Revolution Populi
A thesis on digital freedom

By:
David Gelernter, Rob Rosenthal, Paolo Coppola, Todd Aydelotte

INTRODUCTION

> **We propose a new social net, where members own their own data and make money selling it – where people describe their lives online, just as they do today, but advertisers pay *them*, not Facebook.**

A decentralized, publicly-governed and user-controlled blockchain database will give *every person* ownership and control over their data. Think about it: what would Facebook or Google be without their databases? Nothing. And yet a person's data is *their* sovereign property – and a critical natural resource.

We propose decoupling the colonizers of the internet from the data that doesn't belong to them. So now, revenue generated by a user's data goes to that user. Ad revenue generated by Joe Peffl's photo of himself and his daughter at Yosemite goes to Joe himself—not to Facebook or any other platform.

This new social net creates an environment where a new cyber token or "cryptocurrency" is the medium of exchange. Members can use their earnings to get services within this environment *for free*—music streaming or movie streaming, even car rides, food orders or any other service on offer. Or they can keep their earnings as income. We will earn money as a cryptocurrency exchange, *not* by selling user-owned data—in fact, we couldn't sell the data even if we wanted to, the database wouldn't belong to us or any entity. It'll belong to the people.

A "Personal Genius" blockchain lets users choose which data or content they want to share with other users or sell to advertisers. Advertisers pay users directly. When someone takes a look at your life, and clicks an ad, *you* get paid. When you take a look at someone else's life, and click an ad, *he* gets paid. The more data you share with advertisers, the more you make.

Consider LeBron James. He has, at the moment, +50M followers on Instagram (and growing). Facebook-Instagram makes +$20 per user per year (and

growing). If each user has roughly 150 followers or friends on average, that's +$6mm per year to Facebook, *not* LeBron. Yet it's *his* content, *his* brand, *his* life.

Now consider a user who has 20K followers. That's still more than $200 per month; and as followers grow, so does the monthly income. It's easy to imagine an app that lets this person use his earnings for music streaming, Uber-style rides, meals delivered to his home or other kinds of services.

Now consider a user with 1200 followers. That's +$10 per month—and, again, as followers grow, the monthly take increases. And that alone would cover the cost of a music streaming service. A user who once paid for music streaming now gets it for free—whereas today, he pays that money to Facebook or some other platform in exchange for *nothing*.

We are describing a future—a *near* future—where advertisers who once paid Facebook-Instagram now pay *you.* You do nothing new; you just switch social nets, from a net that sells your property and keeps the money, to a net where *you* get the money.

Data

Facebook isn't a half-trillion dollar company because of their users. They're a half-trillion dollar company because of the data *from* their users.

Today, social networks influence the course of real events. They shape the information the world consumes. But these networks are not *shaped by* or *controlled by* their users. They are not governed by *the users* who post the content that creates the value. They are governed by the middlemen who run the platforms. **The course of real-world events is shaped by these networks, and the networks are shaped by a small bunch of Big Cheeses— by the platform's owners, the central authorities—*not* by the users who *are* the network, *who create its value*.**

It's natural that things have reached this point – just as every European nation, *naturally,* reached a point where it was governed by a powerful monarch and his court. *But this state of affairs is wrong and must change.* Everyone knows it.

A blockchain ledger will allow a decentralized community to **set the rules that control the social network,** by *democratic vote*. These rules serve the best interests of the people who *are* the social network, *the users*, the actual

creators and owners of the network's content. They will *not*, as they do today, enrich the central authority, the Big Cheeses, the King of Facebook and his courtiers. Our guiding principle is this: users own their own data and *they* earn money from that data.

This, in our view, is good harmony, a virtuous circle—which exists because of the elegant structure of a decentralized blockchain ledger, whose value *rises* as the rules and protocols become *increasingly fair and correct.* The block contributors, and those who determine and enforce the rules, will be elected decentrally by the community of users and token holders. They will be paid in tokens for a job well done—or fired if they do the job badly. Thus the elected blockchain and data stewards will always have a reason to improve the system for the benefit of the *users.* After all, the value of the tokens (their pay) is tied to the ledger, and the value of the ledger is tied to user satisfaction, engagement, and system integrity. Such an ever-improving, self-sustaining system *whose goal is fairness and equitable treatment* is made possible only by a decentralized blockchain.

