MOLOCH

The Optimization Trap

By Nicholas Detweiler

For Crystal Daniels,
I'd never have learned these lessons without you.
You will be missed and loved forever.

Contents

Chapter 1: A Warning Shot

A month ago I finished reading a novel that wasn't written by a human. I enjoyed it.

I want to sit on that sentence for a moment, because the verb is doing the work. I didn't endure it. I didn't respect it the way you respect a student essay that's trying hard. I enjoyed it -- the way you enjoy a book that makes you stay up too late, that makes you think about its characters when you're supposed to be doing something else. I finished it and set it down and stared at the wall for a while, which is what I do when a book has landed.

The novel is called A Thousand Silences. It's 52,000 words, set during the Haitian Revolution, about a French translator who slowly recognizes that the precision of his work is what makes him complicit. I'm releasing it into the public domain alongside this book. You can read it. You can check whether I'm full of it.

I didn't write it. I built the system that produced it.

* * *

A year ago I was thinking about game engines. Specifically, about non-player characters, the shopkeepers and quest-givers in video games who say the same three lines until you want to throw your controller through the screen. I wanted to know if AI could give them something better. Better dialogue, responses that changed based on what you'd said to them before.

I started pulling on that thread and it led somewhere I didn't expect. The problem with NPCs turned out to be a problem with long-form coherence in general. The common knowledge at the time was that AI could generate paragraphs, maybe scenes, but collapsed across anything longer. It was reasonable common knowledge. Ask it to write chapter one and it might impress you. Ask it to remember what happened in chapter one when it's writing chapter twelve, and the thread slips. Characters forget promises they made. Plot lines dissolve. The thing falls apart.

What I found, working through it over months, was that much of that collapse wasn't fundamental to the models. It was an orchestration problem. The models could hold coherence -- they just couldn't hold it alone, across a hundred pages, with no structure supporting them. Neither can a human writer, for that matter. Humans use outlines, notes, revision, editors, beta readers. The question was whether you could build an equivalent scaffolding out of specialized AI agents: one to track character state, one to flag continuity errors, one to revise for tone, one to argue against the draft from the perspective of a skeptical reader.

That system is what I call Open-Write. It's a workflow of AI agents designed to sustain coherence across long-form narrative, each one checking the others' work, the way a good writers' room checks itself. I gave it three pieces of direction for the first test: use the Haitian Revolution as a setting, draw on Laurent Dubois's Avengers of the New World as historical grounding, take Hamlet as the emotional template.[1] I did not provide the source texts. I used standard pretrained models. No fine-tuning, no custom training.[2]

A Thousand Silences is what came out.

I can't cleanly separate self-interest from principle in my own head. I built this system because the problem was interesting, and I'm writing this book because what it produced frightened me. Both things are true, and I won't pretend I have the distance to be neutral about my own work.

I should say something else here, because a book that warns about hidden persuasion mechanisms while itself employing one is doing the exact thing it warns about, and you deserve to know that before you decide whether to keep reading. This book -- the one you are holding -- was drafted with AI assistance. The same kind of system I just described. I directed it. I revised it. I made the decisions about what to argue and how to argue it and where the fiction goes and what the characters say. But the prose was generated, and the structure was scaffolded by the same kind of multi-agent workflow that produced the novel. You are reading a book about AI-generated persuasion that was itself produced with AI assistance.

That fact is either a contradiction or a proof of concept. I choose to read it as a proof of concept. If this book persuades you, the persuasion came from a human-directed AI system. That does not make the warning less true -- it makes the warning self-demonstrating. If it fails to persuade you, that failure is data too. But the only way to credibly warn about a capability is to show it operating, openly, with its seams showing. The alternative -- writing a conventional book that only describes the danger -- would leave you guessing whether the danger is real. This way you have evidence. I wrote this book with AI assistance because writing it without would have taken a year I don't have to give away. That's not an excuse. It's the same trade the novel's translator faced: the tool makes you complicit, but not using it leaves the work undone. If the arguments in this book land -- if the fiction moves you, if the structure feels true, if you find yourself thinking about Marcus's desk or Jake's phone weeks from now -- and you didn't notice the seams until I pointed them out -- then the capability I'm describing is real, and it's already working on you, and the fact that you're still reading is the evidence. The book is its own demonstration. I'd rather you knew that up front than discovered it later and retroactively distrusted everything I've said.

* * *

The reason I'm writing this book is a specific passage.

In chapter twelve, the translator is copying out a decree. The decree restores slavery. He is a man who has spent the entire novel believing that his skill with language makes him useful, neutral, a tool in the hands of whoever employs him. The decree is in front of him. He copies the word loyaute -- loyalty -- and feels his hand begin to shake.

He presses his palm flat on the desk until the tremor stops. He picks the quill back up. He finishes.

The passage doesn't tell you what to feel. It shows you a man's hand shaking and lets you sit with it.

I read that passage and went back to read it again. The involuntary second pass -- that's the test, the one where you already know what's coming and it still lands. I've studied narrative structure, written screenplays, spent years inside stories as both a reader and a builder. That passage landed the way a good passage lands in a book written by a person who knows what they're doing. It had specificity. It earned its moment.

And it was produced by a system that cost about a hundred dollars in compute to build -- that same hundred dollars also covered two earlier demo projects before the novel.[3] The novel itself, once the system existed, cost around six dollars off that same bulk-token plan. That's not a research grant or a corporate budget. A few weeks of work from one person who was curious about NPCs.

There's a legal wrinkle here. Under current US copyright guidance, purely AI-generated material isn't copyrightable on its own -- you need meaningful human authorship.[4] So the raw output of my system, as it stands, isn't protectable. Its value is developmental: the structure, the character work, the draft scenes are raw material a human author transforms into copyrightable work through substantial rewriting in their own voice. I placed A Thousand Silences in the public domain because that's where the law puts it anyway, and doing so raises questions the courts have not settled. How much of a person's own authorship has to layer onto AI-generated material before the result is protectable? Where is the line between editing and authoring? These are live, genuinely unsettled questions, and a system like this one will force them into court sooner than anyone is ready for.

What is not in doubt is the narrower fact: the developmental layer that used to require a room full of people is being commoditized now.

* * *

The gap is this.

Most people's mental model of AI writing, as of a month ago, goes something like this: it can generate text, but it can't sustain a narrative. It's generic. It's obvious. You can spot it from across the room. It sounds like a corporate email trying to be friendly. It has no feel for rhythm, no sense of when to be quiet, no understanding of what a human being actually sounds like when they're trying to say something true.

That model was reasonable. It was also wrong -- it described what AI used to do accurately enough, but missed what it can do now, with the right process around it. The gap between that mental model and the current reality is the warning shot. The technology isn't perfect. But it has crossed a threshold that most of the creative industry has not yet registered, and the crossing happened while everyone was arguing about the previous generation's limitations.

I am not claiming A Thousand Silences is a great novel. I am claiming it is closer to one than common knowledge says AI is currently capable of producing.

The cost to produce it -- on top of the system already built -- was about six dollars in tokens.[5] A traditional novel takes a year or more of a skilled writer's life. A traditional writers' room developing a multi-season television arc costs hundreds of thousands of dollars.[6] I generated four seasons of spec scripts and four novel outlines for a project I'd carried in notebooks for a decade, in roughly two weeks, for the cost of a model subscription.

That is not a future prediction. That is a thing that happened last month. The capability is here, arriving regardless of how anyone feels about it. It is cheaper than the institutions around it are behaving as though it is. It is diffusing faster than those institutions can track.

* * *

Let me be honest about what this means and what it doesn't.

The most directly affected roles are developmental ones: spec writers, story consultants, developmental editors, the junior writers'-room positions whose job is to generate raw material for senior writers to refine. I don't pretend that's a small loss. People build careers in those roles. People feed their families with that work.

The larger creative economy -- writers, directors, producers, performers, the people who make the finished work -- is changed in nature rather than eliminated. The final expressive act, the one that turns raw material into something with a voice, still belongs to a human being. For now. The system I built supplies throughput, not judgment. It can give you ten versions of a scene. It can't tell you which one is the one that matters. That's still yours to bring or to lack.

What keeps me up at night isn't about writing.

I started this project thinking about game engines. I ended it staring at something that looked like a general capability. The orchestration techniques that keep a novel coherent -- state tracking, staged revision, adversarial critique -- are not specific to fiction. They're specific to any problem where you need a system to sustain quality across a long arc of work. Legal analysis. Medical diagnosis. Policy drafting. Software architecture. The scaffolding is domain-agnostic. The models are general-purpose. What I built for stories, someone else is building right now for their own.

If one person, working alone, on a consumer budget, can build a system that produces a novel that a careful reader can't automatically distinguish from human work -- then the assumption underneath our entire approach to managing knowledge work is aging badly. The assumption that certain tasks require human judgment, that you'll know the machine output when you see it -- that assumption just took a hit.

I don't know exactly what that means for your field. I know it isn't limited to mine. That passage in chapter twelve -- a man's hand shaking over a decree -- it wasn't about a translator in revolutionary Haiti anymore. It was about every domain that has told itself, reasonably, that the machines can assist but not create. That line just moved. I can't tell you exactly where it moved to. I can tell you it's closer than most people think, and that the distance between "most people think" and "where it actually is" is the space where the real decisions get made.

* * *

People hear "arriving regardless of how anyone feels about it" and think technology. They think gravity. They think: this is the march of progress, unstoppable, indifferent, and the best you can do is adapt. That framing is wrong, and the wrongness matters.

The technology is not inevitable the way gravity is inevitable. It is inevitable the way a race to the bottom is inevitable -- because the incentive structure makes it so.

The people building these tools operate inside an environment where slowing down doesn't just shave profit -- it can mean losing strategic position entirely. Many are thoughtful about what they're making. Many are genuinely worried. Yet the system doesn't require universal recklessness to produce reckless outcomes. It requires only that enough actors eventually decide they can't afford restraint.

That is a structural problem. It means the inevitability everyone senses is manufactured, not natural. It is the product of choices made inside a structure that rewards certain behaviors and punishes others. And a manufactured inevitability is a different thing from a natural one, because it means the trajectory can be changed -- if the structure changes. The people inside it don't need to change first. The structure does.

For now, hold onto the distinction: the thing that feels like gravity is actually an incentive system, and incentive systems can be redesigned. The place to intervene is the architecture, not the individuals moving through it.

* * *

One more thing before we move on.

I'm releasing Open-Write alongside this book. It's the full production pipeline: the scaffolding, the templates, the multi-agent workflow that makes long-form coherence possible. I'm keeping two components private. One evaluates structural weaknesses before writing begins. The other develops characters with interiority through structured psychological modeling rather than detailed authorial specs. I keep them partly for my own use -- they're how I get the results I get. I also keep them because releasing everything would enable the kind of low-effort, high-volume output that hurts the working artists I want this tool to serve.

You could fault me for releasing a tool that will cost people work, or for holding back the pieces that make it work best, and those charges point in opposite directions. I've already told you I can't cleanly sort my own motives. That hasn't changed. The next person facing the same pressures will make their own call, and the structure will shape what those calls tend to produce in aggregate.

This tool rewards taste. An artist who already knows what good work looks like will use it to produce work near their ceiling. An artist still learning will produce work that confirms what they already mistake for good. The system supplies throughput. Judgment is still yours.

* * *

I wrote this book because I saw something I didn't expect, and the implications of it are larger than the thing itself. A novel written by a machine that I couldn't dismiss. The capability arrived before the industry was ready for it, and the window it opened won't stay open -- the technology will stay, but the decisions that shape how it lands are being made right now, mostly by people who aren't thinking about the shape, only about the speed.

The window -- the brief period where the capability is real but the structure hasn't hardened around it yet, where the choices of a relatively small number of people can still influence how this lands for everyone else -- that window doesn't stay open forever. It never does.

I'd rather you were on this side of it while it's still open. But that's yours to decide, not mine to press.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004).*

[2] The Open-Write pipeline is released as open source; it runs on standard pretrained models with no fine-tuning or custom training.

[3] Self-reported: roughly $100 in model compute to build the system and produce two earlier demo projects. The novel itself, produced after the system existed, cost about $6 of that same bulk-token subscription.

*[4] U.S. Copyright Office, *Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence* (March 16, 2023); *Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices* (3rd ed.), §313.2; *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, No. 22-1564 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023).*

[5] Self-reported: about $6 in token usage from the same bulk-token subscription referenced in note 3, once the system itself already existed. Time spent steering the run is not counted in this figure.

*[6] A multi-season television writers' room runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars and beyond. See Writers Guild of America minimum basic agreements and writers'-room budgeting; production-cost reporting in *Variety* and *The Hollywood Reporter*.*

Chapter 2: The Floor

The keyboard is three-eighths of an inch from the monitor's base. Marcus sets it there every morning, using the edge of his employee badge as a straightedge. The monitor is centered on the desk. The bezel's left edge is the same distance from the desk's left edge as the bezel's right edge from the desk's right. He checks this by eye now, the way he has checked it every shift for two years, and the alignment holds.

The succulent sits in the desk's upper-left corner. A small ceramic pot, unglazed, the color of wet sand. He watered it yesterday -- Sunday -- and the soil is still dark at the edges. He touches the rim of the pot with one finger. The ceramic is cool.

The chair is set to the fourth notch. He sits.

The screen wakes. The login field. His employee number. His password, which is sixteen characters and changes every ninety days. The system accepts it. The queue loads.

Twelve items waiting. The counter reads 12/?, which is how the system displays it -- the slash, then the symbol. Marcus has never seen the counter at zero.

The first item is a photograph of a parking lot. Two cars. Daylight. A caption beneath it in a language Marcus doesn't read, but the characters are formatted as a question. He looks at the image. He looks at the tags the system has applied. No flags. No keywords from the policy list. He checks the image against the visual guidelines -- no weapons, no blood, no minors, no identifiable license plates that could constitute doxxing. Two cars in a parking lot. He clicks approve. The item closes. The next one loads.

A video. Twelve seconds. A man in a kitchen, speaking to the camera. Marcus's eyes go to the caption -- auto-generated, English, mostly accurate. The man is talking about a political figure. The tone is heated. Marcus scans the transcript for the specific phrases: calls to action, direct threats, dehumanizing language. The man says the political figure should be "removed." Marcus checks the guidelines. "Removed" is ambiguous -- the escalation matrix has a flowchart for ambiguous language that takes forty-five seconds to navigate if you know it, which Marcus does. He flags the video for escalation and moves on.

The next item loads. An image. He looks at it.

The next item loads.

The rhythm establishes itself by the tenth item. Item appears. Marcus reads or watches. Marcus checks the guidelines if the item is borderline, which some are. Marcus makes a decision -- approve, flag, escalate. The item closes. The next one loads. His right hand stays on the mouse. His left hand stays in his lap or on the desk's edge. He does not shift in the chair. The chair does not creak.

The early items are the easiest. Borderline content, ambiguous, the kind that makes Marcus check the guidelines and the flowcharts and the decision trees that Nexus printed and laminated and mounted on the wall behind the monitors. He checks them the way a pilot checks instruments. A meme that uses a slur but is quoting the slur in order to criticize it. A photograph of a protest sign that could be read as threatening or as metaphor. A user comment that says "I could kill for that recipe." Marcus reads it twice. He clicks approve.

By the twentieth item he has flagged four and escalated two. The escalated items will go to a senior moderator or, if the system's confidence score is high enough, to an automated reviewer. He sends items up. Outcomes do not come back.

The twenty-third item is a comment thread. Fourteen replies. A user has posted a series of responses to a news article about a missing child. The replies contain speculation about what happened to the child. The speculation is detailed. Marcus reads the first reply, then the second, then the third. His eyes move across the text. His breathing is steady. He flags the thread for escalation -- the guidelines are clear on speculative content involving minors -- and clicks next.

