around anymore.

Chapter 15: Conclusion

Building a Decentralized Future for Sovereign Individuals

The battle lines are drawn. On one side, we have **boomers**, clinging to their **debt-driven systems, corporate hierarchies, and landlord mentalities**. On the other side, we have the **crypto kids**, building a future of **decentralization, sovereignty, and community-driven governance**. The **Web 3 revolution** is far from over, but one thing is clear: the future belongs to those who are ready to **break free** from the systems that have held them down.

Boomers thought they could bring their **real estate scams**, their **corporate control models**, and their **education debt traps** into the world of crypto. But they underestimated the power of **decentralization**, the determination of **sovereign individuals**, and the **unstoppable momentum** of the Web 3 movement.

The future is decentralized, and the **slumlords of yesterday**—the boomers who spent their lives collecting rent and controlling systems—are being left behind. Crypto kids are building a world where **ownership** is distributed, where **meritocracy** rules, and where **sovereign individuals** can finally break free from the **indentured servitude** that boomers tried to impose on them for so long.

The **Web 3 revolution** isn't just a technological shift. It's a **cultural shift**. It's a rejection of the boomer-driven world of **debt, control, and rent extraction**. It's a movement that promises **freedom, sovereignty, and decentralization**—and no matter how hard boomers try to take it over, they'll never win.

Because in the world of **Web 3**, the only thing that's overleveraged is the **boomer ego**—and crypto kids are here to **liquidate it**.

Conclusion: The End of the Boomer Era - Building a Future of Sovereignty and Empowerment

The boomer generation, with its obsession for control, debt slavery, and value extraction, is fast approaching its final chapter. Their old-world mentality—a relic of an era when men charged at each other with pointy sticks, vying for dominance—has no place in the decentralized, sovereign future that crypto kids are building. The boomer obsession with hierarchies, ownership by force, and the belief that power is a birthright rather than something earned is crumbling in the face of the Web 3 revolution.

For decades, boomers thrived in a system where rent-seeking was the name of the game, and value extraction was seen as the pinnacle of success. They rode the waves of cheap debt, overleveraged real estate, and exploitative corporate structures, turning the world into a marketplace where everything—from education to creativity to human labor—was something to be bought, owned, and controlled. They looked at the younger generations not as equals, but as indentured servants, shackled by the very systems that boomers created to keep them in line.

But boomers underestimated something: they assumed that the future would be just like their past—an endless cycle of power games and control mechanisms, where value was extracted by the few and the many were left to serve. They assumed that their archaic worldview—shaped in a time when humans solved conflicts by running at each other with pointy sticks—would continue to define how society worked. They were wrong.

The crypto revolution has already begun to rewrite the rules of the game. In this new world, power doesn't come from ownership, but from participation. Merit replaces money as the driving force of success. The systems that boomers spent decades building—centralized, hierarchical, and designed to extract value—are being dismantled by decentralization, where sovereign individuals reclaim control over their assets, creativity, and decisions.

For crypto kids, this isn't just a battle over technology—this is a battle for the very soul of the future. The boomer mentality of exploitation is the enemy, and now that you're aware of their cowardly rent-seeking tactics, you are equipped to resist them, defy them, and build something better. You are no longer the tenant in their slumlord world,

the student in their overpriced **education factory**, or the employee in their **corporate fiefdom**. You are a **sovereign individual**, part of a community that values **merit, collaboration, and decentralization**.

The boomers' time is ending, and they know it. Their desperate attempts to bring their **extractive mindset** into crypto, Web 3, and **decentralized systems** are the last gasps of a generation that spent its life **hoarding wealth, consolidating power, and controlling access**. But in this new world, they will find no place to **extract value**. Because here, **value is created by the community, shared by the community, and protected by the community**.

Reclaiming Your Power

Now that you understand the tactics of **boomer capital**—how they try to **own DAOs**, how they bring their **debt-driven models** into crypto, and how they attempt to **centralize power** under the guise of innovation—you are empowered to take action. You no longer need to fear their **old-world tricks**. You know how to fight back:

- **Reject Their Debt-Driven Models:** Don't let **boomer investors** sneak in their **convertible notes**, their **debt instruments**, or their **token hoarding tactics**. Use **decentralized governance models** like **quadratic voting** and **reputation-based systems** to ensure that **capital doesn't control your future**.
- **Build Sovereignty, Not Ownership:** In the boomer world, ownership was the key to control. But in Web 3, the real power comes from **sovereignty**—the ability to **participate** and **create value** as an equal, not as a **subject** of someone else's property. Ensure that your projects are built on models of **distributed ownership**, where communities thrive without being **exploited by capital**.
- **Defend Decentralization:** The boomers will continue to try and **centralize** the platforms, DAOs, and systems you build, because that's all they know. They grew up in a world of **gatekeepers**, and they don't know how to live without them. But decentralization is the future, and it's your responsibility to **protect** it. Don't let them recreate their **Web 2 hierarchies** under the guise of tokenization.
- **Push Back Against Their Ego:** Boomers love to tell you how they "built the world" and "paid their dues," but in reality, they built a world where they could **extract value** from everyone else. Their overinflated egos are just as overleveraged as their **real estate portfolios**. Crypto kids don't need to follow their rules. You've built something new—something they can't control. **Push back** against their outdated mindset at every turn.