There are two components here: a newly designed social net, offered as a platform by a company called Revolution Populi, and *separately* a decoupled, decentralized blockchain, a Decentralized Autonomous Organization (DAO) serving as the database and governed democratically, and owned by no person or company whatsoever. It's owned by the community of users—just as the assets of the United States are owned by the citizens of the United States. Access to the database will begin as a "launching privilege" for Revolution Populi's social net – which will be a maiden portal to feed data to the blockchain. But this maiden portal will be subject to the rules of the ledger enacted by *the people*, just like *any* other platform seeking access to the blockchain. And if *any* platform, including Revolution Populi's, tries to break the rules, they will do so at their own peril. Their database access might be limited or even cut off; whatever seems right to the governing community. Other social nets, and *any* other apps *or* ecosystems, will have fair access as well—*the people* will decide the rules. We won't allow one central authority to be replaced by another in the form of ourselves. Revolution Populi is a revolution first, a commercial enterprise second. The second can fail. The first must not.

In a democracy, the people freely determine what's fair and right. Our platform will move constantly closer to what's fair and right because *the people control the platform*.

The platform's rules will be continuously honed and improved democratically. Today, on the other hand, central authorities dictate these all-important rules—by themselves, and entirely in their own interests. Our plan is **cyberpower to the people**—to the people who *are* the network, who generate the network's *content.* After all, the social network belongs to them, to its *users*, not to Facebook. The rules that govern *this* network are democratic rules; the people's rules. The people own the internet, own the Web, and own the information that constitutes the social net's reason for being.

Content

Likeness-piracy has never been a vexing economic problem for people on social nets. Generally, user-supplied content earns nothing for the person posting the photos, or the person in the photos; so no one cares. But a social net like ours, where users will be paid for their content, must consider unethical users whose goal is to steal someone's picture and profit from it. Fake social network accounts have caused *significant* problems to be sure, from embarrassment caused by "cat fishing" to the consequences of false stories deliberately spread. It is therefore important that the network verify your identity—and make sure that you are who you say you are.

Companies like Facebook, which are valued on their total "active users," have no economic incentive to deal seriously with fake accounts. On the contrary: they have every reason to build up their active user count in any way they can. (Bots can make fake accounts seem active.) But, on this new net, we have no need to pad our active user count. We can prune fake accounts quickly, and provide a safer, more reliable service than Facebook and the others.

Today there are many fake accounts on social networks. And anyone can post photos of famous people. Even those photos will make money, on our system, for the famous person—not for Facebook.

Less famous people's photos are also stolen all the time. Users often discover fake accounts created by people pretending to be them.

The hardest verification problem in the open internet age is this: how can we create a digital doorman to detect an account that's based on a false identification? How can we be sure that a photo labeled "Joe Shmoe" actually *shows* Shmoe unless someone else examines the photo and the physical person? And If Shmoe, on the other hand, offers a photo of Teddy Roosevelt and calls it "Me, Joe Shmoe," how will he be prevented from profiting from Teddy Roosevelt's images?

Many attempts have been made to solve this problem—to hand out that blue Instagram checkmark—although never for a purpose like ours. Sometimes, government IDs are required. Accounts may need to be linked to their owner's websites—which are then required to validate back to the social network. These methods seem to be driven by the ruling authority's desire to guarantee to users that Kim Kardashian really *is* Kim. Users who hope to follow famous people won't pay any attention unless they know for sure that an account *claiming* to represent a celebrity really does. But if they *are* certain that Kim's posts are really hers, engagement will grow—and Facebook will profit.

Notice that only certain people are verified, people selected by the authorities. Why not *everyone*? Because Facebook earns lots of money from content that celebrities or well-known figures provide for free. If celebrity accounts are verified, they can draw attention and engagement from "*ordinary*" people. Such verification is, furthermore, a status symbol, something to aspire to. You're "special" or somehow "better" if you have that blue checkmark. Yet masses of ordinary people click on ads and thereby give Facebook its earnings and power.