The thirty-first item. A user profile. The profile picture is a close-up of a hand holding a knife. The bio contains a street address. Marcus checks the guidelines. He checks the doxxing flowchart. He escalates it. Next.

The fortieth item. The fiftieth.

The queue does not slow down. The next item loads as soon as the previous one is closed. No pause between them. Marcus could pause. He could take a breath between items. He does not. The rhythm is item, assess, decide, next.

Sometime in the late morning -- he does not check the clock -- the content shifts. A video of a fight in a school hallway. Two students, a hallway full of lockers, other students filming with their phones. Marcus watches it. The video is twenty-two seconds. One student hits the other. The second student falls. A shoe comes off. The students filming do not intervene. Marcus watches to the end. He escalates it. Next.

A photograph of a handwritten note. The handwriting is neat, the lines straight, as if written with a ruler underneath the paper. The note contains a threat. It names a person. Marcus looks at it. He escalates it. Next.

A clip from a livestream. A man screams at someone off-camera while a child cries in the background. Marcus watches the clip. It is nine seconds long. He watches it to the end because the guidelines require him to confirm the content matches the tags. The child's cry is high and sustained. Marcus clicks escalate. The item closes. The next one loads.

His jaw is tight. He lets it stay tight and moves to the next item.

A screenshot of a text conversation. The messages are in English. Marcus reads them. The messages escalate across the screenshot -- the first message is casual, the last message is not. He reads them to the end. He flags it. Next.

The next item is a comment. Three words. He reads them. He flags it. Next.

A photograph. He looks at it long enough to classify it. He clicks escalate. His left hand, which has been resting on the desk's edge, moves to his lap. The next item loads.

The queue continues.

The afternoon items are worse. The queue is the queue -- it arrives the way weather arrives, in patterns that have causes he does not see and cannot influence. The items load. He processes them.

A video. He watches the first three seconds and his breath stops. The video continues for eight more seconds. He watches it. His right hand moves the cursor to the escalation button. The cursor pauses there for one second, then two. He clicks. The item closes. He exhales through his nose. The next item loads.

The next item is a still image. He looks at it. His shoulders draw upward, a fractional movement. He flags it. Next.

A user account. The profile is new -- created that morning. The bio contains a date, a location, and a description of intent. Marcus reads the bio. He reads it again. He escalates the account and writes a note in the escalation field. The field allows two hundred characters. He uses sixty-one. He clicks submit. The next item loads.

His breathing has changed. The breaths are shorter now, taken higher in the chest.

The items keep coming.

The tightness in the jaw. The breath held and released. The shoulders that have climbed half an inch since the morning. The hands that move with increasing precision, as if the mouse requires more careful handling than it did at eight-thirty.

A string of text. A user has written a detailed account of something they claim to have done. Marcus reads it. The account is specific. Names. Locations. Sequence of events. He reads it to the end. He checks the account's history. He flags it and adds a note in the escalation field -- the second note he has written all shift. He uses forty-seven characters. He clicks submit. The next item loads.

His right hand is on the mouse. His left hand has moved to his mouth -- the back of his index finger pressed against his lower lip. He moves it back to the desk's edge. The next item loads.

A video. He turns the volume down. The video plays. He watches. He escalates. The next item loads.

The clock in the corner of the screen reads 2:14, then 2:31, then 3:08. Marcus does not watch the clock. The clock advances between items, in the half-second of black screen before the next one loads, and Marcus's eyes are on the new content, not the time.

The queue continues.

A comment thread that Marcus reads in full. Twelve replies. The first reply is measured. The replies get shorter as they go. The last reply is one word. Marcus flags the thread. Next.

A photograph that he classifies in two seconds and escalates. A video that he watches for four seconds before escalating. A user profile that he reviews and flags.

A photograph. He looks at it. His hand goes to his mouth again -- the back of his fingers against his lips, the pressure steady. The photograph stays on the screen for four seconds, five, six. He clicks escalate. He moves his hand back to the mouse. The next item loads.

The next item loads.

The next item loads.

The worst item of the shift appears at 3:47. It is a video. He presses play. The video runs for eleven seconds. He watches it to the end because the guidelines require it. His body pulls back from the screen, a movement of maybe two inches, the chair's wheels rolling on the carpet. His hand covers his mouth. The palm, this time, not the back of the fingers. He holds it there. The video has ended. The still frame sits on the screen. He clicks escalate. He does not add a note. The item closes.

The next item loads.

Marcus processes it. The next one. The next one.

The jaw tight, the shoulders raised, the breath shallow, the hands precise. The items keep coming. Marcus keeps clicking.

At 4:56, Marcus's eyes go to the clock. The eyes move to the corner of the screen where the time is, then back to the queue. Four minutes. He processes two more items. He flags one. He approves one -- a photograph of a sunset, no tags, no flags, nothing in it that violates any guideline. He clicks approve and the item closes and the clock reads 4:59.

At 5:00, Marcus clicks the logout button. The system asks if he is sure. He clicks yes. The screen returns to the login field.

He does not stand yet.

His hands go to the keyboard. He adjusts it -- a small movement, the keyboard sliding forward on the desk until it is three-eighths of an inch from the monitor's base. He checks the alignment using the edge of his badge. The keyboard is straight. He centers the monitor. The bezel's left edge is the same distance from the desk's left edge as the right edge from the right. He touches the succulent's pot. The ceramic is cool. He adjusts the pot so that its left edge is flush with the desk's upper-left corner.

He looks at the desk. The keyboard. The monitor. The succulent. The desk is clean. Nothing on it that should not be on it.

The realignment has taken three minutes. His hands are steady. His jaw is tight, but his hands are steady, and the desk is right.

Marcus stands at 5:01.

He pushes the chair in. It rolls to the fourth notch and stops. He walks to the door of the moderation floor. He badges out. The door clicks behind him.

The hallway is fluorescent. His footsteps are the only sound. He walks to the elevator and presses the button. The elevator arrives. He steps in.

The parking garage is dim and warm. His car is on the second level, row C, space fourteen. He unlocks it, sits in the driver's seat, puts his hands on the steering wheel. The leather is hot from the Texas afternoon.

He sits there. The engine is off. The windows are up. The garage is quiet.

After a while -- he does not count the minutes -- he starts the car. He backs out of the space. He drives toward the exit. The gate opens. The light outside is gold and flat, the late-afternoon light of a city that has been hot all day and is only now beginning to cool.

Marcus drives home. He does not turn on the radio.

* * *

Chapter 3: The Incentive Problem

When does aggregate self-interest cross into risk you can't undo? How long can you run a system with that risk baked in before something has to change or break?

Those are the questions worth asking, and they are the questions almost nobody is asking. They don't have clean answers. They are steering instruments, tools for pointing your attention at the right target. The right target is the structure that determines what those people reliably produce under pressure.

* * *

Consider Boeing.

I'm not picking on Boeing. I'm using it because the case is documented, the mechanism is specific, and the lesson generalizes.

Boeing's 737 MAX killed 346 people across two crashes in five months.[1] Lion Air Flight 610 went down in October 2018.[2] Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 went down in March 2019.[3] The investigations that followed turned up internal communications showing that engineers had raised concerns about the Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System.[4] That's the software that pushed the nose down based on a single sensor reading.[5] Those concerns were overruled. Timelines compressed. The fix that might have prevented the second crash was delayed.

Between those two crashes, Boeing knew the system was dangerous. The company had the data. Engineers had said, explicitly, that the single-sensor design was a problem. Five months passed. The fix did not ship. The second plane went down.

Here is the part that matters, and I want to be precise about it. A structure that rewards share buybacks over safety engineering does not need every manager to cut corners. It needs enough managers to cut corners, and the incentive gradient guarantees that fraction is non-zero. Between 2013 and 2019, Boeing spent over $43 billion on share buybacks -- money returned to shareholders instead of invested in the engineering culture that had built the company's reputation.[6] The stock price rose. The safety margins thinned. The people who made those decisions were not cartoon villains. They were doing what the structure measured and rewarded, and the structure measured performance in quarters.

Many people inside Boeing resisted. The structure didn't need all of them to fail. It needed some of them to fail, and the pressure made that inevitable.

Blaming the specific managers who signed off feels satisfying. It also leaves the structure intact, because the pressures remain, and the structure simply produces new managers facing the same incentives the next time around. You can fire every person who made the wrong call and change nothing, because you didn't change the thing that made the wrong call rational.

* * *

The history of industrial failure is full of systems like this. Systems where the incentive structure made eventual failure statistically likely, and where the public response afterward was to find an individual villain, punish him, and leave the structure that produced him fully intact.

Boeing. The savings-and-loan crisis. The 2008 financial collapse. The opioid epidemic. Regulatory capture across a dozen industries. The same shape every time.

In 2008, the banks that packaged toxic mortgages into securities and sold them as safe were not staffed exclusively by criminals.[7] Some were. Most were people responding to a structure that rewarded volume and punished caution, where the bonus came this quarter and the collapse, if it came, would be someone else's problem by then. The ratings agencies were paid by the firms whose products they rated.[8] A structural conflict so obvious that you don't need anyone to be evil for it to produce catastrophic outcomes. You need the incentive to exist and enough time for the math to work itself out.

The specific numbers are worth sitting with. In the years leading up to the crisis, the top five investment banks were leveraged at ratios between 30-to-1 and 40-to-1, meaning they had thirty or forty dollars of borrowed money for every dollar of their own.[9] That ratio is only rational if you believe the downside scenario is impossible. The people making those bets were not stupid. They were inside a system where the upside of leverage was personal and immediate (bonuses, promotions, status) and the downside was collective and deferred. The structure rewarded risk at the individual level and socialized the cost at the system level. The outcome was a calculation that the structure made rational for enough people, for long enough, that the math eventually caught up.

The steering numbers tell the same story from the borrower side. A majority of subprime borrowers had credit scores high enough to qualify for cheaper prime loans -- 41% in 2000, 55% in 2005, 61% at the 2006 peak.[10] Creditworthy borrowers were steered into predatory products because the structure rewarded origination volume, not borrower outcomes.

The opioid crisis is the same shape with a different least-protected population. In 2016, Congress passed the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act.[11] The bill was drafted early by a drug-industry lawyer -- a former DEA official -- and shepherded by Rep. Tom Marino and Sen. Orrin

Hatch.[12] It made it nearly impossible for the DEA to issue immediate suspension orders against distributors flooding communities with pills. Industry put more than a million dollars into the relevant campaigns.[13]

The bill passed both chambers unanimously. 535 legislators, both parties, not a single no vote.[14] They waved through a bill that defanged the DEA during the deadliest drug crisis in American history, because fighting a dull-sounding patient access bill backed by industry lobbyists was the irrational move for every individual legislator in the structure. One pharmacy in Williamson, West Virginia received 258,000 hydrocodone pills in a single month -- ten times the norm.[15] Overdose deaths quadrupled after 1999.[16] The Sackler family extracted more than ten billion dollars from OxyContin.[17]

No villain required. The structure produced the outcome. The people inside it responded to the incentives they faced. The same shape.

What the reform did next is the part the book needs to hold.

After 2016, the CDC published a prescribing guideline -- written as guidance, not binding.[18] It was operationalized as hard ceilings. Forced tapers of stable chronic-pain patients. Pharmacy risk-scoring algorithms refusing fills. DEA production-quota cuts. Prescribers abandoning pain management defensively, because writing a prescription had become a career risk and not writing one had not. The documented result: patient harm, including deaths following involuntary tapers, severe untreated pain, and a 2019 clarification from the guideline's own authors that it was being misapplied, followed by a 2022 revision.[19]

Meanwhile the supply squeeze met intact demand. The 2010 OxyContin reformulation had already run the natural experiment -- users substituted to heroin and then fentanyl, and total deaths accelerated as prescriptions fell.[20] The intervention optimized the visible metric -- prescriptions written, morphine-equivalents dispensed -- while the outcome metric worsened. Goodhart's law, inside the reform.[21]

And the targets followed the cost gradient exactly. Patients and prescribers are visible, legible, and cheap to police -- pill counts, database flags, license actions. The corporate defendants converted consequence into structured settlements. The same crisis produced under-enforcement against architects and over-enforcement against the powerless, simultaneously, by the same selection logic that routed the original energy.

One man pushed back against that logic. Dan Schneider was a pharmacist in New Orleans whose son died of an overdose. He spent years conducting unpaid investigation -- surveilling a pill mill, documenting the patterns, feeding evidence to enforcement until the operation was shut and the license surrendered.[22] Individual virtue imposed a targeted, real cost on a specific node of the gradient.

Schneider proves both halves of the book's virtue thesis at once. Virtue can impose targeted costs -- real, and worth honoring. And virtue cannot substitute for structure -- it took a grieving father years of unpaid work to accomplish what a funded enforcement apparatus does as routine, and the necessity of his heroism is the indictment. What Schneider did ad hoc, the False Claims Act does systematically: qui tam pays private virtue to hunt fraud at scale, with fee-shifting and treble damages.[23] The structural answer to "we cannot rely on heroes" is to build the machinery that makes heroism unnecessary -- and where individuals still step forward, to pay them and arm them.

The opioid case now contains one failure per lens. The accountability gap -- architects paying civilly, keeping fortunes, facing no criminal certainty -- is the failure the left's lens sees clearly and the right's struggles with. The overcorrection -- the state grinding down legitimate pain patients in the name of the crisis -- is the failure the right's lens sees clearly and the left's struggles with, because the harm arrived wearing public-health clothing. One crisis, two failures, one visible per lens. A single case study that hands each reader something true their own side missed.

The benchmark politician is the one who can say: we overcorrected on pain management while never establishing certain consequence for the architects. Both halves, in one sentence, in public. The book's mechanism chapter will describe the machine for making that sentence survivable.

After the crash, we had the trials. The congressional hearings. The public shaming of specific executives. What we did not have was a structural change proportional to the structural failure. Some regulations tightened. Some of them have already been loosened. The incentive shape, short-term reward for risk and long-term cost externalized, is still the dominant architecture of the system. We punished the people it produced. We left it free to produce more of them.

We repeat this cycle because we keep asking the wrong question. Were the people involved good or bad? Were they greedy? Were they negligent? Those questions feel urgent. They also don't have answers you can build on, because the distribution of human virtue in any large population is roughly stable. Boeing had thousands of engineers, most competent and well-meaning, and the structure still produced the outcome it did. The managers who overruled safety concerns were not aberrations. They were the ones the system selected for. You work with the population you have.

The question with an actual answer is different: what does this structure reward when ordinary self-interest gets applied?

That last clause is the whole move. Ordinary self-interest will be applied. It always is, because people are people, mixed, distracted, tired, doing their best under the pressures they actually face, which are not the pressures we wish they faced. Morality itself is mostly downstream of the structure. Take the same person and put them inside an organization that rewards caution, then inside one that rewards speed-to-market. You get different decisions. For the purposes of figuring out whether a system is safe, treat the character of the people inside it as effectively fixed and ask what the incentives do with that fixed input.

* * *

I want to slow down here, because this is where the argument gets misheard.

When I say we cannot rely on individual virtue, I'm saying something narrower than it sounds.

When a failure cannot be undone -- when the plane crashes, when the financial system locks up, when the manipulation becomes the default operating environment. No rate of human goodness is a safety margin.

"Most people are good" is true. I believe that. I've seen it. It is also not a number you can put under a load that is not allowed to fail.

That is not a verdict on anyone's character. We put guardrails on mountain roads, and nobody reads the guardrail as an insult to careful drivers. The guardrail is there for the predictable few who will go off anyway, on the one night that matters, and its presence makes no claim about how good the drivers are. You design the aircraft so that one exhausted mechanic's mistake cannot kill three hundred people, and you also train the mechanic well, and no one experiences the redundancy as contempt.