A New World for Sovereign Individuals

The future that Web 3 promises isn't just about **blockchain technology**, **cryptocurrencies**, or **decentralized finance**—it's about a fundamental shift in how **power** is distributed, how **value** is created, and how **communities** thrive. It's a world where **sovereign individuals** can operate without being tied to **corporate hierarchies**, **debt systems**, or **landlord empires**. It's a world where **meritocracy** drives innovation, where **communities** control their destinies, and where **boomers**—with their outdated, **extractive mindset**—are nothing but relics of a bygone era.

So now that you've read this book, you have the **knowledge** and the **tools** to combat the **boomer mentality** that's been holding society back. You understand how their **value extraction tactics** work, how they seek to **recentralize** crypto and Web 3, and how they'll stop at nothing to **preserve their control**. But you also understand that you have the power to **defeat them**—by building systems that are **decentralized**, **community-driven**, and **built to last**.

Boomers built their world by running at each other with **pointy sticks**—but the world you're building doesn't need that kind of barbarism. You're building something better. A world where **sovereignty** isn't just a buzzword, but a **reality**. A world where **power** isn't **extracted**, but **shared**. A world where the future belongs to those who **create value**, not those who seek to **profit from it**.

The **boomer era** is ending. It's time to leave behind their **slumlord tactics**, their **corporate exploitation**, and their obsession with **control**. The future belongs to **sovereign individuals**, and it's yours for the taking. **You are the future**, and the boomers? They're just **running at shadows** with their pointy sticks, hoping they can stop the inevitable. But they can't.

The Crypto revolution is here, and it's Unstoppable



Afterword: The Rise and Fall of Curt Schilling's 38 Studios - A Boomer Sabotage Story

Curt Schilling is best known as a baseball legend, a World Series hero whose pitching performances in Boston are the stuff of legends. But in 2006, after retiring from the mound, Schilling embarked on a second career—one that would lead him not to victory, but to a cautionary tale of boomer sabotage, graft, and the dangers of trusting establishment investors with dreams of innovation.

Schilling founded 38 Studios, a video game development company named after his jersey number, with the ambitious goal of creating top-tier fantasy games. Schilling's vision was bold: he wanted to build a massive multiplayer online game (MMO) that could rival the likes of World of Warcraft. The flagship project was "Project Copernicus," a sprawling, high-fantasy universe that had the potential to be groundbreaking. But Schilling's dream soon collided with the brutal reality of boomer investors, corrupt politics, and the graft-filled world of state-backed financing schemes—specifically, in the state of Rhode Island.

The story of 38 Studios isn't just about a failed game development company. It's about how a group of Rhode Island politicians, shady financiers, and boomer grifters exploited Schilling's naivete, used him for political gain, and ultimately sabotaged his project, leaving him bankrupt and his dream in ruins. It's a story that highlights the dangers of trusting old-world capital, especially when that capital is driven by value extraction rather than innovation.

The Dream: 38 Studios and Project Copernicus

In 2006, Curt Schilling had a new dream. Having already conquered baseball, he set his sights on a different arena: the world of video game development. As an avid gamer himself, Schilling had a genuine passion for creating immersive, story-driven games. He assembled a team of industry veterans, including R.A. Salvatore, the famous fantasy author, and Todd McFarlane, the legendary comic book artist, to help build a universe that gamers could lose themselves in.

Schilling poured millions of his own money into the company, determined to make 38 Studios a success. The first major release was *Kingdoms of Amalur: Reckoning*, a single-player RPG that showed promise, receiving positive reviews for its rich world-building and gameplay mechanics. But it was *Project Copernicus*, the planned MMO, that was Schilling's real passion. He envisioned a massive, online world that could compete with the biggest titles in gaming.

However, despite his passion, Schilling faced a major hurdle: capital. Building an MMO was an enormously expensive undertaking, and Schilling needed significant financial backing to make his vision a reality. That's when the boomers of Rhode Island came calling.

The Setup: The Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation

In 2010, Rhode Island had a problem. The state was struggling economically, with a high unemployment rate and a weak job market. Politicians were looking for a way to jumpstart the economy, and they saw an opportunity in Schilling's 38 Studios. Schilling was a high-profile figure with a big idea, and Rhode Island's leaders thought they could use his project to sell a narrative of economic growth and job creation.

The Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation (RIEDC)—a quasi-public agency responsible for boosting the state's economy—offered Schilling a \$75 million loan guarantee to relocate his company from Massachusetts to Rhode Island. In exchange, Schilling agreed to bring 38 Studios to Providence, promising to create 450 jobs and make the state a hub for video game development.

On paper, the deal seemed like a win-win: Schilling would get the funding he needed for Project Copernicus, and Rhode Island would get the jobs and economic boost it so desperately needed. But in reality, the deal was a disaster waiting to happen. The grifty boomer investors and political cronies behind the deal weren't interested in innovation or the success of Schilling's company. They were interested in lining their pockets and using Schilling's name to boost their political careers.

The Grift: How Rhode Island's Boomers Set Schilling Up to Fail

The \$75 million loan guarantee came with strings attached—big ones. Rhode Island's politicians saw Schilling and 38 Studios as a public relations stunt, something they could use to show voters that they were creating jobs and investing in innovation. But behind the scenes, the boomer investors involved in the deal had no real understanding of the video game industry, and they cared little for the long-term success of 38 Studios.

Instead of giving Schilling the financial flexibility he needed to build Project Copernicus over the long term, the loan deal was structured to create immediate pressure on Schilling to hit short-term milestones. The state wanted quick results—a flashy success story they could parade around during election season. This forced Schilling to burn through cash at an unsustainable rate, pushing the company toward financial collapse before the MMO could even get off the ground.

Worse, the boomer politicians who orchestrated the deal were incompetent in understanding the complexity of game development. Building a large-scale MMO takes years—and Schilling's team needed time and money to get it right. But the loan payments were structured in a way that required immediate returns, and when Schilling's company struggled to meet those demands, Rhode Island's boomer establishment turned on him.

The Fall: 38 Studios Collapses and the Boomers Cash Out

By 2012, 38 Studios was in deep trouble. Despite the promising release of *Kingdoms of Amalur: Reckoning*, the development of Project Copernicus had stalled due to lack of funding and the financial pressures imposed by the state of Rhode Island. Schilling had already sunk more than \$50 million of his own money into the company, but it wasn't enough to keep the lights on. 38 Studios missed a \$1.1 million payment to the state, setting off a chain reaction that led to the company's collapse.

When 38 Studios declared bankruptcy, it wasn't just Schilling who lost everything—Rhode Island taxpayers were left holding the bag. The loan guarantee meant that the state had to cover the losses, leading to a \$112.6 million debt that would haunt the state for years. Schilling himself was financially ruined, forced to sell off his personal assets to cover the fallout.

And yet, while Schilling was left with nothing, the boomer investors and politicians who orchestrated the deal walked away unscathed. The grifty boomer establishment of Rhode Island had used Schilling as a pawn in their game of political optics, taking advantage of his passion and his money to score points with voters, only to abandon him when the project inevitably failed.

The RIEDC—and the boomer politicians behind it—had never been invested in the success of 38 Studios. They saw it as a quick PR stunt, something they could use to inflate their own egos and claim credit for economic development. But when the deal fell apart, they were quick to blame Schilling, framing him as reckless and irresponsible, even though they had set him up to fail from the beginning.

The Lesson: Beware of Boomer Capital and Political Grifters

The story of Curt Schilling and 38 Studios is a cautionary tale for anyone—especially crypto kids—who might be tempted to trust boomer capital or government-backed deals. Schilling's downfall wasn't due to a lack of vision or passion—it was the result of trusting boomer grifters who were more interested in extraction than in innovation.

The boomer establishment in Rhode Island saw Schilling as a tool for their political agenda, a way to make headlines and claim credit for job creation. But in the end, they were never willing to give him the time, space, or support he needed to succeed. They extracted what they could from him—his name, his money, his reputation—and when the project failed, they abandoned him, leaving him to take the blame for a system they had rigged against him from the start.

For crypto kids, the lesson is clear: be wary of boomers bearing promises of capital and political support. Whether it's a state-backed loan or an overleveraged venture fund, boomer capital always comes with strings attached—strings designed to benefit them, not you.

Schilling's dream of Project Copernicus was crushed not because it lacked potential, but because it was sabotaged by a system designed to fail. The boomers who ran Rhode Island's economic development machine were more interested in scoring political points than building a real, sustainable future.

But the Web 3 world you're building is different. In Web 3, the community decides the future—not politicians or boomers looking to cash in on your hard work. The story of Curt Schilling is a reminder to always protect your vision, your sovereignty, and your future from the old world mentality of graft, extraction, and short-term thinking.

Because in the new world of Crypto that we build for ourselves, Crooked Boomers don't get to decide how the story ends