Our net can verify and protect accounts by using facial recognition and biometric verification protocols tied to blocks in an ultra-secure blockchain to verify and protect accounts. (Facebook has used such protocols for economic purposes.) By using these procedures, we can make sure that the economic benefits of a photo, or any other content, flow to the right person. Facial recognition, plus thumbprint verification, plus name verification by joining a token exchange, offers a powerful way to provide a digital doorman. And *all* this information belongs to you and is controlled by you. It's stored on your personal blockchain. You will be able to participate safely in all the economic benefits of the environment, and in a "one person one vote" system for controlling the rules.

Anyone who uses our network for its intended purposes will be a verified user. We gain by means of token transactions between actual human counterparts —not by gathering as many accounts as possible.

There are also additional, and far more consequential issues at stake here. Today people all around the world depend on social networks for information that governs all sorts of actions and decisions. Unverified information is manipulated and used for truly destructive ends. Governments who oppose each other use social networks as a weapon against one another. It's natural that they would. It's there to be used. However, it's safe to say that significant,

ongoing moves in this direction is a dangerous game. It can in fact lead to all out cyberwar. Imagine if such a cyberwar were to escalate beyond the point of repair, and a foreign adversary were to, say, shut down America's power grid, or manipulate its air traffic control system and crash planes? These are huge, dangerous problems, and today's social networks have *shown* that they can be, and will continue to be, manipulated for truly dangerous purposes.

The Good News

Such problems can be *solved* by the very decentralized blockchain system we propose, governed democratically by the people who contribute data to it. In essence, we propose curing the disease once and for all as opposed to just treating the symptoms, via for instance the "intended" consequences of government regulation. The people, not Facebook, make the money. And so it's in *the peoples'* interests to have a fair and stable system, which in turn encourages more people to want to use it, which in turn means that *everyone* makes more money. In summary, as *the people* determine the rules for data access democratically, the system will always be perfecting itself. We don't know how the rules will take shape. We merely offer a powerful, self improving method of determining them. The only catch is this: you, the people, will need to pick up the mantle, to care enough to take control of your life, and throw off the system that has bounded you.

The Facebook Conundrum

Let's face it, a lot of people would love to see an end to Facebook—yet they keep laughing all the way to the bank. Users want to leave, but can't seem to. Why? Because *everyone* is there. There's an entrenched user base that's been built up through years of small connections, growing larger, and larger, and larger, and now all our stuff is there. If we leave, we're afraid that we'll lose our memories, the timelines of our lives, our recorded lives themselves. So, what do we do?

Well first we have to have some courage. We have to recognize that we're oppressed, and held hostage by their database of our lives. We have to believe that this is harmful to us—and it is. Second, there needs to be a *system* for alternatives. Not just a bunch of independent shysters looking to convince people to flip the half-trillion dollar monopoly from Facebook to them.

With a decentralized, democratically governed blockchain database, lots of other apps and social nets can have the data (by user permission) and compete in the open. Imagine any new entrepreneur with a new app, with maybe a new

viral feature (like Snapchat had), with access to all of the data in Facebook's database, ALL of it—photos, likes, comments, messages, every last thing. And what if, from there, all that's needed is a simple user permission, and whammo —users can go from one social net to the next with all of their data instantly there (including yet-to-be-connections on a new net).

Imagine a database which is an aggregation of data from many, many apps (all kinds of apps, not just social nets), and is user owned, user governed, user controlled. Such data can then be turned around and used by other apps based on user permission. The data then swells, and it all belongs to the user. This *would end* Facebook's lockup on users. It's death to Facebook by decentralized data aggregation and user control. It's death by 1000 apps (or more).

Now, there are three paths for you to take back your life: 1) Start afresh with a new social network (or networks); 2) DOWNLOAD ALL OF YOUR DATA FROM FACEBOOK/INSTAGRAM (you can do this by the way) and upload it to a new, decentralized, publicly-governed, user-owned database where YOU own and control YOU; or 3) Both. Freedom isn't free. If you want your life back, you have to TAKE IT BACK.