Designing for failure and appealing to people's best work were never rivals. The structure is the guardrail. The appeal to our better nature is the training. You want both, and you build the floor out of the one that doesn't depend on every person clearing the bar every time.

* * *

So virtue is not idle in this picture. It has a job, and the job is real.

Individual virtue doesn't decide whether a badly built structure eventually fails. The incentives decide that. What virtue does is move the failure rate at the margin, and moving the rate buys time. Every person who declines the extractive move when the structure rewards it lengthens the runway by a little. Every engineer who raises the concern, every manager who slows the timeline, every moderator who flags the content that the algorithm would have amplified. They are all buying time at the margin.

That is not nothing. It may be the whole difference between changing the structure in time and changing it too late. But what virtue cannot be is the floor. It can be the thing that keeps us on our feet long enough to build a real one, and that is worth being grateful for without ever being safe to depend on.

I notice I'm inside this, by the way. I built a system that accelerates the commoditization of creative work. I built it because the problem was interesting and the capability was real and I couldn't see a reason not to. I also built it knowing what it would do to people who do the kind of work I once did. I cannot cleanly sort those motives. I don't think anyone can cleanly sort their own motives, and I distrust the person who claims to. What I can tell you is that the structure I operate in rewards the move I made, and that a structure that rewards a thing will reliably get the thing.

* * *

The attention economy follows the same logic.

The business model rewards engagement. The most engaging content is the most emotionally activating, the content that makes you afraid, or outraged, or certain you're right. The algorithm doesn't need to be malicious. It needs to optimize for a metric that is correlated with activation, and the activation does the rest. The people who built those systems are mostly not villains. They responded to a structure that rewarded growth and punished restraint, and the structure produced what structures produce: the outcome that the incentives select for.

Think about what that means at scale. A recommendation engine serving two billion people does not need to be wrong about most of them.[24] It needs to be wrong about enough of them, in the same direction, for long enough. The content that keeps you scrolling is the content that keeps you activated -- afraid, outraged, certain you're right. That content does the most damage to your ability to think clearly, and it is the content you can't stop watching. The incentive to be wrong in that direction is baked into the business model.

The engineers inside those companies know this. Many of them have said so publicly after leaving. The internal documents leaked by whistleblowers have shown, repeatedly, that the companies' own research identified the harms -- adolescent mental health, political polarization, the basic capacity for shared reality.[25] The research was shelved or deprioritized when it conflicted with growth targets. The engineers who raised the concerns were good at their jobs and cared about the outcome. The structure overruled them. The structure optimizes for the metric it is paid to optimize for, and the metric it is paid to optimize for is engagement, and engagement correlates with activation, and activation correlates with harm. The pattern repeats.

This is not a conspiracy. It is an incentive.

* * *

Quarterly earnings and share price dominate markets. The next election dominates politics. Growth metrics and funding rounds dominate tech. In every case, we have optimized for present performance at the expense of future resilience, and the bill for that optimization accumulates quietly until it doesn't.

Post-crash reforms didn't change that relationship. The bailouts kept the banks solvent. Dodd-Frank tightened some rules. Within a decade, banks were posting record profits again and some of those rules had been loosened.[26] The same pressures acted on the next cohort of ordinary people and produced the same kind of decisions.

I say this because the goal is to stop the next crash, not to feel righteous about the last one.

* * *

You participate in this. I'm not pointing at you. I'm pointing at us. You respond to incentives. I respond to incentives. We both operate inside systems whose incentive structures we didn't design and don't fully see. The job you take, the product you build, the content you click on. Each of those decisions is shaped by a structure that makes some moves expensive and others free, some paths rewarded and others punished. You are not outside the structure, looking in. Neither am I.

The platforms you use, the companies you work for, the markets you depend on. Each has an incentive shape. In some of those shapes, caution is rewarded. In others, it is punished. In most, it is quietly ignored until something breaks, at which point everyone asks why nobody was careful. The question is whether the systems you're embedded in make care the rational move, or whether they make it the expensive one.

Recognizing that pattern is the first move. The next chapters will address what to do with it.

* * *

So here is the standard I'd ask you to carry through the rest of this book, and into any proposal from anyone, in any direction, about how to manage the risks we've been talking about.

Ask whether it changes what the structure rewards. Whether it makes the failure mode more expensive, whether it makes caution stable under pressure instead of a competitive disadvantage.

The question is not whether good people exist inside these systems. They do. The engineers at Boeing who raised the flag were good. The bank managers who didn't sell the worst products were good. The content moderators who burn out trying to hold the line are good. The goodness is real, and it is not the thing that determines the outcome. The outcome is determined by the structure, by what the incentive system rewards and punishes, by what it makes expensive and what it makes free.

Being a good person inside a bad structure is not the same as being safe. I know that's uncomfortable. Character is the reason we have any runway at all. But character under sufficient pressure eventually bends.

The next chapter puts a body on this argument. It takes you inside a room where a person with the skill and the authority to change the structure tries to change it -- and discovers that the structure won't let her. The argument you've just read is the frame for what happens in that room. The structure is not an abstraction. It is sitting in a conference room, wearing a mechanical watch, presenting slides that will not survive the meeting.

That is an engineering problem, not a spiritual one.

* * *

* * *

Notes

[1] Boeing 737 MAX crashes killed 346 people. U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, "The Design, Development, and Certification of the Boeing 737 MAX" (Sept. 2020).

[2] Lion Air Flight 610, Oct. 29, 2018 (189 deaths). House Committee report (Sept. 2020).

[3] Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302, Mar. 10, 2019 (157 deaths). House Committee report (Sept. 2020).

[4] Internal Boeing communications showed engineers raised MCAS concerns that were overruled. House Committee report (Sept. 2020); Boeing internal emails released by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

[5] MCAS activated on a single angle-of-attack sensor input. House Committee report (Sept. 2020); Joint Authorities Technical Review, "Observations, Findings and Recommendations" (Oct. 2020).

*[6] Boeing spent over $43 billion on share buybacks, 2013-2019. Boeing annual reports and SEC filings; see Natalie Kitroeff, *The New York Times* (2019).*

*[7] Banks packaged subprime mortgages into securities marketed as safe. Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report* (2011); Michael Lewis, *The Big Short* (2010).*

*[8] Credit rating agencies were paid by the issuers whose products they rated. FCIC Report (2011), ch. 2; U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, *Wall Street and the Financial Crisis* (2011).*

[9] The five largest investment banks reached leverage ratios of roughly 30:1 to 40:1 before the crisis. FCIC Report (2011); SEC 10-K filings for Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, Goldman Sachs, and Morgan Stanley.

*[10] Subprime borrowers with prime-qualifying credit scores: 41% in 2000, 55% in 2005, 61% at the 2006 peak. Rick Brooks and Ruth Simon, "Subprime Debacle Traps Even Very Credit-Worthy," *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 3, 2007.*

*[11] Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016, Pub. L. 114-145. Scott Higham and Lenny Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 2017.*

*[12] The bill's early draft was written by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer and shepherded by Rep. Tom Marino and Sen. Orrin Hatch. Higham and Bernstein, *Washington Post*, Oct. 2017; Congressional record, H.R. 471.*

*[13] Industry put more than $1 million into the relevant campaigns. Higham and Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 2017.*

[14] The Act passed both chambers unanimously (Pub. L. 114-145). Congressional roll-call record.

*[15] A Williamson, West Virginia pharmacy received 258,000 hydrocodone pills in a single month. Higham and Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 2017.*

[16] Drug overdose deaths roughly quadrupled after 1999. CDC, "Drug Overdose Deaths"; NIDA.

[17] The Sackler family withdrew more than $10 billion from Purdue Pharma/OxyContin. U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform, hearing record on Purdue Pharma and the Sackler family.

*[18] CDC, "CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain," *MMWR* 65 (No. RR-1), 2016 -- issued as guidance, not a binding rule.*

*[19] CDC authors' clarification: Dowell, Haegerich, and Chou, "No Shortcuts to Safer Opioid Prescribing," *NEJM* (2019); CDC, "2022 Clinical Practice Guideline," *MMWR* 71 (2022).*

[20] The 2010 abuse-deterrent OxyContin reformulation drove substitution to heroin and then fentanyl. Alpert, Powell, and Pacula, "Supply-Side Drug Policy in the Presence of Substitutes," NBER WP 23031 (2017); Evans, Lieber, and Power, "How the

*Reformulation of OxyContin Ignited the Heroin Epidemic," *REStat* (2019).*

[21] Goodhart's Law: an observed statistical regularity tends to collapse once it is used as a control target. Charles Goodhart, "Problems of Monetary Management" (1975); cf. Campbell's Law (1976).

*[22] Dan Schneider, a New Orleans pharmacist, investigated his son's fatal overdose, surveilled a pill mill, and supplied evidence until the operation closed and its license was surrendered. Netflix, *The Pharmacist* (2020).*

[23] False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733 (qui tam and treble-damages provisions).

[24] Major recommendation platforms serve on the order of two billion users. Meta "Family of Apps" user disclosures (10-K/earnings); YouTube/Google user metrics.

*[25] Internal research leaked by whistleblower Frances Haugen documented the companies' own findings on adolescent mental health and polarization. Jeff Horwitz, "Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Teen Girls," *Wall Street Journal*, Sept. 14, 2021; the "Facebook Papers" (2021).*

[26] Post-crisis rules were later partially rolled back and bank profits reached records. Dodd-Frank Act, Pub. L. 111-203 (2010); Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. 115-174 (2018); FDIC Quarterly Banking Profiles.

Chapter 4: The Algorithm

Sarah wound the watch at 6:40 a.m., seated on the edge of her bed, the crown between her thumb and forefinger. Twenty-eight rotations. She had counted once, years ago, and now the number was a habit she did not think about. The watch was a Seiko, manual-wind, the face scratched from twelve years of wearing it in labs and on planes. Her father had worn it for twenty years before that, at Intel, in the fabs where the air was cleaner than outside. He had given it to her the week she left for Stanford. He did not say why. He did not need to.

She set the watch on her wrist and clasped it. The second hand moved.

Her slides were on the laptop, open to the first deck. Well-Being Metrics in Recommendation Systems: A Framework for Deployment. She had reviewed them at midnight, again at six. The data was clean. The methodology was documented. The confidence intervals were conservative. She knew the numbers the way she knew the route from her apartment to the building -- without needing to think about them.

She showered, dressed, walked to the office. The San Francisco morning was gray and cool. The building was glass and steel, twenty-two floors, the kind of place that looked like it had been designed to impress investors. She badged in, took the elevator to sixteen, and walked to her office without stopping to talk to anyone.

Her office had a window facing east. She could see the Bay Bridge if the fog cooperated. Today it did not. She opened the backup data file -- the one she had circulated to the board the week before -- and ran through the numbers one more time. She wanted them in her voice, in her cadence, ready to be spoken aloud if someone asked a question that required her to recite a confidence interval from memory. She had done this before. She knew how the room worked. The technical questions came first, and they were the easy ones. The hard questions came after, when the conversation moved from "does it work" to "can we afford it."

She closed the file. She touched the watch face -- a quick press of two fingers against the crystal -- and then dropped her hand.

At 9:15 she closed her laptop and walked to the boardroom on twenty.

* * *

The boardroom had a long table, twelve chairs, glass on three sides. The city was visible through the fog in pieces. Sarah set her laptop on the table, plugged in the HDMI cable, and opened the deck. The first slide was the title. She did not need to look at it.

The board members arrived in ones and twos. Patel first, then Kowalski, then Reeves. They shook her hand. They were polite. They were always polite. Morrison came last, carrying a coffee, and sat at the head of the table.

Sarah stood at the opposite end, the screen behind her. She held the presentation remote in her right hand. She did not fidget with it.

"Thank you for the time," she said. "I will walk through the framework, the data, and the deployment proposal. I expect about twenty minutes for the presentation and ten for questions."

Morrison nodded. The others were settling, opening notebooks, pulling out tablets. Kowalski was already looking at the screen.

Sarah clicked to the second slide. A graph. User well-being index over six months, comparing the current algorithm against the proposed framework. The current algorithm's line was flat. The proposed framework's line rose.

"This is the well-being index," she said. "Composite metric. Self-reported satisfaction, session quality, and a behavioral measure we developed for this project -- the ratio of time spent on content users rated as valuable versus time spent on content they did not. We tested across a cohort of two hundred thousand users over six months. The proposed framework produced a thirty-one percent improvement in the well-being index."

She clicked. The next slide. Methodology.

"The framework modifies the recommendation engine's objective function. The current system optimizes for engagement -- time on platform, sessions per day, scroll depth. The proposed framework adds a well-being term to the objective function. The engine still optimizes for engagement, but it weights the well-being index as a secondary objective. The result is a recommendation feed that surfaces content users find genuinely valuable at a higher rate, while reducing the volume of content that produces compulsive consumption without satisfaction."

She clicked. Data tables. Confidence intervals. Sample sizes.

"The sample is representative. The cohort was stratified by age, geography, and usage intensity. The effect sizes are statistically significant across all subgroups. The largest improvements are in the eighteen-to-twenty-four demographic, which is also the demographic with the highest rates of self-reported negative experience on the platform."

She clicked. A slide showing the behavioral measure in detail -- the ratio of valuable to non-valuable time, broken down by content category. The chart showed a clear pattern: the proposed framework reduced time spent on political content, celebrity gossip, and outrage-driven posts while increasing time spent on educational content, long-form articles, and community discussions. The net time on platform decreased. The net satisfaction increased.

"We built the behavioral measure because self-report data has known limitations. People are not always accurate reporters of their own experience. The ratio gives us an objective proxy -- how much of a user's session was spent on content they later rated as worthwhile versus content they did not. The proposed framework shifts that ratio by approximately twenty-two percentage points."

She clicked. Deployment timeline.

"We can deploy in two phases. Phase one is a limited rollout -- five percent of users, monitored for six weeks. Phase two is full deployment, contingent on Phase one results. The engineering work is done. The model is trained. The infrastructure is in place."

She paused. The board was listening. Kowalski was leaning forward, reading the data tables. Reeves had her tablet out, scrolling through something -- the deck, or the backup data Sarah had circulated the week before. Patel was watching Sarah. Morrison was watching the screen.

Sarah clicked to the next slide. Engagement projections.

"Here is where I want to be transparent." She used the remote to highlight a bar on the chart. "The proposed framework produces lower engagement numbers than the current algorithm. In the six-month test, time on platform decreased by fourteen percent. Sessions per day decreased by nine percent. Scroll depth decreased by eighteen percent."

She let the numbers sit in the room.

"The tradeoff is real. The users in the test cohort spent less time on the platform. But the time they spent was rated significantly higher in terms of satisfaction. The net effect on retention is -- " she clicked to the next slide, a retention curve " -- positive over twelve months. Users in the test cohort showed lower churn rates at the six-month and twelve-month marks. The initial engagement drop stabilizes, and the long-term retention curve crosses the current algorithm's curve at approximately month nine."

She stopped talking. The room was quiet.

Kowalski spoke first. "The fourteen percent engagement drop. That's aggregate?"

"Aggregate across the cohort. The breakdown by segment is in the appendix. The eighteen-to-twenty-four segment drops more -- about nineteen percent. The thirty-five-and-over segment drops less, around eight percent."

"And the retention crossover at month nine. That's based on six months of data projected forward?"

"Correct. The projection uses a standard retention model. The confidence interval is plus or minus two months."

Kowalski nodded. He did not write anything down.

Reeves looked up from her tablet. "The objective function modification -- does this affect the ad targeting pipeline?"

"The targeting pipeline reads from the recommendation engine's output. The modification changes what the engine surfaces, which changes what the ad system has to work with. In the test cohort, ad impressions per session decreased by approximately twelve percent. Click-through rates on ads were essentially flat -- a slight increase, within the margin of error. The net effect on ad revenue per user is negative."

