ChatGPT

Institutional Design of Rights and Wealth Concentration: An Annotated Bibliography

Welfare States and Inequality: Institutional Designs and Distributive Outcome (2006)

- **Author(s):** Joakim Palme
- **Summary:** This empirical study compares welfare-state institutions across countries to examine how social policies shape income inequality. Using new cross-national data on social rights and income distribution, Palme finds that differences in the **institutional design of welfare rights** – specifically the level and distribution of social entitlements – are key determinants of inequality outcomes [1]. Case analyses (family benefits, unemployment insurance, pensions) illustrate that more **universal and generous social rights** correspond to lower poverty rates among vulnerable groups. In short, the **scope and equity of welfare rights** significantly influence social stratification [1].
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** Palme's findings provide empirical support for the idea that **robust, rights-based welfare policies can reduce inequality**, complementing the user's schema which emphasizes "rights recovery" and treating welfare as an investment. It confirms that designing welfare programs around **broad social rights** (e.g. education, income support) can mitigate wealth concentration by uplifting the poor. This resonates with the user's focus on **retrospectively guaranteeing educational rights** and redefining welfare in economic terms (Pillar 1 and Pillar 3 of the proposal).
- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** While focused on income inequality and poverty, this study does not directly address **top-end wealth concentration** or digital-era challenges. It predates concepts like digital sovereignty and does not consider how control over data or technology might affect wealth distribution. Future research could extend this by examining whether welfare institutions also need to evolve to address **data rights** and modern forms of inequality (a gap the user's digital sovereignty and data commons ideas seek to fill).

Heterogeneous Preferences and Asymmetric Insights for AI Use Among Welfare Claimants and Non-Claimants (2025)

- **Author(s):** Mengchen Dong, Jean-François Bonnefon, Iyad Rahwan
- **Summary:** This **empirical study (Nature Communications)** investigates public attitudes toward using AI in welfare benefit decisions, via surveys of 3,200 people in the US and UK. It uncovers a stark asymmetry: **welfare recipients are far more skeptical of AI-driven decisions** than non-recipients, even if AI would speed up processing [2]. Non-recipients **systematically overestimate** how much claimants trust AI, revealing a empathy gap [3]. Even offering a right to appeal AI decisions barely increased trust among claimants [4]. The authors conclude that without including vulnerable groups in AI system design, automated welfare systems risk bias, eroding trust and **wrongful benefit denials** [5]. They call for **participatory development of "AI for welfare"**, ensuring the voices of claimants are heard to prevent further marginalization [5].
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** This study highlights the importance of **informational asymmetries and inclusion in welfare governance**, directly tying into the user's schema. The user's concept of **"Input Constitutional AI"** aims to protect rights at the data/input stage; Dong et

al. provide evidence that **neglecting user perspectives in algorithm design** can harm rights (unjust denials) and reduce trust. This confirms the need for the user's proposed **participatory, rights-based AI oversight** in welfare (aligning with Pillar 2's emphasis on ethical duties of supporters and Pillar 4's call for scientific, inclusive assessment). It also complements the user's focus on **preventing exclusion from databases** – here, showing that perceived exclusion or misrepresentation of welfare claimants' interests in AI systems is a real concern.

- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** While rich in behavioral insight, the study doesn't propose specific institutional reforms beyond participation. It does not directly address **wealth concentration** or how AI might perpetuate economic inequality. A supplemental perspective could be empirical data on whether automating welfare decisions leads to material exclusion (e.g. higher denial rates for benefits, widening gaps) – connecting the attitudinal findings to actual wealth or welfare outcomes. Additionally, the study is centered on U.S./U.K. contexts; exploring similar dynamics in other welfare states (or in digital governance contexts like personal data use) would enrich understanding of **asymmetric information governance** across different institutional designs.