Finally, while a decentralized blockchain offers an elegant method for solving such problems, the point is actually larger, and philosophical. What happens online *can* have enormous consequences. In a democratic society, such happenings ought to be controlled as completely as possible by the people themselves. They must not be controlled by some centralized authority. At a minimum, the people's degree of control must increase constantly. No democratic society could withstand a mere shift of control from one central authority (e.g. Facebook) to another (e.g. the government)—much less a shift towards a partnership between the two.

ECOSYSTEM

MUSIC STREAMING

Premise

> **Suppose that music streaming on this new social net included not just standard catalogue music, but every artist on earth with a musical thought? Suppose you could listen to the music you know and love the same way as always—and also, with no effort at all, be handed new music you're apt to like? Music you would never otherwise have discovered?**

You'd get new music for a good price, and the price you pay would go straight to the artist and help him live and make more art. And you'll be able to pay using income you don't have now—income you'd get merely by using your social network in your ordinary way. And it'd be straight through if you like. Meaning you'd simply use your social media, and part of the money you earn would pay for the music automatically, without you having to think about it.

Piracy

An immutable decentralized ledger for digital content would let a utility controlled by no company or person to determine *what is or is not piracy*. A continually growing rule-based system (legislated and governed democratically) helps make that determination.

The new approach would help address many of the problems that have plagued fair, equitable distribution of earnings *to the actual content owners* in the digital age.

Perhaps the most complex issue facing copyright ownership in the open internet age is this: How do you tie the artistic content of a composition—what you hear and see—to a master reference in a way that allows you to determine whether a new product is merely a *new version* of the original, and not a new composition in its own right?

In this new democratically governed data system, hypothetically, a rule might be proposed and implemented whereby copyright disputes are left up to a "jury" of sorts—a digitally determined "close enough" standard for everyone based on digital thumbprints of the content, and the validated ownership structure of the blockchain, with smart contracts directing the traffic to the rightful copyright owners' personal blockchains. This is a much more elegant, practical and sustainable concept than YouTube's (Google's) "ContentID". The larger point, however, is that the community governs access to the database. So any system, any app (including ours), would have to conform to whatever the rules are, otherwise they can be clipped from the database. And, needless to say, any app would need to abide by temporal law as well concerning DMCA takedowns. The point is that such a system could provide *better* protections against copyright infraction on top of existing law. Plus, an added benefit is that smart contracts can eliminate all that costly infrastructure to make sure that the right artists get paid the right amount, which means higher payouts for the artists.

Such a decentralized, ever-improving, self-sustaining system, whose mission is fair and equitable distribution of earnings from content, can be realized only by means of a decentralized blockchain. The users and content-owners have complete control, and decide on the rules. Such a system will necessarily be self-improving and become more and more fair—*assuming only that a reasonable, fair-minded majority exist*s among users and content owners.

Google and YouTube would no longer be in control. The content owner would be. Just by being on the system, the owner helps to prevent piracy of her material due to the self-improving nature of the system—remember, that owner owns all of the content, including all of the digital thumbprinting. The owner is now better protected from a situation where, by the time she's had phony material removed, someone else has uploaded it all over again, and could (theoretically) use her blockchain as a safeguard against regular internet companies from pirating her material by requiring those companies to reference her personal blockchain. It's hers, she can do with it what she pleases.

In summary, without blockchain, a centrally-controlled hornets' nest of systems, databases, paperwork maintenance and manual intervention will always prevail—a hornets' nest that is full of errors, avarice, endless negotiations, lobbying and law suits. A hornets' nest that learns nothing and makes nothing better, ever. Such a system is monumentally messy and complex, and stays that way. It's such a mess, we can fairly argue that, without the systems harmonization and complete digitalizing that blockchain brings, copyright infringement can never *really* be controlled; will never be eradicated or even made better. And the cost of the regime of the hornets' nest is born ultimately—*of course!*—by the content consumer or content producer or both.

MOVIE & TV STREAMING

Our ecosystem can put user-generated video content side by side with licensed movie and television content. With straight-through processing and smart contracts, users will be able to pay-per-stream, and content owners will get the economic benefit directly and instantly. The money made by platforms like Netflix and Hulu would be virtually wiped away. Consumers will pay less, and licensors will be paid more. And there will no longer be a gap between amateur and professional producers—they will share the same platform. Machine learning will be focused on user preferences. Artificial Intelligence and other advanced technology will make discovering new content a pleasure: the process will be smooth, simple and surprising in the best sense.