Reeves nodded. She did write something down.

Patel asked about the behavioral measure -- the ratio of valuable to non-valuable time. Sarah explained the methodology. Patel asked about the self-report component. Sarah explained the survey instrument. The questions were good. They were the questions she would have asked.

For a few minutes the room felt like what it was supposed to feel like: a group of smart people evaluating a serious proposal. Kowalski asked about the statistical model. Sarah walked him through the regression, the controls, the robustness checks. Reeves asked about user consent and data privacy. Sarah explained the privacy architecture -- differential privacy, data minimization, user opt-out at every stage. The framework was designed to be transparent. Users could see what the algorithm was optimizing for. They could adjust the weights. They could turn it off.

The data was real. The methodology was sound. She could defend every number on every slide. She had spent nine months on this project. Her team had spent nine months. The work was done.

Then Morrison spoke.

"What's the competitive landscape look like for this?"

The room shifted. No one moved. The earlier questions had been about whether the framework worked. Morrison's question was about whether it could survive.

She had prepared for this. She had slides. She clicked to them.

"Currently, no major platform has deployed a well-being-integrated recommendation engine at scale. There are research initiatives at two universities and a pilot program at a smaller platform -- under five million users. The space is open."

She paused. The slides showed market share data, engagement trends across the major platforms, user growth projections. The numbers were accurate. They did not say what she needed them to say.

"Deploying first establishes the category. A reputational advantage -- we would be the first major platform to optimize for user well-being. The regulatory environment is moving in this direction. The EU's Digital Services Act has provisions that could require this kind of framework within two to three years."

Morrison nodded. "And the risk?"

"If we deploy and our competitors do not, we lose engagement share in the short term. The fourteen percent drop -- or whatever the actual number turns out to be at full scale -- that is users spending less time on our platform and more time on theirs. The retention benefit is long-term. The engagement cost is immediate."

She paused. She had one more card to play.

"A competitor might also deploy a similar framework first. If that happens, the reputational advantage shifts. We would be following, not leading. The window for first-mover advantage in this space is open now. It will not stay open indefinitely."

Morrison leaned back in his chair. It was a small movement. Sarah noticed it because she had been watching him for the past ten minutes, tracking his posture the way she tracked user engagement -- looking for the signal in the behavior. When he leaned forward, the questions were about the data. When he leaned back, the questions were about the money.

Kowalski cleared his throat. "The engagement number is the concern. Fourteen percent at two hundred thousand users is manageable. Fourteen percent at our full user base -- " He did not finish the sentence. He did not need to. The number was in the hundreds of millions of dollars in annual ad revenue.

"The long-term retention -- " Sarah began.

"Nine months," Kowalski said. "I understand the curve. The question is whether we can sustain a fourteen percent engagement drop for nine months while we wait for the crossover. The board has to answer to quarterly earnings. The market does not reward patience."

He said it without hostility. He said it the way a person states a fact about gravity. The market does not reward patience. The sentence hung in the air.

Reeves looked up from her tablet. "The ad revenue impact -- you said twelve percent fewer impressions per session. If we model that at scale, across the full user base, with current CPMs -- " She tapped her tablet twice. "That is a significant number."

"It is," Sarah said. "The user satisfaction -- "

"Satisfaction does not show up in the quarterly report," Kowalski said. Still no hostility. Still just the fact.

Sarah's hand was on the remote. She pressed the button and brought up the retention slide again, the curve crossing at month nine. She looked at the curve. The curve was real. The data was real. The model was sound.

She stopped talking. The room was quiet.

Morrison looked at Kowalski. Kowalski looked at his notes. Reeves was still writing.

"Thank you, Sarah," Morrison said. "This is thorough work."

He said something else -- about the quality of the research, about the team's effort. Sarah heard the words. She was watching Kowalski's face. Kowalski was the numbers person. He was thinking about the fourteen percent.

"We appreciate the work that went into this," Morrison said. "I think the right move for now is to deprioritize the full deployment and revisit when the competitive picture is clearer. We can keep the research active and look at this again in a quarter or two."

The word landed in the room and stayed there. Deprioritize. It was a word that meant nothing and meant everything.

It meant Sarah's hand was on the watch.

She did not check the time. Her fingers were on the face, the crystal cool against her fingertips, the second hand moving under them. She could feel the tick through her bones. The tick was steady. The tick did not depend on the competitive landscape.

"Understood," she said.

Her voice was level. The word did not sound like anything. It sounded like a person acknowledging a decision.

Morrison was already gathering his papers. Kowalski stood. Reeves closed her tablet. Patel caught Sarah's eye for a moment, then looked away.

"The research is solid," Morrison said, at the door. "We'll come back to it."

Sarah nodded.

* * *

The hallway was long and carpeted and lit with the kind of fluorescent light that made everything look clean and nothing look real. She walked past the glass-walled offices where people were working on the next version of the current algorithm. She could see them through the glass -- engineers at their screens, a whiteboard covered in diagrams, a standup meeting in progress. The work was moving forward. The current algorithm was shipping. The next release had a date and a sprint and a team and a metric, and the metric was engagement.

She walked past the elevator bank and kept walking, taking the stairs because the stairs were empty and the elevator was not. Her heels made a sound on the concrete that echoed in the stairwell. She did not hurry. She did not slow down. She walked the way she always walked -- measured, purposeful, the stride of a person who knew where she was going.

She passed a window on the landing between floors seventeen and sixteen. The fog had not cleared. The city was a gray shape behind glass.

Her office was on sixteen. She opened the door, stepped inside, and closed it behind her. The latch made a small sound. She sat down. Her laptop was open to the deck. The last slide was still on the screen -- the engagement projections, the fourteen percent, the retention curve that crossed at month nine.

She set the presentation remote down on the desk and left her hand there, next to it.

The office was quiet. The building hummed with the sound of people working on things that would ship. Through the glass she could see the open floor where her team sat -- thirty-one engineers and product managers building the next release. She could see Amin at his desk, headphones on, reviewing code. She could see Tanaka at the whiteboard, sketching a data pipeline. They were good engineers. They were building the best version of the algorithm they were allowed to build.

The next release would use the current algorithm. The current algorithm optimized for engagement. The engagement numbers were good. The users in the eighteen-to-twenty-four demographic would keep scrolling. The ad impressions would keep loading. The quarterly report would look fine.

She looked at the watch.

The second hand moved. The minute hand moved. The hour hand moved. The time was 10:47. The watch said 10:47, which was the time. It was the same time her phone said, the same time the clock on her laptop said, but the watch said it differently. The watch said it because the gears turned and the springs released and the balance wheel oscillated at exactly the frequency it was designed to oscillate at. The watch did not optimize. The watch did not adapt. The watch did what it was built to do and continued to do it.

Her father had worn this watch in the fabs at Intel, where the air was filtered to remove particles that could ruin a wafer. He had checked the time between shifts. He had not checked it to see whether the chips were performing above or below projections. The chips did what the architecture specified. The architecture was the thing. If the architecture was right, the chip worked. If the architecture was wrong, you fixed the architecture. You did not ask the chip to optimize for a different metric and hope the yield improved.

She wound the watch most mornings without thinking about it. Twenty-eight rotations. The number was a fact about the watch, the way the diameter of a transistor was a fact about a chip. The fact did not change because the market moved.

She looked at the deck on her laptop. The slides were good. The data was clean. The methodology was sound. She could revise the projections, tighten the retention model, build a stronger case for the long-term numbers. She could come back in a quarter with better data and a more favorable competitive analysis. She could find the version of the proposal that the structure would accept.

She closed the laptop.

The watch said 10:49.

* * *

Chapter 5: The Structural Solution (Part 1)

Here is the pattern. So consistent it functions as a law.

In 1929 the stock market collapsed.[1] The crash did not arrive from nowhere. The structure had been rewarding speculation for a decade through margin buying, insider trading, banks playing the same market they were supposed to be regulating.[2] The long-term cost accumulated. The bill came due on a Tuesday in October. And then, only then, with millions of people ruined, did the window for real reform open. The Securities Act of 1933.[3] The Exchange Act of 1934.[4] The creation of the SEC. The structure changed because the disaster made the cost visible, and the cost made the political will possible, and the political will made the reform survivable.

Before the crash, none of that was possible. People saw the risk. The economists who warned about speculation were ignored. The structure did not reward listening to them.

Here is the pattern again.

In 1930 forty-eight people died in the R101 airship disaster.[5] In 1937 the Hindenburg killed thirty-six.[6] In 1954 two Comet jets broke apart in midair, killing fifty-six between them.[7] Each time, the investigation followed. Each time, the investigation revealed structural failures in design, in certification, in the regulatory framework that was supposed to prevent exactly what had happened. And each time, the investigation produced reform: new safety standards, new certification processes, new requirements for structural testing that did not exist before people died.

The reform was real. It made flying safer. It saved lives that would have been lost if the old structure had continued. The reform arrived because the bodies were on the ground and the public was watching, and the window for change opened only when the cost became undeniable.

One more.

In 2008 the financial system collapsed.[8] Again. The structure had been rewarding risk for years through mortgage-backed securities, credit default swaps, leverage ratios that would have embarrassed a sober accountant.[9] The people inside the system were not, mostly, villains. They were responding to the same incentives everyone in the system was responding to. The structure rewarded the behavior. The behavior accumulated the risk. The risk produced the collapse. And then, only then, with the economy in free fall and millions of people losing their homes, did the window open. Dodd-Frank. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. Stress tests.[10] The reform was real. It was also thirty years late. Brooksley Born had warned about derivatives in 1998. She was overruled.[11] The structure did not reward listening to her. It took the collapse to make her warning legible.

After the collapse, the narrative split along partisan lines. One version blamed the borrower -- irresponsible homeowners, government-pushed lending, the Community Reinvestment Act. CRA-covered banks made less than 36% of subprime mortgages between 2004 and 2007.[12] The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission found only about 6% of high-cost loans had any CRA connection.[13] The primary driver was Wall Street investor demand for mortgages regardless of quality. The other side has its own case: Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's affordable-housing mandates did raise the risk appetite; Alan Greenspan said so himself.[14] I am not asking you to pick a winner. I am asking you to notice what happened to the argument. A technical failure of financial regulation became a culture-war fight about who deserved blame, and the fight became the obstacle. The "it's the borrower's fault" framing spread regardless of any individual's intent. The effect was the same: it constrained the Obama administration's response.[15] The structure produced the framing; the narrative capture was the immune response. It took a crisis that should have produced structural reform and redirected the energy into a partisan dispute that is still unresolved. The durability of the unresolved dispute is itself the mechanism at work.

The same shape appears in public health. The thalidomide disaster of the late 1950s -- children born with severe birth defects because a drug was approved without adequate testing[16] -- produced the Kefauver-Harris Amendment, the law that required pharmaceutical companies to prove a drug was effective before selling it.[17] Before the disaster, the law required safety but not efficacy. After the disaster, it required both. The reform was obvious. Too late for the children.

The opioid epidemic is the same mechanism with a different least-protected population -- the Sacklers made more than ten billion dollars while overdose deaths quadrupled, and when regulators moved, a unanimous Congress defanged the DEA during the deadliest drug crisis in American history.[18] I described the details in Chapter 3. The pattern is the point here: the incentive rewarded volume, the cost was externalized, and the structure produced the outcome.

If maximum sympathy still couldn't produce real reform, then the worthiness of the victims was never the variable. The structure was.

The pattern: long period of structural failure accumulating cost, then the cost comes due, then the window opens, then the reform arrives. Disaster, reform. Disaster, reform. A mechanical quality. The structure rewards short-term gain. The long-term cost accumulates. The cost comes due. The window opens. The reform follows.

The pattern has worked every time.

I want to sit with that for a moment, because the reliability of the pattern is the thing I need you to feel before I ask the question that comes next. The pattern works. It has a track record. The system breaks, and then we fix it, and the fix is real, and we go on. That is the history. The way structural change has actually happened in this country and in most others, and if you are feeling some comfort in that rhythm -- disaster, reform, we survive, we fix it -- I want you to notice the comfort, because the comfort is the thing I am about to take away.

* * *

We may not be able to afford to do it that way this time.

I think about the last chapter -- about Sarah Chen, the algorithm, the boardroom. The right answer existed. The data was clean. The methodology was sound. The structure shelved it. The structure rewarded the short-term number and did not reward the long-term one. That is the pattern at the level of one meeting, one decision, one word -- deprioritize -- that meant nothing and meant everything. The right answer was in the room. The structure would not let it out.

Now scale that up. The pattern at the level of a civilization.

When the people who study these systems most closely -- the researchers who build and test these systems for a living -- tell us the threat may be existential, the after-the-disaster model stops being available. Because the disaster is the kind you do not get to learn from.

Two threats. They operate in different registers.

The first is the one the movies trained us to picture. An intelligence we build and then lose control of. A process started that cannot be stopped. The sorcerer's apprentice at civilizational scale. The more dramatic threat, and the less likely one. If it arrives, it takes everything, and there is no investigation, no commission, no reform. The window does not open because there is no one left to climb through it.

The people who study it are already having that conversation, and they are having it more precisely than I can. The threat, while real, is still mostly ahead of us. The second threat is the one that is already here.

The second is quieter, more likely, and already underway. The use of these systems as instruments of manipulation. Machines that learn to move us faster than we can notice we are being moved, deployed by companies whose incentives reward exactly that.

The present business model of much of the internet, about to become far more capable. The recommendation systems that already shape what you see, what you click, how long you stay, what you believe -- those systems are primitive. They optimize for engagement with no model of the person on the other side. They are blunt instruments, and they have already remade the attention economy, polarized public discourse, and contributed to a mental health crisis among adolescents.[19] That is what a blunt instrument did.

Now picture the next version. Systems that model one specific person's vulnerabilities in real time. That generate the persuasion to fit. That test a thousand variants to find the one that moves you. The incentive is engagement, ad spend, influence -- and the precision just rose by orders of magnitude. A billion small rooms, each tuned to one person, each learning what makes that person click, stay, buy, believe, hate. The rooms do not need to be run by a single entity. They just need to share an incentive structure, and they do.

One of these threats steals our lives. The other steals every chance we have to think a thought that is actually our own. Both are existential.

* * *

Here is the part that keeps me up at night.

The manipulation is not just a threat in its own right. It is the threat that makes addressing every other threat harder. The obstacle between us and the structural reform we need.

You cannot form a coalition to fight a structure if the structure is shaping your perception of who your allies are. You cannot see the pattern if the pattern is optimizing what you see. The manipulation undermines the capacity to respond to threats.

Let me make it concrete.

You have felt it. You may not have named it, but you have felt the thing I am describing. The feeling of scrolling through a feed and being moved -- your body tightening, your pulse rising -- by something you did not choose to see. The feeling of clicking on something and then clicking on the next thing and then looking up and realizing twenty minutes have passed and you do not remember choosing to spend them that way. Then reading a headline that makes you angry and then the next headline that makes you angrier, and the anger feeling like yours, the anger feeling like a reasonable response to what you are seeing, and only later, if at all, wondering whether the anger was what the system was optimizing for.

That feeling is the manipulation operating as structure. The algorithm learned what moves you. The algorithm served you more of what moves you. The algorithm got better at it. And now the thing that is moving you is shaping your picture of the world -- who is trustworthy, who is dangerous, what is happening, what it means -- and the picture is being shaped by a system whose only objective is to keep you engaged.

Now try to reform that structure. Try to build a coalition to change the rules that govern it. You will discover that the structure has already shaped your perception of who would be in that coalition. The people who share your concern about the manipulation are on the other side of a divide the manipulation helped build. You have been served content that makes them look like the enemy. They have been served content that makes you look like the enemy. And the structure that is serving both of you the content that keeps you apart is the structure you are trying to reform.