AI Data-Driven Personalisation and Disability Inclusion (2021)

- **Author(s):** Mike Wald
- **Summary:** In this perspective piece (Frontiers in AI), Wald examines how **AI systems often fail to accommodate people with disabilities**, due to bias in data and design. He notes that **disabled individuals are highly diverse ("heterogeneous")**, yet AI algorithms rely on large-group patterns – meaning those with atypical needs become "outliers" often **excluded from AI training datasets** [6] [7]. The paper discusses examples like voice recognition and autonomous vehicles: if **training data lack disabled users' input**, AI solutions (e.g. standard UIs, computer vision) can be unusable or even dangerous for them [8]. Wald advocates **"designing for the edge cases"** (i.e. inclusive design from the start) rather than the common practice of designing for the majority and ignoring outliers [9]. He also explores ideas like **interoperable accessibility profiles** and involving disabled people in AI development to ensure personalisation truly serves everyone.
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** Wald's work directly supports the user's concern about **systematic exclusion of persons with disabilities from AI training data**. It provides a concrete backdrop for the user's "Input Constitutional AI" framework: if AI datasets and classification schemes don't respect the rights and realities of disabled individuals, those individuals remain invisible in digital systems. The user's schema aims to **"prevent exclusion from databases"** and enforce principles like non-discrimination at the point of data entry – exactly the kind of solution Wald's observations call for. This paper thus **confirms the need for an input-side constitutional check**: by catching when disabled persons' data or needs are omitted, and ensuring AI-driven services (like employment support tools) recognize and adapt to disabilities. It complements Pillar 1 (rights recovery) as well, since making AI inclusive can help restore access to opportunities and services for disabled people, countering wealth/economic marginalization.
- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** This article is a high-level discussion and doesn't provide empirical measurements of bias or wealth outcomes. A missing perspective is the **link to wealth concentration**: e.g., how exclusion from AI might translate to reduced economic opportunities or accumulation for disabled groups. Additionally, Wald focuses on disability; similar mechanisms of exclusion might affect other marginalized groups (by race, region, etc.). The user's schema could be enriched by research on those dimensions and by policy proposals to mandate **"data commons" or shared ownership of personal data** for marginalized users – an idea implicit in Wald's call for inclusion but developed more fully in data governance literature.

Human Rights, Datafication, and the Democratic Governance of AI (2025)

- **Author(s):** Molly K. Land and Wendy H. Wong
- **Summary:** This recent legal scholarship chapter argues that governing AI should be rooted in **international human rights law**, and crucially that we must address AI's **inputs (data and values)**, not just its outputs [10]. Land and Wong posit that the datasets powering AI have profound human rights implications, especially regarding privacy, equality, and participation. They contend that the **right to science and technology** (an oft-overlooked human right) can be interpreted to require **public participation in decisions about AI data and design** [11]. By democratizing the "upstream" phases – what data are collected, how they're used, and for whose benefit – society can better mitigate systemic risks. In essence, the chapter proposes a **human-rights-based, input-focused governance model** for AI: ensuring transparency, accountability, and community input at the stages of data collection and algorithmic design, as a complement to the more common focus on output fairness or harm.
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** This work provides a strong theoretical foundation for the user's **"Input Constitutional AI"** concept. It explicitly validates the idea that protecting rights at the data/input stage is essential, echoing the user's point that **output-side fixes (like Anthropic's Constitutional AI) are insufficient if marginalized groups are absent from training data** [12] [13]. Land and Wong's call for democratic participation in AI design aligns with the user's emphasis on **user-sovereignty and commons-based data governance** in the welfare context (e.g., the proposed user-sovereign data commons for disability support). Moreover, by framing data rights as human rights, this chapter complements the user's schema which implicitly treats access to one's own support records and data as a right (Pillar 2's transparency and Pillar 4's scientific assessment). It **confirms and broadens** the schema's normative underpinnings, suggesting that the user's approach is not only innovative but grounded in emerging human-rights discourse on AI.
- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** While rich in principle, this piece is largely theoretical and legal in nature. It does not delve into specific welfare policies or wealth redistribution mechanisms. A supplemental perspective might be empirical research on how **participatory data governance** affects social outcomes – for instance, do communities that exert more control over their data see less concentration of digital economic power? Also, the chapter doesn't explicitly tackle **wealth concentration**; it focuses on rights and governance. Bridging that gap (perhaps by exploring how monopolies over data lead to concentration of wealth in tech firms, and how a rights-based intervention could counter that) would directly tie into the user's concern about wealth distribution in a digital economy.