This will throw the gates wide-open to visual creators (in addition to composers and songwriters per above)—and users will benefit from a greatly-expanded group of easy-to-choose offerings while they continue to locate their old favorites easily. The system will make it possible for anyone with a phone plus an idea to compete with major, professional productions. We might well find that a new generation of visual story-tellers, composers and lyricists will push forward into domains we'd never have discovered so soon, or never *at all*, without the fairness and freedom that this system plans to offer.

Visual story-telling, for example, is natural to most of us. Almost everyone loves stories, and many of us think in pictures. But unless you are an illustrator, painter or comic book artist, or can find one to work with, you're not apt to get *one chance* to tell the public a visual story *in your whole life*. Thus a powerful human talent goes almost unused because our technology is so grossly unimaginative.

> *No industry moves slower than technology. No industry resists innovation more stubbornly.* The reason is simple: no new industry has *ever* been so flush with cash, power and success. Why should the industry change, why should it move forward, why should it move a muscle when it is working so beautifully for its owners? To move this industry forward requires an entirely new system with an entirely new approach. *We can bring forward such a system.*

In short, it will be hard for rational users to resist our proposition. They will *pay less* to stream basically the *same mainstream content*, with a chance to discover *new offerings they'd never have found otherwise*, on a system where *content providers get their fair share* at last. And many users will *pay nothing*— because they will earn money by using social media in the same way they always have.

No platform or app has figured out how to compete with YouTube. None has figured out how to put your favorite movies and TV on that same platform. The system we've outlined herein solves exactly the problem that has stood in the way of the one-stop platform so many users would love to see.

NEWS

News organizations, especially print, don't get all that much from social nets right now. Right now they make money when someone shares a link to their story, which then takes that person to their website that has ads on it. What we propose here is a system where news stories, full stories, show up in your

social media feed, and the *news organization* makes the money off of the ads in your feed, *not* Facebook. This would mean a seamless stream of your news, along with all the other content you want to see, or listen to, or experience. Such news organizations will then literally have additional revenue, because their content will be viewed additionally directly on the social media platform. Your news stream would be a separate vector populated with the news outlets that you like. These outlets' stories would be folded into your social net feed, and everybody wins. Except Facebook.

SEARCH ENGINE

Google is a tax on every business and every consumer to the tune of $100 billion per year. If I search for some sneaker brand, a shop has spent money to put its link on top. And that shop doesn't even know if it will make a sale.

In our proposed ecosystem, *the user who clicks the link* will profit—will get a discount paid in tokens. But only if he buys the sneakers.

This strategy will send advertising dollars straight to consumers in the form of discounts. *And* it will eliminate the $100 billion per year Google pockets—and consumers pay. It will decrease the overall cost of advertising, because it's incentives don't work to gouge advertisers. Cheaper ads also return money to consumers: they lead to lower prices for products and services, because businesses don't have stiff advertising costs to pass on. Of course consumers are paid directly, too, in the form of discounts.

The technical aspects of internet search are not unique to Google. (Historical note: certain aspects of Google's parallel search technique—many computers must work simultaneously on the stream of search requests to provide adequate performance—we guess *may be* based on the search techniques described by Carriero and Gelernter in their 1991 book, *How to Write Parallel Programs* (MIT Press).) The *non*-uniqueness of Google's search technology explains the company's spending many billions to create a software ecosystem to surround and protect their search engine. But if users use our search routine instead, *they* will gain financially. They will pay less for products and services. And this fact might be enough to break Google's stranglehold on computer users all over the world—and thus break Google's power to own and control user search patterns worldwide. By knowing a user's search patterns, Google *learns something about that user's thought patterns*. Knowing *those* gives Google a dossier on every user. Facebook and Google have the traditional power wielded by secret police forces throughout history. Americans have never allowed such power in private hands.