That is the trap. The manipulation does not just harm people. It prevents people from organizing to stop the harm. The threat that makes structural reform harder to reach, at the exact moment structural reform is most urgently needed.

* * *

I keep coming back to the founders.

They owned people. They compromised with evil to hold a coalition together. Their failures are real and they matter and I am not asking you to look past them.

But they did something worth noticing.

The founders did not invent the Constitution on the spot. They did not walk into Independence Hall with a blank page and start drafting. Behind that document lay centuries of accumulated thought. English common law. The long argument of the Enlightenment. Locke on the limits of power. Montesquieu on the separation of powers.[20] The hard example of republics that had failed. The immediate, painful lesson of the Articles of Confederation proving inadequate to hold the country together.[21]

The intellectual foundations were laid long before the moment they were needed. The framers were drawing on work that had been done in advance, by people who did not know when or whether the work would be needed, who did the thinking anyway because the thinking mattered.

When the moment came -- when the Articles failed and the convention was called and the delegates gathered in Philadelphia -- they were not improvising. A framework. Arguments. Precedent. Centuries of people who had thought carefully about the problem of power and written down what they found. The framers walked into the room with all of that behind them, and what they built was preparation meeting opportunity. The thinking had been done. The moment arrived. The thinking held.

Do the thinking now. While we still have room to think.

We know the window for finding the answer is open, and we know it is closing, and we know that when it closes -- if we have not done the work -- we will be standing in the rubble trying to improvise the design of the thing we needed to have ready.

The founders had Locke. They had Montesquieu. They had the English tradition. They had the failures of the Articles. They walked into the room prepared.

We have a structural argument that the problem is bad incentives, not bad people. A historical pattern that says structural reform usually requires the shock of catastrophe. The recognition that this catastrophe may not open a window, may close one. The two-threat frame: the dramatic and the quiet, the catastrophic and the manipulative. The manipulation as the obstacle, the thing that prevents us from organizing to address the thing. The lived experience of watching the structure shelve the right answer in a boardroom in San Francisco.

Those are the materials. They are not a blueprint. They are the beginning of one.

Hold the question. Look at the pattern and see what it costs us to wait, and ask yourself whether waiting is still the move we can afford to make. The people who study these systems most closely are telling us the window is not as wide as it looks. They are telling us the usual mechanism -- disaster first, reform second -- may not be available this time, because the disaster is the kind that does not leave an afterward.

The thinking is available to us. The room for it is still open.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] The 1929 stock market crash. John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Great Crash 1929* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955).*

*[2] Pre-crash speculation through margin buying, insider trading, and banks playing the market they were supposed to regulate. Galbraith, *The Great Crash 1929* (1955); Ferdinand Pecora, *Wall Street Under Oath* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1939) (Pecora Commission hearings, 1932-1934).*

[3] Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq.

[4] Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq. (established the SEC).

*[5] The R101 airship crashed at Beauvais, France, Oct. 5, 1930; 48 of 54 aboard killed. Peter Masefield, *To Ride the Storm: The Story of the Airship R.101* (London: William Kimber, 1982); S.C. Gwynne, *His Majesty's Airship* (New York: Scribner, 2023).*

*[6] The Hindenburg burned at Lakehurst, NJ, May 6, 1937; 35 aboard plus one ground fatality = 36 dead. U.S. Department of Commerce, *Report of the Air Commerce Bureau on the Hindenburg Accident* (1937).*

*[7] Two de Havilland Comets broke apart in midair in 1954 -- BOAC Flight 781 (Jan. 10; 35 dead) and South African Airways Flight 201 (Apr. 8; 21 dead) = 56. Sir Lionel Heald, *Report of the Court of Inquiry into the Accidents to Comet G-ALYP and G-ALYY* (London: HMSO, 1955); cause was metal fatigue at square cabin-window corners.*

*[8] The 2008 financial collapse. Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011).*

*[9] Mortgage-backed securities, credit default swaps, and extreme leverage preceded the collapse. FCIC, *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report* (2011).*

[10] Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. 111-203 (2010), which established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and mandated stress tests.

*[11] CFTC chair Brooksley Born warned about over-the-counter derivatives in 1998 and was overruled by the President's Working Group on Financial Markets. PBS *Frontline*, "The Warning" (2009).*

[12] CRA-covered banks made less than 36% of subprime mortgages between 2004 and 2007. Center for American Progress, "The 2008 Housing Crisis" (Apr. 2017); Neil Bhutta and Glenn B. Canner, "Did the CRA Cause the Mortgage Market Meltdown?,"

Community Dividend, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Mar. 2009); Federal Reserve Board letter to Sen. Menendez (Nov. 25, 2008).

[13] The FCIC found only about 6% of high-cost loans had any CRA connection. FCIC, *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report* (2011).

[14] Alan Greenspan testified that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac affordable-housing mandates raised the risk appetite. Alan Greenspan, testimony before the House Financial Services Committee (2005) and FCIC testimony (2010); AEI, "The Clinton-era Roots of the Financial Crisis." *Opposing view, presented for balance.*

[15] The "borrower's fault" framing constrained the Obama administration's response -- narrative capture. Heather McGhee, *The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together* (New York: One World, 2021), chs. 3-4.

[16] The thalidomide disaster (late 1950s): roughly 10,000 children born with severe birth defects, about half of whom died within months. Martin Johnson, Raymond G. Stokes, and Tobias Arndt, *The Thalidomide Catastrophe* (London: Starflower Publications, 2018).

[17] The Kefauver-Harris Amendment (Drug Amendments of 1962), Pub. L. 87-781, 76 Stat. 780. ? Accuracy note: the 1962 amendment added the requirement that a drug be proven *effective* (efficacy); *safety* was already required by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, ch. 675, 52 Stat. 1040 (enacted after the elixir sulfanilamide deaths). The manuscript's wording ("prove a drug was safe") attributes to 1962 what the 1938 Act already required.

[18] The Sackler family extracted more than $10 billion from OxyContin while overdose deaths roughly quadrupled after 1999, and a unanimous Congress defanged the DEA. See Chapter 3; CDC, "Drug Overdose Deaths"; U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform, hearing record on Purdue Pharma and the Sackler family.

[19] Recommendation systems have remade the attention economy, polarized public discourse, and worsened adolescent mental health. Ezra Klein, *Why We're Polarized* (2020); Jonathan Haidt, *The Anxious Generation* (2024) (contested); Tim Wu, *The Attention Merchants* (2016); Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (2019); the "Facebook Papers" (2021).

[20] The framers drew on Locke, Montesquieu, and the English common-law tradition. Max Farrand, *The Framing of the Constitution of the United States* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913).

[21] The Articles of Confederation proved inadequate to hold the country together. Farrand, *The Framing of the Constitution* (1913).

Chapter 6: The Incident

The keyboard is three-eighths of an inch from the monitor's base. Marcus checks it with the edge of his badge. The monitor is centered. The bezel's left edge is the same distance from the desk's left edge as the right edge from the right. He checks by eye now, the way he has checked it every shift for two years, and the alignment holds.

The succulent sits in the upper-left corner. A small ceramic pot, unglazed, the color of wet sand. He watered it yesterday -- Monday -- and the soil is still dark at the edges. He touches the rim of the pot with one finger. Cool ceramic.

The chair is at the fourth notch. He sits.

The screen wakes. His employee number. His password, which is sixteen characters and changes every ninety days. The system accepts it. The queue loads.

Eighteen items waiting. The counter reads 18/?.

The first item is a screenshot of a comment thread. Nine replies. A user has posted a series of responses about a public figure's family. The replies escalate across the thread -- the first is a joke, the fourth is a suggestion, the ninth is something else. Marcus reads them to the end. His eyes move across each reply the way they move across every reply, steady, even. He flags the thread for escalation. The item closes. The next one loads.

A photograph. A backyard, a fence, a dog standing in the grass. No flags. No keywords from the policy list. Marcus checks the image against the visual guidelines -- no weapons, no blood, no minors, no identifiable information. A dog in a yard. He clicks approve. The next one loads.

A video. Thirty-one seconds. A man in a car, speaking to the mounted camera. The man is angry about a local ordinance. Marcus scans the auto-generated transcript for the specific phrases: calls to action, direct threats, dehumanizing language. The man says the city council should be "taught a lesson." Marcus checks the escalation matrix. The flowchart for ambiguous language takes forty-five seconds to navigate if you know it, which Marcus does. He flags the video. Next.

A user profile. The account is new -- created that morning. The bio contains a date and a location. Marcus checks it. He flags it. Next.

The rhythm establishes itself. Item appears. Marcus reads or watches. He checks the guidelines when the item is borderline, which some are. He makes a decision -- approve, flag, escalate. The item closes. The next one loads. His right hand stays on the mouse. His left hand rests on the desk's edge or in his lap. He does not shift in the chair. The chair does not creak.

By the eighth item he has flagged three and escalated two. The escalated items will go to a senior moderator or, if the system's confidence score is high enough, to an automated reviewer. He sends items up. Outcomes do not come back. This is how it has always worked.

The ninth item is a comment. Four words. He reads them. He flags it. Next.

The tenth item. A photograph of a kitchen counter. A knife block. A caption that reads like a question. He looks at it. He checks the visual guidelines. He clicks approve. Next.

The eleventh item is a video.

He presses play.

The video runs for fourteen seconds. Marcus watches the first two seconds and the muscles in his back pull tight, a contraction that runs from his shoulder blades to the base of his spine. His body moves -- not much, an inch, the chair's wheels rolling backward on the carpet. His left hand lifts off the desk and hangs in the air between the desk and his face. The fingers are spread. The video continues. Marcus watches. The hand comes down on the desk's edge and grips it, the knuckles pressing against the wood laminate.

The video ends. The still frame sits on the screen. A room. A figure. The light is bad. The timestamp in the corner of the frame reads a date three days ago.

Marcus watches the video again. He presses play. The same fourteen seconds. His jaw locks. His breathing goes shallow, high in his chest. His right hand is on the mouse but the mouse does not move. He watches to the end. He watches it a third time. The tags are accurate. The system got this one right.

He moves the cursor to the escalation button. The cursor pauses there for one second, then two. He clicks. The escalation form opens. Category: violent and graphic content. Subcategory: real-world violence. Severity: high. He types a note in the field. Forty-one characters. He reads the note once. He clicks submit.

The escalation is sent. The item closes. The screen goes black for the half-second before the next item loads.

The next item in the queue is already loaded. A photograph. A living room. A couch, a television, a window with the blinds half-drawn. A caption beneath it in a language Marcus does not read.

Marcus does not click it.

His left hand is still gripping the desk's edge. He can feel the laminate pressing into the pads of his fingers. He looks at the photograph. He looks at the escalation counter in the upper-right corner of the screen. The counter shows a number. The number does not change.

He waits.

The photograph sits on the screen. The living room. The couch. The window. The caption in the language he does not read. Marcus has seen thousands of photographs like this one. Ordinary rooms. Ordinary objects. His eyes are on the escalation counter.

Seven minutes pass. He knows because the clock in the corner of the screen moves from 10:47 to 10:54. He has not processed an item in seven minutes. The longest he has gone without processing an item, in two years of shifts, is forty seconds -- the time it took to read a long comment thread.

The photograph is loaded and waiting. The counter reads 18/?.

His breathing is shallow. The breaths are taken high in the chest, short. It is not yet eleven. His jaw is tight. He can feel the pressure in his molars, the teeth pressed together hard enough that the muscles in his temples stand out.

The escalation counter changes. The number increments. A response has arrived.

Marcus clicks the response. The panel opens. The response is four lines. The system's font. The system's formatting. The same template as every escalation response he has ever received.

Content reviewed. The flagged item does not violate community guidelines. No further action required. Item restored to active distribution.

He reads it.

He reads it again.

Does not violate community guidelines.

His eyes move across each word. Does. Not. Violate. Community. Guidelines. The words are the same words that appear in every escalation response that comes back with no action. He has read this phrase hundreds of times. He has read it on items he flagged for violence, for harassment, for misinformation, for content involving minors. He has read it before and clicked next and moved on.

He reads it a third time. Does not violate community guidelines.

His left hand releases the desk's edge. He presses both palms flat on the surface. The desk is cool. The keyboard is three-eighths of an inch from the monitor's base. The monitor is centered. The succulent is in the upper-left corner. His palms are flat and the pressure is even and the desk holds.

He opens the guidelines. The document is four hundred and twelve pages, indexed, searchable, formatted in the same font as the escalation response. He types the section number from the response. Section 7.3. Violent and Graphic Content. The section loads.

He reads it. The section defines the categories. Real-world violence. Fictional violence. Graphic imagery. Each category has subcategories. Each subcategory has criteria. Marcus reads the criteria for the subcategory his escalation referenced. The criteria are specific. They list five conditions. The content must meet at least three of the five conditions to constitute a violation of the community guidelines.

Marcus reads each condition. He reads the first one. He reads the second. He reads the third, the fourth, the fifth. He goes back and reads them again. He checks the video against each condition -- the fourteen seconds, the room, the figure, the light, held in memory.

The video meets two of the five conditions.

The threshold is three.

Marcus closes the guidelines. He stares at the screen. The response panel is still open. Does not violate community guidelines. The content does not violate the guidelines as written. The video meets two. The threshold is three.

He clicks the close button. The panel closes. The photograph from the queue is still loaded. The living room. The couch. The window. The caption in the language he does not read.

His palms are flat on the desk. The surface is clean.

He clicks the photograph.

The next item loads. A comment. Three sentences. He reads them. He flags it. The next item loads. A video. He watches it -- eight seconds, a street, an argument, no audio that matters. He escalates it. The next item loads. A screenshot. He reads it. He clicks approve. The next item loads.

The queue continues.

Marcus processes items. His right hand moves the mouse. His left hand follows its circuit -- the desk's edge, his lap, the back of his index finger pressed against his lower lip, back to the desk's edge. Sweat gathers at his hairline. The breath comes shallow, held for a count of three, released through the nose, held again.

The afternoon items arrive. A user profile. A screenshot. A video. A comment thread. A photograph. Approve. Flag. Escalate. Approve. Flag. His left hand keeps moving. His molars ache from the pressure in his jaw.

The clock reads 1:15. Then 2:03. Then 2:48. Marcus does not watch the clock. The clock advances in the half-second between items, in the black screen before the next one loads, and Marcus's eyes are on the content, not the time.

At 3:37, a photograph appears that Marcus looks at for two seconds longer than the guidelines require. His left hand goes to his mouth. The back of his index finger presses against his lower lip. He holds it there. He clicks escalate. The next item loads.

At 4:12, a video that he watches with the volume off. He can see enough. He escalates it. The next item loads.

At 4:39, a comment thread. He reads the first three replies and flags the thread without reading the rest. The next item loads.

At 4:56, Marcus's eyes go to the clock. He processes two more items. He flags one. He approves one -- a photograph of a garden, a row of tomatoes, a wooden stake with a piece of twine. No tags, no flags, nothing in it that violates any guideline. He clicks approve and the item closes and the clock reads 4:59.

At 5:00, Marcus clicks the logout button. The system asks if he is sure. He clicks yes. The screen returns to the login field.

He does not stand.

His hands go to the keyboard. The alignment. The badge as straightedge. He checks it twice. The first check was off -- less than a quarter inch, but off. He centers the monitor. He touches the succulent's pot. The ceramic is cool. He holds it a moment longer than necessary before setting it down.

His hands are steady. The desk is right.

Marcus stands at 5:04.

He pushes the chair in. It rolls to the fourth notch and stops. He walks to the door of the moderation floor. He badges out. The door clicks behind him.