Confronting Data Inequality: A Framework for Equitable Data Governance (2021)

- **Author(s):** Angelina Fisher and Thomas Streinz
- **Summary:** Fisher and Streinz examine how unequal control over data has become a new driver of inequality, and propose legal strategies to rebalance it. They define **"data inequality"** as the disparity not only in access to data, but in the **power to decide what becomes data (the power to datafy)** [14]. Today's digital economy, they argue, is characterized by a few actors monopolizing the infrastructures that generate and manage data – leading to a concentration of economic and social power [15]. Current laws often treat data as a tradable asset or privacy issue, missing this structural power imbalance [15]. The authors suggest several interventions: preserving flexibility for local data governance experiments, **reclaiming public control over data infrastructure, mandating transparency, encouraging pooling of data (data commons) to boost collective**

bargaining power, and using conditional access schemes [16] . These measures, they claim, could democratize data control and ensure that the value of data is more equitably shared.

- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** This work directly addresses **digital sovereignty and wealth concentration** through the lens of data governance, which is central to the user's interests. The user's concept of a **"personal data commons"** and a **user-sovereign data platform** in disability services finds support here: Fisher and Streinz explicitly promote **data pooling and collective bargaining** as ways to empower individuals and communities [16] . This resonates with the user's long-standing idea of treating personal records (PHR) as a commons (mentioned as a 15-year ideological continuity in the proposal) [17] . By highlighting how unequal "power to datafy" contributes to wealth concentration (tech giants amassing capital from our data), the paper complements the user's focus on **institutional reform**: it provides concrete legal-political tools (like infrastructure regulation and data trusts) that could be integrated into the schema's policy recommendations. In essence, it **confirms the intuition** that controlling data is key to redistributing power and wealth in the digital age, reinforcing the importance of the user's Pillar 3 (redefining welfare as investment) in a data-driven economy.
- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** Fisher and Streinz concentrate on data and legal infrastructure, so they do not directly discuss traditional welfare policy or specific vulnerable populations like disabled people. A missing link is how these data governance interventions would interplay with the **welfare state** – for example, ensuring marginalized communities (welfare recipients, disabled users) benefit from data commons. Integrating this with welfare policy (such as using data trusts to improve social services or to channel digital value to the poor) could further enrich the user's schema. Additionally, while the authors mention **"unequal control over data" as a problem for human agency and development**, empirical evidence of how data commons or transparency requirements actually reduce inequality is still scarce. Future research or pilot projects demonstrating such outcomes would bolster the case for the user's proposed data sovereignty measures.

The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism (2019)

- **Author(s):** Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias
- **Summary:** In this influential work (often summarized as the theory of **"data colonialism"**), Couldry and Mejias argue that the massive extraction of data from individuals is creating a new form of colonial enclosure. They draw a parallel between historic land appropriation and modern **data appropriation**: just as colonial powers seized communally held land, today corporations are enclosing the **"data commons"** – turning personal and social information into private capital [18] . People's everyday lives and experiences become raw material for tech companies, often without meaningful consent, undermining autonomy [18] . This process yields tremendous wealth for a few (largely Global North) corporations, exacerbating global inequality [19] . The authors call this dynamic **"data colonialism's double logic"**: first extract resources (data) from communities, then monetize them in ways that primarily benefit the extractors [19] [20] . The book urges recognition of this exploitative paradigm and calls for new frameworks (legal, normative) to reclaim data for the public good and prevent a future of **"digital serfdom."**
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** This work provides a macro-level, critical backdrop for the user's focus on **digital sovereignty and wealth concentration**. It helps explain why the user's proposed **rights-based data commons** is so crucial: without such countermeasures, personal data (like that of welfare service users or disabled persons) risk being harvested by outside entities in ways that reinforce existing wealth hierarchies. Couldry and Mejias's notion that data extraction consolidates wealth in the hands of a few [19] supports the user's concern that current institutional designs (or lack thereof) around data contribute to inequality. In response, the user's

schema (through Input Constitutional AI and data sovereignty) can be seen as an attempt to **"decolonize" data – to ensure individuals/communities have sovereignty over their information** and share in its value. Moreover, the user's emphasis on preventing exclusion from AI datasets intersects with this: currently, marginalized groups' data may be excluded (as the user notes for persons with disabilities), or if included, the value is captured by others. This book's perspective therefore **challenges and energizes** the schema: it implies that achieving true equality may require not only including everyone's data, but also restructuring who owns and benefits from that data.

- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** Couldry and Mejias paint the problem in broad strokes but offer fewer concrete policy solutions. They highlight the structural issue but leave open how to build alternatives (aside from general calls to action). The user's work could add that missing piece by devising specific institutional innovations (e.g., **data commons, personal data trusts, community data rights**) as practical tools to counter data colonialism. Additionally, while the book is global in scope, it doesn't explicitly connect to **welfare policy** or social safety nets. There is room to explore how data colonialism might specifically affect public services and welfare states (for instance, when governments rely on private tech or data, as in "digital welfare" systems). Bringing those welfare-state considerations into dialogue with this theory would further enrich the schema's foundation.

Limitarianism: Upper Limits and the Fate of Excess Wealth (2024)

- **Author(s):** Dick Timmer (building on Ingrid Robeyns' work)
- **Summary:** Limitarianism is a principle in distributive justice proposing that there should be a **morally permissible upper limit to the wealth or resources** any one person can hold [21] [22]. In this recent Res Publica article, Timmer unpacks the concept's structure. Following Robeyns (who coined the term), he explains that resources beyond what is needed for a fully flourishing life are considered **"excess"** and ought to be redistributed to meet urgent needs and reduce political inequality [21]. In other words, **extreme wealth is inherently problematic**: it's not just that poverty should be alleviated, but also that too much wealth in one hands undermines democracy and equality. The article distinguishes versions of limitarianism – for example, debates on whether excess wealth has zero moral value to its holder or simply lesser weight than others' needs [23] [24] – and explores how a limitarian rule could be implemented (redistribution schemes, wealth taxes, etc.). It also compares upper wealth limits to the idea of social **minimum thresholds**, arguing that just as society sets a floor to prevent destitution, it can set a ceiling to prevent oligarchy [25] [26].
- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** Limitarianism directly addresses **concentration of wealth** – offering a normative case for institutional designs (like wealth caps or steep progressive taxes) aimed at the **top end** of distribution. This is somewhat orthogonal to the user's primary focus on welfare and data, but highly complementary. The user's schema heavily emphasizes uplifting those at the bottom (rights restoration, welfare as investment) and inclusion in data/AI systems, which aligns with ensuring a social minimum. Limitarianism asks the flip side: should there be a **limit to riches** to preserve equality? Introducing this perspective can **challenge and enrich** the schema: for instance, even if welfare rights are strengthened (raising the floor), unchecked wealth at the top can still skew power dynamics (as Robeyns notes, excessive wealth undermines democracy and fairness) [27]. By integrating limitarian principles, the user's framework could encompass not just empowering the marginalized, but also **curbing the extremes of wealth** that often correlate with control over data and policy. This aligns with the schema's spirit of systemic reform – acknowledging that rights design might include not only guaranteeing minimum rights but also preventing the **over-accumulation of economic rights/power** by elites.
- **Notes on Missing Perspectives:** Limitarianism is largely a philosophical and ethical argument; it doesn't provide empirical guidance on how exactly to implement caps or what level of wealth is

"too much." Critics also question feasibility and impact on innovation. The user's analysis might need to supplement this with policy studies or pilot programs (for example, historical cases of wealth taxes, or proposals like maximum income ratios) to gauge outcomes. Moreover, the limitarian view doesn't explicitly engage with **digital assets or data wealth** – a billionaire's wealth today may come as much from data monopolies as from traditional capital. A synthesis of limitarianism with digital-era governance (perhaps capping not only monetary wealth but also access to personal data troves or AI capabilities) could be a novel extension that directly ties into the user's digital sovereignty focus. In short, while limitarianism broadens the scope to the top of the distribution, applying its logic in the context of **AI and data governance** remains an open, fruitful area for further exploration.