Our search routine will never centralize such information, will use decentralized storage for all such data and will store it in cloud partitions that are always accessible to, and controlled by, the user.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) / MACHINE LEARNING

The colonizers of the internet, the "Kings," have control over trillions of dollars of market capitalization, and control all the data necessary to fashion new sentient machines as they see fit. They will be able to program their belief systems, their politics, their morality, everything. This would all otherwise sound like crazy talk, paranoia, or a modestly entertaining science fiction movie, if it weren't an actual real risk. While one might argue that such manipulation would cease to be a successful sentient machine (if it were programmed with biases), the reality is that the human brain operates based on both logic and emotion. Emotion is ever changing; and often people continue to make the same mistakes as a result; and while most of us learn over time, the variables to that learning may not be a complete set (and arguably rarely if ever are)—and the end result of this "learning" may therefore never be fully complete or understood—meaning that you might think you've figured out an answer, but a few years later, realize you still were somewhat wrong in your thinking. Thus, a machine would have to, theoretically, go through the same experiences in order to "learn" (albeit due to the oceans of data and access to outcomes of behavior, they'd learn much, much faster—and arguably "better"). And, along the way, the human beings that control not only the "how" in the learning, but the "what's the lesson here to understand", will control the wiring of the machine's brain, and thus will likely embed their particular biases. A successful outcome of a "lesson" learned by a machine would have to be judged by the person who controlled the machine—whatever they deem to be a "success" would be the success, even if that in and of itself were data driven (e.g. is "mob rule" a successful outcome, and if not, what's the better outcome for the particular matter to hand, and why?); and even if, in order to really successfully mirror for instance a negotiation between two objectives, the outcome would have to be satisfactory to what would otherwise be two human counterparts, who's to say what that is? Some deals end up being "good" for both sides in absolute terms, but "bad" in terms of emotion; or good over the first five years, but bad thereafter due to unforeseen circumstances; or perceptively "good" but in reality not "good". And so, it could very well come to pass that biases in what's deemed a "success", or even nefarious changes along the way, point algorithms in the direction that best suits the "maker", or a hacker, inevitably.

As a machine may be programmed to learn on its own, based on mistakes in logic that it itself has made, and thus then recode or reprogram itself to improve on its own—success and failure, good and bad, are elementally emotional and moral determinations, which are, perhaps (though perhaps not), elastic or even ever-ambiguous. And while a machine may decide a binary answer and learn and improve, or even determine that ambiguity is the answer and allow further inputs to guide the decision-making course, or even determine that the answer is dependent on sentiment of the moment, demanding societal chaos and violence for a period of time for humanity to resolve itself, we are indubitably at an inflection point where the technology is developing to bring to market such a machine beast, but where we as a human race are still raging against ourselves, still in the dark ages when it comes to any kind of reasonably evolved architecture or definition of the 'soul' itself.

We can't code God—at least not yet. And we can't allow the Kings of The Internet to determine what that code should be in the meanwhile. And if we don't stop them, right now, they will.

There are a host of ethical and, quite literally, life and death issues that arise out of the future of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. What we've done is to solve for the debate: we want to leave it in the hands of the people. The data used to determine these sentient machines will be from the oceans of data that's transmitted over the internet. If *the people* owned and controlled all that data, as they would in our proposed system, and own and control all the rules surrounding the use of that data, then the people (not the Kings of The Internet) would control the uses of it. The people would decide, how, if, when, to what extent, and by whom this data would be used for AI purposes. We have no idea, nor do we have an opinion to share herein, about the answers to those puzzling questions. However, what this does solve for is this: people throughout the world won't wake up one day with a sentient computer doing their job and making their decisions for them unless they have willfully permitted such a thing. One may argue that no one would willfully permit that. However, one could imagine, for instance, people determining certain functions that they don't mind having a machine determine for them—and the people who would be otherwise displaced in their jobs as a result might, as a requirement for the implementation of such a thing, own a stake in the company that put them out of work in return for allowing it to happen; and/or need to be offered the reskilling that would place them in new jobs. Either which way, those decisions would be in the hands of the people. However, any which way, it's *data from the internet* that will decide all of it. And that data belongs to all of us, both collectively as a human race, and individually as our own sovereign beings, all at the same time.