The hallway is fluorescent. His footsteps are the only sound. He walks to the elevator and presses the button. The elevator arrives. He steps in. The doors close.

The parking garage is dim and warm. His car is on the second level, row C, space fourteen. He unlocks it, sits in the driver's seat, puts his hands on the steering wheel. The leather is hot from the Texas afternoon.

He does not start the engine.

He sits with his hands on the steering wheel and looks at the parking structure's concrete wall. The wall is eight feet from the front bumper. It is gray. It has the texture of a form board -- the lines where the wooden panels met when the concrete was poured, the small holes where air bubbles escaped during the pour and left behind round indentations the size of pencil erasers. A stain sits near the bottom of the wall, dark, irregular, the shape of nothing. Above the stain, a crack runs vertically for about a foot and then stops, as if the concrete decided to hold.

Marcus looks at the wall. His hands are on the steering wheel. The leather is hot under his palms and then warm and then the temperature of his skin. His grip holds. The garage is quiet. A car starts somewhere on the level below -- the engine turning over, the hum of it pulling away, the sound fading as it moves toward the exit. The garage is quiet again. The light at the far end of the structure shifts as the sun clears the building's edge, casting a longer shadow across the floor. Another car starts. Fades.

He looks at the concrete wall. The crack. The stain. The air-bubble holes. The lines where the form boards were. The wall does not change. The wall is gray and flat. It is a wall.

Marcus starts the engine. He backs out of the space. He drives toward the exit. The gate opens. The light outside is gold and flat, the late-afternoon light of a city that has been hot all day and is only now beginning to cool.

He drives home. He does not turn on the radio.

* * *

Chapter 7: The Structural Solution (Part 2)

Marcus sat in his car for twenty minutes looking at a concrete wall. The structure that put him there is maintained by people who agree on the fix but have been trained to see each other as the emergency.

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Josh Hawley disagree on almost everything. If you listed the positions that define each of them to their supporters and their opponents, you would produce two lists with no overlap. Tax policy. Immigration. Climate. Healthcare. The role of government itself. On the standard axis -- the one that runs from left to right, the one every poll and every cable news chyron and every voter guide reinforces -- they sit at opposite ends.[1]

Start with a narrower question than the one cable news wants you to ask. Should members of Congress be allowed to trade individual stocks while sitting on committees that write the laws moving those stocks' value?

Both have backed a ban.

They arrive from different directions. Ocasio-Cortez frames it as the corruption of democracy by capital, elected officials profiting from the very system they are supposed to regulate. Hawley frames it as a Washington class enriching itself at the public's expense, a self-dealing elite that plays by rules ordinary citizens never get to see, let alone use.

Different diagnoses. Same prescription.

The public record is the public record. Both have introduced or co-sponsored legislation.[2] Both have said it on camera, repeatedly, in front of their own audiences. You can verify it in an afternoon.

The same axis showed up in a quieter fight. In 2016, Congress passed the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act unanimously -- both chambers, no dissent -- defanging the DEA during the deadliest drug crisis in American history.[3] I described the details in Chapter 3. The point here is the axis: the bill's early draft was written by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer,[4] and not a single legislator in either party voted against it.

After the 60 Minutes / Washington Post expose,[5] Senator Joe Manchin, a Democrat from West Virginia -- the hardest-hit state in the country[6] -- moved to repeal it.[7] A populist-edge reform attempt against an entrenched, bipartisan, industry-protecting arrangement. The axis that ran through the 2016 vote was not left versus right. It was industry-insulated incumbency versus everyone else.

* * *

The overlap goes further.

On a set of questions about whether incumbent power gets to insulate itself from accountability -- congressional stock trading, revolving-door restrictions, transparency measures that expose self-dealing -- the populist edges of both parties quietly agree. The progressive wing and the populist-conservative wing land on the same structural reforms more often than either side's base is comfortable with.

The well-funded middle of each party quietly resists these reforms. The donors, the committee chairs, the safe seats. The people whose position depends on the rules as they stand. They block the changes the populist edges keep proposing. Procedurally. The bill does not make it out of committee. The vote is not scheduled. The reform dies of neglect, session after session, and no one is blamed because no one is seen killing it. The portfolios differ: the Republican middle answers to extraction industries, defense contractors, and the donor class that benefits from low enforcement; the Democratic middle answers to tech platforms, professional guilds, nonprofit institutions, and the homeowner base that benefits from asset scarcity. Both kill reform. They kill different reforms, for different donors, using the same procedural machinery.

The real axis runs between those who benefit from the current arrangement and those who want to change it. That line crosses both parties at a right angle to the one we are trained to see.

I know the strongest version of the objection to what I just said. It goes like this: some structures are not symmetric. Some are downstream of deliberate capture by one coalition more than the other. The opioid lobby leaned Republican. The tech platforms leaned liberal. The revolving door spins faster on one side of some industries. Saying "both sides" flattens real differences in power, intent, and harm distribution. That objection is partly right. I am not arguing both sides are equally culpable in every case. I am arguing the structure produces catastrophic outcomes regardless of which side is in power, because the incentive dynamics are the same. The opioid crisis was bipartisan -- a unanimous Congress defanged the DEA. The 2008 crisis was bipartisan -- both parties deregulated.[8] The AI race is bipartisan -- both parties fund it.[9] The question is not who is more to blame. The question is whether the structure can be changed by one side alone. It cannot. The people who want reform sit at both ends. The people who block it sit in the well-funded middle of each party. That is not both-sidesism. That is the map.

* * *

So the obvious question. If the populist edges of both parties agree on structural reform, why does the coalition never form? Why do the people who want the same changes spend their energy fighting each other instead of the system that blocks them both?

Here is what I see. You may see it differently, and that is your right.

Partisan hatred is the system's immune response.

Think about what that means in biological terms. The system is working as designed. It identifies a threat -- in this case, the threat of structural reform -- and it activates a defense. The defense is you. Your conviction that the other side is the existential threat. Your certainty that the populist conservative, or the progressive, is the thing that must be stopped before anything else can be addressed.

As long as you are certain the other side is the emergency, you will not see the axis that crosses both parties. The system does not need to defend itself against a coalition that never forms. It only needs to keep you staring at each other.

You have felt this. I have felt this. The tightness in your chest when you see a headline about the other side doing something that confirms your worst fears. The conviction, a thing that lives in your body, that they are the problem. That if they would just stop, if they could just be defeated, things would get better. That feeling is real. Notice what it prevents you from seeing.

I notice I'm inside this too. The certainty that I'm right about this feels exactly like the certainty I'm describing. The training did not skip me.

The system trains that feeling into you. It serves you content that confirms it. It learns what makes you angry and gives you more of it. No one decided to do this to you. The system rewards activation, and partisan hatred produces it in its purest form. The feedback loop runs on your hatred.

* * *

The first move is a refusal.

The decision to stop treating the other side as the existential threat. The disagreements are real, and they matter. The differences are worth fighting over. The refusal is narrower than all of that. It is the decision to stop treating the other side's existence as the emergency, because the real threat is the system, and you cannot see it while you are staring at each other.

AOC does not have to stop being AOC. Hawley does not have to stop being Hawley. They keep every disagreement they hold. What they give up is the belief that the other's presence in the room is the thing that must be addressed first.

That is the entire ask. It is harder than any platform, because the system fights to keep that conviction intact. The algorithms serve it to you. The politicians perform it. And it keeps the coalition from forming. It keeps the rules in place.

I am not asking you to agree with the other side. I am asking you to stop treating them as the thing that has to be dealt with before anything else can happen. The distinction matters. The system depends on you not seeing it.

* * *

I sometimes think about what I would say to the people the structure favors most. The executives. The people the present rules are built to protect.

You will read a movement like this and see a threat to your interests. I understand that reading. I think you should look again, because the thing you are defending may not be the thing you actually value.

You cannot slow down because you know someone else will not. You cannot step off because stepping off feels like unilateral disarmament. You have looked for the exit and not found one that does not cost you your position. It is a prisoner's dilemma with the species as the stakes, and you did not build it. The system trains one fear into everyone it favors: that any change to the rules is a change that takes something from you.

If you built something real, you already know the answer. Your value lives in what you can make. What you can make does not evaporate when the rules get more level. A more level structure reduces what you can extract beyond your contribution. It does not touch the contribution. The engineer is still the engineer. The founder who saw the thing three years early can still see the next one. What shrinks is the premium the system paid you on top of that. Ask yourself which part that was.

The system keeps a second thing from you. I described it in Chapter 5 -- the billion small rooms, each tuned to one person, the precision rising, the cost falling. You are not standing outside it, and neither are your children. Your leverage does not exempt you from being moved. It only means whoever aims it at you can afford the best version.

Nobody is asking you to lead this or fund it or put your name on it. The question is whether you will keep protecting an advantage that was never the same thing as your competence.

* * *

To the rest of us.

Keep voting for your party. Your politics are your politics. Here is one thing to consider at your primary.

Among the candidates who share your views, find the one willing to work with the other side on structural reforms. Find the one whose voting record shows they have worked across the aisle when it cost them with their own base. Reward that willingness with your vote.

The primary is where this works, and it is where your single vote carries the most weight, because almost no one shows up. A low-turnout primary is the one place where an organized minority of people who care about structural reform can route around the incumbents who do not want it. The system controls a lot. It does not fully control who shows up at your polling place on a Tuesday when most people stay home.

To be clear: primary voting alone will not change the structure. What it does is send a signal. When voters reward a candidate who has worked across the aisle on stock trading bans or revolving-door restrictions, they tell every other candidate: you will not be punished for this. That signal breaks the collective action problem. The center is paralyzed not because its members are bad, but because each one fears being the only one to step off the treadmill. The signal makes it safe to step off together. The real prize is legal -- fiduciary duty reform, campaign finance, binding ethics mechanisms. Primary voting is how you create the political space to pass them.

The primary is the first shove of the snowball, not the whole run down the hill. Its purpose is not to install the populist fringes as permanent governors. Its purpose is to break the logjam -- to weaken the incumbents who block reform so that the political center can breathe again. If you expect the same people who broke the logjam to build the entire future, you will be disappointed, and you will have misunderstood the mechanism. The fringes are the breaker. The center is the builder. The primary is how we break the logjam. The center is how we build what comes after.

You might ask: how does this survive the same incentive structure it diagnoses? The feeds are radicalizing both sides. The algorithms are reinforcing tribal identity. The manipulation is getting more precise. How does a primary strategy survive in that environment?

It survives because it does not require everyone. It requires a few. A low-turnout primary is the one election where a small organized minority can route around the incumbents. The feeds radicalize the majority. The mechanism works with the minority. The people who show up to a primary on a Tuesday when most people stay home are already a self-selected group -- they care enough to show up. Among them, a subset cares about structural reform. That subset does not need to be large. It needs to be organized, and it needs to reward the right behavior. The rest of the electorate -- the ones the feeds have radicalized -- are not the mechanism's audience. They are the reason the mechanism is necessary.

I should be honest about what I am not claiming. The primary is not a sanctuary. The same incentive structure that captures Congress operates in primaries -- the feeds, the tribal identity, the fundraising machinery. Chapter 20 will show you exactly how the trap operates there: a staffer who agrees on the reform, whose boss's primary is in six months, who cannot be seen working with the other side. The primary is the least-defended door -- the smallest electorate, the highest leverage per participant -- and that is why it is the target. It is not trap-proof. It is the point where the trap is thinnest. A lever, not a sanctuary.

Then, after you have helped put those people in office, do the harder thing.

They cannot accomplish this with speeches. It will take working with people their base has been taught to treat as the enemy, and every time they do, someone will call them a traitor. Cable hosts will question their loyalty; activists will primary them. The system will activate its immune response, and it will activate it inside the people closest to them.

You are the only one who can make that survivable. The reason our representatives cannot cooperate across the aisle is that we punish them for it. Every primary challenge, every viral clip of a handshake with the wrong person: those are the costs we impose on the people who try to do the thing we need them to do. We can also be the reason they can. Give them the room.

* * *

The reforms themselves are not complicated.

Ban members of Congress from trading individual stocks while in office. AOC and Hawley already agree; the resistance comes from the committee chairs who profit from the current rules.

Close the revolving door that lets former industry executives write the regulations governing their own former companies. The opioid crisis was enabled in part by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer drafting the law that defanged her former agency.[10]

Require algorithmic transparency. If a system is shaping what you see, believe, and feel, you have the right to know how it works and what it is optimizing for. The well-being algorithm described in this book is not a thought experiment. It is the minimum standard for a system that currently operates with none.

Set hard limits on data integration. When the behavioral profiles merge into a single model -- when every fragment of your behavior feeds one system -- the leverage becomes total. Prevent it before it exists.

Reform fiduciary duty law to explicitly state that corporate directors are not required to prioritize quarterly earnings over long-term resilience, worker welfare, or public safety. The shareholder-primacy norm that made Boeing's buybacks rational and Sarah's well-being algorithm impossible to deploy is not a law of nature.[11] It is a convention -- not even an enforceable legal duty, as Lynn Stout has argued -- that can be reinterpreted or replaced.

None of these require you to abandon your party or your principles. They require you to reward the people willing to pass them, and to stop punishing them when they work with the wrong partner to do it.

I know the objection to each of these. Let me take them seriously.

A stock trading ban will be gutted the way Dodd-Frank was gutted -- slowly, quietly, by the next Congress under industry pressure. That is a real risk. The answer is not that the ban is pointless. The answer is that the ban needs enforcement teeth that survive the next Congress: mandatory disclosure with criminal penalties for evasion, the kind of structure that makes circumvention more expensive than compliance. The ban is not the finish line. It is the floor.

The revolving door will be circumvented through consulting arrangements. Five-year cooling-off periods exist in some agencies already, and people route around them. That is true. The version in this bill extends the restriction to consulting and advisory roles, not just direct employment. It does not close every loophole. It raises the cost of capture. The question is not whether the reform is perfect. The question is whether it makes the problem better than the current structure does. It does.

Algorithmic transparency creates a regulatory apparatus that can itself be captured. Who audits the auditors? The answer is that transparency is not only a regulatory tool. It is a user tool. If a system is optimizing for engagement, and the user can see that, and can adjust the weights, the leverage shifts. The well-being algorithm Sarah Chen built was designed this way -- users could see what the engine was optimizing for and change it. Transparency does not require trusting the regulator. It requires trusting the user.

Data integration limits face jurisdictional problems. Companies will move operations to less regulated markets. They will find technical workarounds. The EU's General Data Protection Regulation showed that a major market can set terms that companies comply with because the alternative is losing access to that market.[12] The limits do not need to be global to be effective. They need to cover enough of the economy that the cost of evasion exceeds the cost of compliance.

Fiduciary duty reform sounds more radical than it is. The Business Judgment Rule already gives corporate directors broad latitude.[13] The reform does not strip that latitude. It clarifies that considering long-term resilience, worker welfare, and public safety is consistent with fiduciary duty -- that directors who choose caution over short-term extraction are not breaching their obligation. The reform makes the cautious choice legally defensible, which is what the current interpretation fails to do.

None of these reforms are perfect. Every one of them will face resistance, circumvention, and erosion. That is the nature of structural change -- it is not a single event but a continuous process of building, defending, and rebuilding. What they share is the thing I asked you to look for: they change what the structure rewards. They make the failure mode more expensive. They make caution stable under pressure instead of a competitive disadvantage.

* * *

This mechanism is slow and messy. It involves temporary coalitions full of tension, and the appeal to the powerful is more hope than guarantee. It routes around incumbents at the one point they cannot fully control: who shows up to a low-turnout primary, and what those voters decide to reward.