(Additional Perspective) Toward Welfare-Driven Rights Restoration – Gaps and Future Research

(No single work fully encapsulates this; this note synthesizes insights and identifies a gap in literature relative to the user's schema.)

- **Summary:** A recurring theme in the user's analysis is **"welfare-driven rights restoration,"** such as retroactively guaranteeing the right to education for those who missed out (Pillar 1). This entails using social policy not just to provide aid but to restore fundamental rights that have been violated or neglected (for instance, offering intensive literacy programs to adults with disabilities who were denied proper education). While many studies cover welfare's impact on economic outcomes, fewer explicitly frame welfare as a mechanism to **reclaim constitutional rights**. The literature on education and social policy indicates that robust public education and training can reduce inequality, and some works note that welfare institutions historically expanded opportunities (e.g., the expansion of schooling and health in the 20th century greatly equalized life chances [28]). However, the idea of restoring rights (rather than simply providing services) is usually seen in legal or reparative justice contexts, not in mainstream welfare policy research.

- **Relevance to User's Analysis:** This perspective is at the heart of the user's Pillar 1 and Pillar 2, which link welfare services with constitutional rights (like Japan's Article 26 on education). It challenges conventional silos: typically, **human rights law** and **social policy** are separate domains. The user's schema merges them, implying welfare programs should be judged by how well they **vindicate citizens' rights** (to education, autonomy, etc.). Empirical and theoretical backing for this could strengthen the proposal. For instance, integrating findings from studies on the long-term benefits of adult education or the positive externalities of welfare (such as increased civic participation) would show that restoring rights via welfare has tangible societal payoffs (echoing the user's SROI argument in Pillar 3).

- **Notes on Literature Gap:** There is a need for more research explicitly connecting **institutional design of rights** with outcomes in wealth distribution. The annotated works above touch pieces of it – welfare design reduces poverty, data rights might redistribute power, limiting wealth could curb inequality – but a unifying framework is still emerging. Particularly, **empirical studies on "rights restoration" programs** (e.g. second-chance education, legal aid expansions, data ownership pilots) and their effect on wealth/income inequality would fill an important gap. Such research would validate the user's bold schema or highlight pitfalls. Additionally, interdisciplinary work bridging **constitutional law, social policy, and AI ethics** is recommended to fully flesh out how a rights-based approach (whether "Input Constitutional AI" or welfare as rights restoration) can holistically tackle the concentration of wealth in the 21st century. Each of the works above offers a piece of the puzzle; the next step is integrating them to design institutions that are both **socially equitable and technologically inclusive**.

---

[1] Welfare states and inequality: Institutional designs and distributive outcome - ScienceDirect
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0276562406000515

2 3 4 5 Automatically disadvantaged? What benefit recipients think about the use of AI in welfare decisions | EurekAlert!
https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1100091

6 7 8 9 Frontiers | AI Data-Driven Personalisation and Disability Inclusion
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/artificial-intelligence/articles/10.3389/frai.2020.571955/full

10 11 Human Rights, Datafication, and the Democratic Governance of AI by Molly K. Land, Wendy Wong :: SSRN
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5371289

12 13 17 02_MAIN_Research_Proposal.pdf
file://file-4kWS1HoNx41hFRpWp685mj

14 15 16 iilj.org
https://www.iilj.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/Fisher-Streinz-Confronting-Data-Inequality-IILJ-Working-Paper-2021_1.pdf

18 19 20 Digital Colonialism and the Data Commons - 3CL Foundation
https://www.3cl.org/digital-colonialism-and-the-data-commons/

21 22 23 24 25 26 Limitarianism, Upper Limits, and Minimal Thresholds | Res Publica
https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11158-024-09662-2

27 Limitarianism: The case for capping personal wealth - LSE Inequalities
https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/inequalities/2024/03/13/limitarianism-the-case-for-capping-personal-wealth/

28 history of inequality: the deep-acting ideological and institutional influences | Oxford Open Economics | Oxford Academic
https://academic.oup.com/ooec/article/3/Supplement_1/i217/7708113