It comes down to this: who controls the data, and the decision making, that will determine the outcome of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning? You have two choices: 1) Facebook & Google or 2) You. Take your pick.

PATH FORWARD

Premise

While Revolution Populi will shepherd the formation of the blockchain foundation, the blockchain itself will belong to the people, not us. If the people, in their wisdom for instance, decide to deny our very own social net platform access to it because we've breached trust, or have somehow demonstrated ourselves to be bad actors, then that's it, we're out. We will draft 'Articles of Confederation', though this time based on the existing US Constitution, as a preliminary structure, which can then give way to an online Constitutional Convention of democratically elected representatives to debate, amend as necessary, and ultimately ratify a Constitution.

Blockchain

We propose a novel system of using blockchain to form a "rope" of interrelated blockchain strands, or "fibers". The common fiber will be the financial blockchain ledger. The surrounding fibers or strands will be the individual personal strands of all users of the platform. Consider the event that Personal Fiber A engages in a transaction with Person Fiber Z. This engagement forms a knot in the common financial fiber. This will be done in typical blockchain form using Merkle Trees. The knot is formed by extending the personal fibers of Personal Fiber A and Personal Fiber Z (essentially the new block extends the chain of both A and Z and the common financial fiber). So both A and Z will have that block added to their personal fiber (and of course whatever other transactions were included in that block, those participants would have their personal fibers extended and knotted).

Only those users that have a transaction in that block will be knotted. This keeps personal fibers always updated and recorded with previous transactions. It also eliminates the need for personal fibers to keep a record of transactions they are not involved in.

The more users/fibers, the more robust the "rope". The more transactions, the more "knots", the more strongly the rope is bound together.

As the proposal is to allow all people to benefit from their data, the personal fibers will link individual content/data to their own fiber, which when transacted upon will tie it into the rope by "knotting" it to the financial fiber. Personal content/data will be connected "booked" to the personal fiber by HASHES linking the personal fiber to a distributed HASH table. Therefore, your content/data, such as photos, music, any of your personal information, will be yours. Larger data files can be stored in a distributed file system and would be connected to your personal fiber.

Data systems can be governed by a proper Constitution, with one person one vote (based off of identity verification). Privacy protocols will be implemented by way of smart contracts, and would be between app(s)/ecosystem(s) and user permissions, in accordance with the Constitution and applicable temporal law. Revolution Populi would provide a template in its maiden platform for privacy protocols, however this would stand only as an initial template—and the governing body would determine laws and adjudication protocols, including any requirements for Revolution Populi and other apps to change their ways. The foundation would be responsible for implementing any holistic technology requirements (if and as seen fit) for developers to comply with in order to access the Rope. They would have the right, for instance, to increase or decrease transaction fees in order to maintain the system responsibly, and for the benefit of all.

We're establishing a simple, elegant connection between the best, most useful aspects of the blockchain technology framework and the best benefits of a central platform, or portal, to feed it data. *Blockchain technology* allows decentralized security, democratic rule-making, straight-through-processing, and transferable cyber currency. A *central platform* allows a central square—a common user community, user-to-user engagement and connectivity, one-stop shopping, and ease of execution.

On this powerful structure there can be a complete software system that lets users own and govern their online lives. They can find all sorts of online services deeply discounted or free—music, movies, car rides, food delivery orders; and many will be able to earn income too.

Fashioning such a structure is an ambitious project, to say the least. But we start with a valuable base: a fully developed and market tested social music app for the Web, Android and iPhone. It combines rich social media with music streaming, playlisting and discovery. This prototype was called MyFyx, and the tech stack is with us in-house.

The very first application to be released will be a simple token exchange app. The maiden product out of the gate, however, will be a new social media app with music streaming, where users will be able to engage in social media activity, and stream music, all using the token as a medium of exchange. As this initial proof of concept swells with activity, more features can then follow —not only to the social net, but to the ecosystem overall—and not only on our portal, but from any other entrepreneur seeking to innovate and create new service models on top of the decentralized blockchain data. Once a stable production environment for the maiden product has been established, the system will be open to developers and entrepreneurs the world over. Following the exhaustion of the initial token reserve to pay for the upkeep of the blockchain, in order to persist the blockchain and reward block producers, apps can pay transaction fees to the blockchain foundation as a cost of doing business as if they're paying a database service provider (they'd no longer need to otherwise pay for the upkeep of any database).