I want to say something here that I think matters more than the mechanism itself. This movement works without a leader. The moment someone stands up and says "I speak for this," the moment a party adopts it or a figurehead claims it, that person has begun constructing the same kind of concentrated power the reform is meant to disperse. Every vanguard that has claimed to represent the people's interest has, given enough time, built a new structure that required its own reform. The pattern is as old as revolution. The people who seize the apparatus become the apparatus.

Structural change that works comes from the ground. Enough people making the same quiet decision, at their own primary, without needing a leader to tell them to do it. That is the only kind of structural change that has ever lasted: distributed, local, boring, and slow. The moment it becomes exciting, the moment it has a face and a slogan and a rally, look closely at who is holding the microphone, and ask whether they are dispersing power or collecting it.

This is not a movement with a leader. I am not that leader. I am a diagnostician. The mechanism I describe -- primary voters rewarding cross-aisle reformers -- does not require my name or my organization. If it works, the people who emerge to govern will come from the center, not from me or from the populist fringes that broke the logjam.

The fringes are the breaker, not the builder. After the logjam breaks, the center governs. That is the design, and it has worked before. After World War II, the old order had collapsed, the donors and the committee chairs were discredited, and for a brief window the center was freed to build -- not perfectly, and not for everyone; the racial exclusion is the taint we must never forget[14] -- but it built. The middle class. The interstate highway system. The institutions that held for forty years.[15] It did not build these by fighting the other side. It built them because the paralytic capture had been temporarily broken. The logjam cleared. The center did what the center already wanted to do, once the blockers were removed. That is what a broken logjam looks like, and the primary is how we break the next one.

Keep this distributed. The moment it has a face, it has a failure mode. The pattern does not make exceptions for people with good intentions.

We do not need to agree on the ideal tax rate or the precise shape of AI regulation. We need to agree that the current structure makes honest compromise on those questions nearly impossible, and then change the rules of the game first. A new middle, less invested in protecting the status quo, becomes possible only after the rules change.

The test I would ask you to bring to any proposal, from any direction, is simple. Does it change the incentives? Or does it just punish the people the incentives produced? If it does the first, it deserves your attention regardless of which party is offering it.

* * *

We have almost always made this kind of change too late -- after the cost was already paid. After the crash. After the war. After the bodies were on the ground and the public was watching and the window opened because the disaster made the cost undeniable.

This is one of the rare times we are being asked to make it before the cost comes due. I do not know whether we will. The future will be decided by what we decide to reward.

The window is open.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] The two major parties have sorted into ideologically distant, affectively hostile camps; figures like Ocasio-Cortez and Hawley sit at opposite poles of this axis. Ezra Klein, *Why We're Polarized* (New York: One Signal Publishers / Avid Reader Press, 2020).*

[2] Both Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Sen. Josh Hawley have introduced or co-sponsored legislation banning members of Congress from trading individual stocks while in office. Public legislative records.

[3] The 2016 Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act passed both chambers with no dissenting vote. Pub. L. 114-145. See Chapter 3.

*[4] The bill's early draft was written by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer. Scott Higham and Lenny Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 15, 2017.*

*[5] The *60 Minutes* / *Washington Post* joint investigation exposed the 2016 Act. Higham and Bernstein, *Washington Post*, Oct. 15, 2017; CBS News / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 15, 2017.*

*[6] West Virginia has led the nation in per-capita drug-overdose death rates for multiple consecutive years. CDC, state-level overdose death data; NIDA, *West Virginia Opioid Summary*.*

[7] Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) moved to repeal the 2016 Act following the expose. CBS News, Oct. 2017; Manchin floor statements.

[8] Bipartisan deregulation preceded the 2008 crisis. Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, Pub. L. 106-102 (1999) (repealed Glass-Steagall; signed by President Clinton); Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-554, App. E (exempted derivatives from regulation).

*[9] The AI race is bipartisan. National AI Initiative Act of 2020, Div. E of Pub. L. 116-283 (enacted Jan. 1, 2021); federal AI R&D budget crosscuts, NSTC, *National AI R&D Strategic Plan*.*

*[10] The opioid crisis was enabled in part by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer drafting the 2016 law. Higham and Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, Oct. 2017. See [^4].*

*[11] The shareholder-primacy norm that made Boeing's buybacks economically rational is *not* an enforceable legal duty under U.S. corporate law -- a contested claim. Lynn A. Stout, *The Shareholder Value Myth: How Putting Shareholders First Harms Investors, Corporations, and the Public* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2012); Business Roundtable, "Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation" (Aug. 19, 2019); cf. *Dodge v. Ford Motor Co.*, 170 N.W. 668 (Mich. 1919), widely regarded as historically misread.*

[12] The EU's General Data Protection Regulation demonstrated that a major market can set compliance terms companies accept rather than lose access. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).

*[13] The Business Judgment Rule gives corporate directors broad latitude. *Aronson v. Lewis*, 473 A.2d 805 (Del. 1984); Robert Charles Clark, *Corporate Law* (Little, Brown, 1986).*

*[14] The post-WWII order was tainted by racial exclusion. Heather McGhee, *The Sum of Us* (2021) (see Chapter 5); Ira Katznelson,*

When Affirmative Action Was White (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005) and *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time* (New York: Liveright, 2013); FHA redlining history.

[15] Post-WWII America built the middle class, the interstate highway system, and institutions that held for roughly forty years. Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Pub. L. 84-627; Thomas Piketty on postwar growth; U.S. Census Bureau / BLS median-wage data.

Chapter 8: The Meeting

Elena was twenty minutes early. She ordered a black coffee, sat at the table by the window, and spread her notes in the narrow space between the cup and the wall. Three months of calls, emails, district visits, and one carefully worded op-ed that mentioned neither staffer by name but quoted both their bosses verbatim. The op-ed had been the key. It gave both staffers the same piece of paper to point to if anyone asked why they were here.

She pulled her hair back and secured it with the band from her wrist. The coffee shop was filling up -- interns with laptops, a pair of lobbyists she recognized but couldn't name, a man reading the Post with the business section folded out. None of them were here for her. None of them knew what this table was about to become.

The notes came out one more time. She had memorized the staffers' positions, their bosses' voting records, the specific language each used when they talked about tech regulation. Ryan Marsh worked for Representative Dawes, a progressive Democrat from Michigan who had co-sponsored three bills on algorithmic transparency and lost all three in committee. Claire Lindstrom worked for Senator Hartfield, a populist-conservative Republican from Montana who had introduced a revolving-door restriction that died without a vote. Both staffers were mid-level. Both had been in their roles long enough to know how the system worked and short enough to still believe it could be moved.

Elena knew the type. She had been the type.

The phone said twelve minutes. She folded the notes and slid them into her bag. The coffee was too hot. She drank it anyway.

* * *

Ryan arrived first. He was taller than she expected, with the slightly rumpled look of someone who had come from a different meeting and had not had time to straighten himself. He wore a lanyard he had forgotten to take off. His ID badge swung when he sat down.

"Elena. Good to meet you in person."

"Ryan. Thanks for making the time."

He ordered an iced tea. Elena noticed the way he held the menu -- not reading it, just holding it, something to do with his hands. She had seen this before. Staffers who agreed to meetings their bosses didn't know about always arrived with something in their hands.

Claire came three minutes later. She was precise where Ryan was rumpled -- pressed blouse, reading glasses pushed up on her head, a leather folder she set on the table like a boundary. She shook Elena's hand, then Ryan's, and sat down with the stillness of someone who had decided exactly how much of herself she was going to show.

"Claire. Thank you for this."

"Happy to be here." She looked at Ryan. "You're Dawes's office?"

"Legislative assistant. Tech and commerce."

"Rao's office." She meant Senator Hartfield's chief of staff. "I handle the policy side."

Elena watched the recognition pass between them. Ryan nodded. Claire's expression didn't change.

Elena let the silence hold for exactly long enough. Then she spoke.

"I asked you both here because I think you're working on the same problem from different directions, and I think you know that."

Ryan glanced at Claire. Claire did not glance back. She was looking at Elena with the focused attention of someone deciding whether this was worth the risk.

"Say more," Claire said.

Elena pulled out her notes -- to make the conversation feel like work, not a social call. She set the paper between them.

"Your boss introduced a revolving-door amendment last session. It died in committee. No vote, no hearing, no public statement from the chair. Dawes's algorithmic transparency bill went the same way. Different committee, same outcome. Both bills targeted the same structural problem -- the tech-regulatory capture that lets the people who write the rules also profit from them."

"That's not exactly how we frame it," Claire said.

"I know. You frame it as sovereignty -- the government's ability to set its own rules without industry capture. Dawes's office frames it as accountability -- the public's right to know how the systems that shape their lives actually work. Different language. Same target."

Claire tilted her head. Not disagreement. Assessment.

Ryan leaned forward. "The stock trading thing is the clearest example. Both our bosses have backed bans. Both bans went nowhere."

"Because the members who block those bills are the ones trading the stocks," Elena said. "The committee chairs. The safe seats. The people whose financial disclosures show the pattern."

"You've looked at the disclosures," Claire said. Not a question.

"I've looked at the disclosures."

The waiter brought Claire's coffee. Elena waited. The pause was useful -- it let the agreement settle without anyone having to commit to it out loud.

"Here's what I want to propose," Elena said. "Not a joint statement. Not a press conference. Nothing that puts either of your bosses on the spot. I want to propose a working group -- informal, off the record -- where your two offices share research on the structural reforms you both support. Stock trading. Revolving door. Transparency. You already have the policy overlap. What you don't have is a way to coordinate without it becoming a headline."

Ryan looked at Claire again. This time, she looked back.

"What does coordination look like?" Claire asked.

"Shared memos. Background briefings. If Dawes's office is working on a transparency provision and Hartfield's office has language on the revolving door that would strengthen it, you swap drafts. No attribution. No public crossover. Just better legislation."

"And if it leaks?" Ryan asked.

"Then it looks like two offices independently arrived at the same reform. Which is what happened. You're not forming a coalition. You're doing your jobs."

Elena watched Claire. The staffer's eyes moved to the table, then back. Her fingers rested on the leather folder.

"My boss's primary is in six months," Claire said.

Elena waited.

"If we're seen working with a progressive office -- even on policy we both support -- the story isn't the policy. The story is the betrayal. 'Hartfield sides with the left.' That's the headline. That's the attack ad."

"I understand that," Elena said.

"Do you?"

"I do. And I'm not asking your boss to be seen with anyone. I'm asking you to share a memo."

Claire held Elena's gaze. Elena held it back. The coffee shop noise filled the space between them -- the hiss of the espresso machine, someone laughing at a table by the door, the clatter of a plate being cleared.

"Okay," Claire said.

Ryan exhaled.

"Okay," Ryan said. "I'll draft something on the stock trading data. The financial disclosure analysis. I can send it to you as a background document -- no letterhead, no attribution."

"I'll send you the revolving-door language," Claire said. "The version that didn't make it into the amendment. The version Hartfield's chief of staff killed because it was too strong."

They talked for another forty minutes. The conversation moved from the specific to the general -- the regulatory structure, the revolving door, congressional stock trading. At some point, Ryan and Claire stopped addressing their comments through Elena. They were talking to each other now. Claire said "here's the language we actually wanted." Ryan said "that's better than what we had."

When they stood to leave, Ryan shook Claire's hand. Not Elena's -- Claire's. Elena watched it happen. Three months of calls, emails, district visits, and op-ed placements, and the proof that it had worked was a handshake between two people who had never been in the same room before today.

Elena shook both their hands. She said the things you say -- stay in touch, I'll follow up, let me know if you need anything. She walked back to the table after they left, sat down, and finished her coffee. It was cold. She drank it anyway.

* * *

The next morning, Elena was in her office by seven. The DRA occupied the second floor of a building on Fourteenth Street that had once been a dental office and still smelled faintly of antiseptic when the heat kicked on. Her desk was a door on sawhorses. The window looked out on a parking lot. Beyond the door to the main office, Priya was on the phone with a reporter, and Tomas was printing something, and the low murmur of the three interns who came on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

She opened her laptop. The email was already there.

The subject line: Quick follow-up. The timestamp: 6:47 a.m. From Ryan Marsh. She almost opened it first -- she had been expecting his draft on the stock trading data. But she saw Claire Lindstrom's name in the other unread message and opened that one instead.

Claire's email was short. Four sentences.

Elena, thank you for setting up yesterday's conversation. It was productive and I appreciate the thought you put into it. After reflecting, I don't think I can move forward on this right now. My boss's primary is in six months, and being seen coordinating with a progressive office -- even on shared policy goals -- creates a risk I'm not in a position to manage.

I wish it were different. I hope you understand.

Elena read it. She pulled her hair back. She let it go.

She read it again.

The words were the same. The four sentences. The I hope you understand.

She looked at Ryan's email. She opened it. Three lines.

Elena -- attached is the draft on the financial disclosure data. Let me know if this is useful. Happy to revise.

No mention of Claire. No mention of the conversation ending. Ryan had sent his draft at 7:12 a.m. Claire had sent her withdrawal at 6:47 a.m. He probably hadn't seen it yet. He was still operating as if the coalition existed.

Elena closed Ryan's email. She opened Claire's again. Four sentences. She had read them three times now, and they said the same thing each time.

The laptop clicked shut.

The office sounds continued beyond her door. Priya's voice, muffled by the wall. The printer starting and stopping. One of the interns laughing at something. Twelve people, on a floor that still smelled like a dentist's office, running an organization with two months of budget and a mission that depended on exactly the kind of coalition Claire Lindstrom had just dissolved.

Her hair had fallen forward. She did not notice.

The desk was clear except for the laptop and a mug of coffee she had not touched. Inside the laptop were four sentences and three lines. The four sentences said no. The three lines said yes, not knowing the no had already happened.

Twelve years. She had been doing this for twelve years.

Beyond the door, Tomas was explaining something to one of the interns. His voice was patient, the way it always was when he was teaching.

Elena sat in the chair. She did not open the laptop. She did not pick up the phone. A handshake that had lasted exactly one day.

The parking lot was full now. The building's heating system clicked on, pushing warm air through the vents. Elena listened. The office on the other side of her door -- Priya's voice, the printer, the interns. Twelve people doing work they believed in, for an organization that could not afford to keep them.

She did not move. She did not call anyone. She sat in the chair with her hands resting on the desk and her eyes on the closed laptop, and she stayed there.

* * *

Chapter 9: The Manipulation Problem

Johann Hari describes a scene I keep coming back to. A conference of tech designers. Hundreds of them. James Williams, a former Google strategist Hari profiles as one of the most important thinkers on attention, stood up and asked the room a question.[1]

How many of you want to live in the world you are designing?

Silence. People looked around. Nobody raised their hand.

Hari makes another point that stays with me. The people building these systems -- many of them prevented their own children from using the products they were making.[2] They knew what the algorithms optimized for and what that optimization produced in the people it served. They would not expose their own kids to it.

A room full of people who built a thing, and none of them want to live in the world it's making, and none of them will let their children near it.

* * *

I described the attention economy in Chapter 3 -- the business model where platforms sell your attention to advertisers, and the engagement metric that rewards content which activates you regardless of truth. I described the next version in Chapter 5 -- systems that model one specific person's vulnerabilities, generate persuasion to fit, test a thousand variants, and deliver the one that works. A billion small rooms, each tuned to one person.

That was the architecture. This chapter is about what the architecture produces.

* * *

Something about the people building these systems, because the easy story is wrong.

That story says they are villains. Reckless. Greedy. That they know what they are doing and they do it anyway because the money is too good.

The distribution of character in tech is roughly the distribution of character everywhere else. What makes the manipulation structural is that the system does not need the people inside it to be bad. It needs them to respond to incentives. And the incentives reward engagement capture.

An engineer who decides not to optimize for engagement, who pushes back against feeding people content that makes them angrier, faces a cost. The platform that restrains itself loses users to the one that does not. That engineer's team loses headcount. The product loses market share. The company loses the quarterly earnings call. Stock drops. The board asks questions. Career narrows.