Such a database can be the foundation for a secure repository for all human data on earth ultimately, fed to it by a multitude of apps for a variety of different purposes, but with any aspect of a person's data going to their own personal blockchain. Each person would have total agency and control over their data, no matter what it is or where it came from.

Token Distribution

Token purchase and exchange details will be released shortly. This will constitute the decentralized, crowdfunding engine for the entire program. So stay tuned...

Monetization

Our objective is to make a $500bn digital ad market (e.g. Facebook, Google), and a $200bn digital content distribution market (e.g. Spotify, Netflix), and a $100bn digital service market (e.g. Uber, Grubhub), and return that money to the people to whom it actually belongs: the content owners and consumers.

We make money as a cryptocurrency token exchange.

If you're an advertiser and you want to display ads on a social media feed, you buy that right by paying the content-creators who drew that attention. You pay in tokens, acquired in a marketplace in exchange for cash. Your tokens are transferred to the wallets of the content-creators. Thus, content-creators are paid directly.

Additionally, suppose you're a market research company, and want to understand behavior patterns or typical attitudes on certain topics. You purchase such information using tokens. You acquire tokens (as usual) at a marketplace in exchange for cash, and pay them directly to the users whose opinions and attitudes you want to learn about. If they don't want to sell, you increase your offer or buy somewhere else.

We also intend to airdrop tokens to advertisers in order to incentivize them, and to incentivize users to join the platform and collect that money. We'll also be looking to airdrop tokens to record companies as a sort of non-refundable deposit so that users can begin streaming their music.

Marketplace

The marketplace to exchange tokens will not be exclusive to us. Our exchange will have a competitive advantage for the specific token because it'll reside within our ecosystem, and the practical use of the token will start on our platform, but our transaction fees will be held in check because we will be subject to marketplace competition; meaning as other crypto exchanges offer better and/or cheaper services, we'll be kept under constant pressure from that competition—which is the whole point. Plus, we envision other apps/ecosystems using the blockchain database and the corresponding token, so more and more exchanges will be incentivized to list the token as it grows in popularity, increasing competitive pressure on transaction fees and platform services.

A New Social Net

The first product pod will be an improved, enriched version of MyFyx—which already combines rich social networking features with music streaming. We will expand the product to include more features, *and* we will enrich our music streaming and discovery offering by adding catalogue music. New music our users would never otherwise have discovered will be placed side-by-side with music they already know and love. We will handle new discovery offerings using a sophisticated AI discovery engine, the foundations of which were built for MyFyx.

Beyond this initial product, we will then seek to incorporate a dramatic new user interface for social networking.

Existing social nets have such a stranglehold over their user base, that very little in the way of design innovation, or innovation at all, tends to happen. We'd like to change all that.

Refer to the video at www.revolutionpopuli.com for a visual representation.

This ecosystem begins with a sphere grid, with pulsating vectors. Each vector is a certain organized stream.

For example one vector can be your standard social net, beginning at the beginning of time and pulsating outward with new activity.

Another can be your music, including recommendations (that an AI engine might recommend that you'd like).

Another can be your search engine, which can show your search history for easy access, or of course a clear vector if you want to clear the history.

Another can be your news – the various news organizations and articles that you like, or that an AI engine might recommend that you'd like.

From there, the vectors from the sphere collapse into card stacks inside a *new* social net ecosystem. So now your *new* social net includes your news articles, your music, your internet searches, and of course your classic social net activity.

CONCLUSION

A publicly-owned, decentralized blockchain database, that decouples the internet colonizers from the data that they control, can, would, and will rescue the world from this dire time that we're in, where a very small handful of human beings have indescribable power and control, and have manipulated the free market and existing law in order to assume absolute power over information. And make no mistake, they're not done yet. We must end this madness.

This is the solution we're presenting to the world. And, while we're confident in our ability to fashion this system, and to be successful with our particular platform, if it's not us, it will be someone else. This is what matters. The solution is what matters.