An engineer who optimizes for engagement ships features that grow the metric. The metric goes up. The team gets more resources. The product wins. Promotion follows.

It is a structural test, not a moral one. Structure does not require malice. It requires only that enough people, facing enough pressure, make the choice the structure rewards.

Those engineers who sat in that conference room and did not raise their hands were describing a structure they work inside, one that rewarded building the systems and punished not building them, and they built them. The hands that stayed down were a symptom, not an indictment.

* * *

The structure does not just produce the manipulation. It assigns whatever narrative best protects the manipulation from accountability.

Subprime victims -- disproportionately Black, disproportionately steered into predatory products they qualified to avoid -- got "irresponsible borrowers, their own fault."[3] The narrative worked so well it constrained the federal response. Reform was softened, accountability gutted, the framing persists.

Opioid victims -- disproportionately white, rural, the subject of bipartisan sympathy -- got the more generous narrative.[4] Disease of despair. Public health crisis. And even with maximum sympathy, structural accountability still failed. The Sacklers kept billions.[5] A unanimous Congress defanged the DEA.[6]

The structure assigns whichever narrative -- blame, sympathy, distraction -- best insulates the incentive from the consequence.

* * *

You have a phone. You have a feed. At some point in the last twenty-four hours, you scrolled through content that was selected for you by a system that has been learning your patterns since you first opened the app. You did not choose most of what you saw. The algorithm chose it, based on what it has learned about what holds your attention.

A feed moves you in fragments, in flashes, in the half-second between scrolling past a headline and stopping to read it. You did not decide to be moved. The movement happened, and you noticed it after, or you did not notice it at all.

Think about the last time you opened your phone to check one thing -- the weather, a message, the time -- and put it down thirty minutes later having scrolled through content you did not intend to see. The feed was there, and it knew what would hold you, and it held you. The thirty minutes disappeared. You did not choose to spend them. They were spent, by a system that learned how to spend them.

I have a phone. I have a feed. I have been moved by the same systems I am describing to you. I am inside it. The recommendation engine has been learning my patterns for as long as I have had the app, and it has shaped what I see, and what I see has shaped what I think. I cannot cleanly separate the thoughts that are mine from the thoughts that were placed there by a system optimizing for my attention. I have caught myself, more than once, feeling a certainty I did not arrive at -- a conviction about a person, a group, a situation -- and when I traced the feeling back, it led to a headline I scrolled past in a feed I opened without thinking. The certainty felt like mine. The source was not.

That is the exposure. You are inside it. The phone in your pocket is the operating surface. The last recommendation that made you stop scrolling -- the one that made you feel something, the one that confirmed something you already believed -- was selected by a system that knew you would stop.

The distance between "them" and "you" is smaller than you think. The teenagers in the documentary, the people who lack media literacy -- they are you, with different content in the feed. The algorithm does not distinguish between the college student who believes everything they read and the media-studies professor who thinks they are immune. It only distinguishes between what you click and what you do not.

* * *

Cross-partisan coalitions. The populist edges of both parties working together on the reforms they both support. The mechanism is real. The overlap is real. The policy alignment exists.

Manipulation is the thing that makes that mechanism fail.

When the feed is constantly reinforcing the conviction that the other side is the emergency, the decision to stop treating them as the existential threat -- the refusal I described in Chapter 7 -- becomes nearly impossible.

That manipulation scales the partisan hatred that already exists and pours fuel on it, twenty-four hours a day, in a room built for you, using content selected because it is most likely to make you feel the thing that keeps you scrolling.

Elena tried to build a coalition in the last chapter. It dissolved overnight because one staffer could not be seen working with the other side. That coalition dissolves faster when the manipulation is operating. Claire's feed tells her progressives are the enemy. Ryan's feed tells him conservatives are the enemy. Both of them hear it every day. By the time they sit down at the same table, the manipulation has already done its work. A handshake sits across from a billion small rooms, each one reinforcing the conviction that the person across the aisle is the emergency.

Manipulation is the force multiplier on every barrier to reform. And it is operating on you, right now, in the same way it is operating on everyone else.

* * *

The manipulation threat is quieter than the science-fiction version. It is the use of these systems as instruments of influence, deployed by companies whose incentives reward that use, at a scale and precision that no previous generation of technology has made possible. It is the present business model, about to become far more capable.

Manipulation is how the structure defends itself against reform. It is the weapon the system uses to keep your attention on the screen. And it is in your hand right now.

Your phone is in your pocket. Your feed is on the screen. The algorithm is still learning. You can see it now. What you do with the seeing is yours.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] Johann Hari, *Stolen Focus: Why You Can't Pay Attention--and How to Think Deeply Again* (Crown, 2022); Hari profiles James Williams, formerly a strategist at Google, on the attention economy.*

*[2] Hari, *Stolen Focus* (2022), on tech designers who restrict their own children's access to the products they build.*

*[3] Heather McGhee, *The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together* (One World, 2021); Rick Brooks and Ruth Simon, "Subprime Debacle Traps Even Very Credit-Worthy Borrowers," *Wall Street Journal*, December 3, 2007.*

*[4] Anne Case and Angus Deaton, *Deaths of Despair and the Future of Capitalism* (Princeton University Press, 2020); CDC county-level mortality data (CDC WONDER).*

*[5] U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform, hearing record on the Sackler family and Purdue Pharma (December 2020); *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma, L.P.*, 603 U.S. ___ (2024); revised Purdue settlement (~$7.4 billion), November 2025.*

*[6] Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016, Pub. L. 114-145; Scott Higham and Lenny Bernstein, "The DEA weakened its opioid enforcement. Congress helped," *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, October 15, 2017.*

Chapter 10: The Feed

Jake was on his bed, phone in hand, thumb moving.

A video opened. A man in a Carhartt jacket standing in front of a building with no windows. The caption said Lordstown. The man was talking about the day the line stopped. He said his name. He said how many years -- twenty-two. He said he'd trained the crew that maintained the robots. He said the word maintained like it still meant something, like the skill was still worth having after the company moved the work to Mexico. His voice didn't break. It was flat. The kind of flat that comes after the breaking has already happened and the person is just reporting the fact.

Jake watched the whole thing. Three minutes and eleven seconds. A woman appeared next. She'd worked quality control. She said the company offered retraining -- a six-week certificate in robotics maintenance, the same robots that had replaced her department. She said this without irony. She said it the way you report the weather.

The video ended. Jake's thumb moved. He didn't think about moving it.

A post. A congressman from Ohio. The post showed two images side by side: the congressman's official portrait, and a screenshot of his financial disclosure. The disclosure showed $1.4 million in stock trades in the quarter before a vote on a pharmaceutical bill. The vote went the way the stock position suggested it would. The post had 47,000 shares. The caption said: He voted for the bill. Then we looked at his portfolio.

Jake's thumb rested on the screen. The post stayed up for six seconds. Then he scrolled.

A meme. No source. No attribution. Just white text on a dark background: They closed your factory. They outsourced your job. They bought your congressman. And they told you to blame the guy on the other side. The word they was in red.

Jake's thumb stopped. He read it again. Then he double-tapped the screen and moved on.

A clip from a podcast. Two men at a table. One of them was saying that wages in manufacturing had dropped fourteen percent in real terms since 2008, adjusted for inflation. He had a number. He said the number and then he said it again, slower, like the number was the argument. The other man nodded. The clip was two minutes. Jake watched a minute and a half of it.

A thread. A woman with a blue check mark and a bio that said labor reporter. She'd compiled data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The thread showed a chart. The chart compared CEO compensation to median worker pay at companies that had received federal subsidies. The ratio was 347 to 1. The woman's caption said: Your tax dollars at work. Jake didn't read the replies. He didn't need to. The number was the whole point. 347 to 1. You didn't need a comment section for that.

His thumb moved faster now. A graphic showing the decline of union membership in Ohio since 1983 -- from 28 percent to 11 percent. A clip of a senator saying the economy is strong at a press conference while a chyron at the bottom of the screen showed unemployment numbers for the senator's district. A post about a pharmaceutical company that had raised the price of insulin by 500 percent over ten years and then donated to the congressperson who sat on the health committee.

Each thing was true. Each thing had a source, a date, a number. The sources were real -- Bureau of Labor Statistics, congressional records, SEC filings, the company's own press releases. Jake didn't check the sources. He didn't need to. The numbers felt right. They matched what he already knew -- what the warehouse had taught him, what five months of no callbacks had taught him, what the stack of bills on the kitchen counter had taught him.

The feed kept going. A video of a man in a suit giving a TED talk about disruption. The man said disruption was creative, that it was natural, that it was the engine of progress. The video had been clipped -- Jake could tell because it started mid-sentence and ended mid-sentence. Someone had cut it to make the man sound worse. Or maybe the man sounded exactly like that in the full version. Jake didn't know and didn't think about it. The man's face was the kind of face that made Jake's jaw tight.

He scrolled faster. A post about a tech company that had laid off 12,000 workers and then announced a $10 billion stock buyback. A graphic comparing the cost of a year of college in 1980 to the cost now, adjusted for inflation -- a 1,200 percent increase. A meme: They want you educated enough to work the machine but not educated enough to ask who owns it.

He put the phone down.

The ceiling was white. It had a crack in it -- a thin line that ran from the light fixture to the corner above the window. Jake had been looking at that crack since he was nine. The light fixture was the same one his father had installed before he left. The bulb was LED now, but the fixture was the same.

The dresser. The lamp with the shade that didn't match. The window with the curtain that didn't close all the way -- a gap at the top where the rod was bent, and a line of afternoon light came through and hit the wall above the bed. Jake's room was small. It had been small when he was a kid and it was small now. The bed took up most of it.

His hands were on the phone. He set it on the nightstand, screen down. His hands went to his knees. The jaw was tight. He could feel it -- the ache in the hinge, the clench that he hadn't noticed happening. His breathing was shallow. He took a breath. It didn't go all the way down.

The house was quiet. His mother was at work. The refrigerator hummed. A car passed outside. The light from the window moved a little on the wall. Somewhere down the street a dog barked twice and stopped.

Jake lay there for a while. The man in the Carhartt jacket. The word maintained. 347 to 1. The red text on the dark background. They sat there, one after another, the way the posts had sat there, one after another.

He picked the phone up.

The feed was waiting. A new post. A woman in a kitchen -- her kitchen, she said, the one she'd lived in for thirty years in Akron -- talking about how the hospital in her town had closed and the nearest emergency room was now forty minutes away. She was crying. The kitchen behind her was dark. She didn't wipe her face. The video had 200,000 views.

Jake watched it. His thumb didn't move.

* * *

He went downstairs at five-thirty.

His mother's kitchen was yellow. The walls had been yellow since before Jake could remember, and the paint was fading above the stove where the steam had worked on it. The table was wood-grain laminate with a place mat that had a coffee stain shaped like a state -- Jake had never decided which one. Iowa, maybe. The light above the table was a fluorescent tube behind a plastic cover. It buzzed. It had been buzzing for years.

His mother was at the stove. She worked billing at St. Elizabeth's. She got home at five-fifteen and started dinner by five-thirty. This was the schedule. It had been the schedule since Jake was old enough to notice schedules.

The radio was on the counter. A plastic one with a dial, the kind you find at yard sales. It was tuned to a station that played adult contemporary and had a local news break at the top of the hour. Neither of them was listening to it.

Jake sat at the table. His phone was in his pocket. He could feel it against his thigh.

"You hear about Lordstown?" he said.

His mother turned from the stove. "What about it?"

"There's a video. Guy who worked there twenty-two years. They moved the line to Mexico and offered him a certificate in robotics. To fix the robots that took his job."

His mother looked at him for a second. Then she turned back to the stove.

"That's been going on for a while," she said.

"I know it's been going on for a while. That's the point. They've been doing it for years and nobody does anything."

His mother stirred something in the pot. The spoon hit the side. The radio played a song Jake half-recognized.

"There's a congressman," Jake said. "Ohio. Made $1.4 million in stock trades right before he voted on a pharma bill. It's public record. You can look it up."

"Which congressman?"

"I don't remember the name. But the numbers are right there. $1.4 million. In one quarter."

His mother set the spoon down. She looked at the pot.

"Where'd you see that?"

"Online."

She nodded. She didn't say anything for a while. The radio played. A commercial for a car dealership in Boardman.

"Are you eating enough?" she asked.

Jake almost laughed. "Mom. I'm talking about a congressman stealing--"

"I know what you're talking about."

She brought the pot to the table. She set it on a trivet. She sat down across from him. The fluorescent light buzzed above them. The place mat with the coffee stain was between them.

"They want you to think it's just one guy," Jake said. "But it's all of them. Both sides. They're all getting rich while this place dies. They don't care about people like us. They never did. Youngstown. Lordstown. Akron. It's all the same story. The factory closes. The company leaves. The congressman buys another stock. And everybody acts like it's just -- like it's just how things are."

His mother served the food. Pasta with sauce from a jar. She pushed his plate toward him.

"Eat," she said.

Jake ate. His jaw was still tight. He chewed and it hurt a little.

"You know what the ratio is?" he said. "CEO pay to worker pay at companies that got government money? 347 to 1. Three hundred and forty-seven dollars for every one dollar. Your tax money."

"Where do you get these numbers?"

"The Bureau of Labor Statistics. It's not like I'm making it up. It's all there. People just don't look."

His mother ate. She didn't look at her phone. She didn't have a feed -- she had a phone, but she used it for calls and texts and the weather app. The weather app was the only thing she opened with any regularity.

Jake put his fork down. "It's like -- the one guy on the podcast was saying, manufacturing wages are down fourteen percent in real terms since 2008. Fourteen percent. And the companies are making more money than ever. So where's the money going? It's going somewhere. It's going to them."

His mother looked at him. The same look she'd given him when he was nine and came home with a split lip. She didn't say anything.

"The insulin thing," Jake said. "Five hundred percent. Over ten years. And the guy on the health committee is taking money from the company that did it. That's not -- that's not an accident. That's a system."

He stopped. He looked at the table. The place mat. The coffee stain. Iowa.

"Jake," his mother said.

He looked up.

"It's a lot," she said. "I know it's a lot."

"It's not a lot. It's what's happening. Nobody talks about it."

"People talk about it."

"No, they don't. They talk about the other stuff. The culture stuff. The stuff that doesn't matter. Meanwhile, the actual -- the actual thing that's happening, the actual people who are getting--" He stopped. His hands were flat on the table. He looked at them.

His mother reached across and put her hand on his. She left it there for a second. Then she took it back and picked up her fork.

"Eat your dinner," she said.

Jake picked up his fork. He ate a bite. The pasta was overcooked. It was always overcooked. His mother had one setting on the stove and it was high.

"You know what's funny," Jake said. "The robotics certificate. Six weeks. They replace your entire department with machines and then they offer you a six-week course to fix the machines. That's -- I mean, you have to laugh at that, right? That's genuinely funny. In a horrible way."

His mother looked at him. The corner of her mouth pulled. It didn't get far.

"It's not funny," she said.

"I know it's not funny. That's what makes it funny."

She shook her head. The radio played another song. The fluorescent light buzzed. The pasta steamed between them.

Jake ate. He stopped talking. His phone was in his pocket. The feed was not running. The kitchen was quiet except for the radio and the light and the sound of forks on plates.

His mother looked at him. He was looking at the table. His hands were beside his plate, palms down, fingers spread. She looked at his hands. She looked at his face. She didn't say anything.

The radio played. A weather report. Tomorrow would be partly cloudy, high of fifty-eight.

But right now the kitchen was yellow. The light was buzzing. His mother was across the table. The place mat had a stain on it. The pasta was overcooked. The radio was playing a song neither of them was listening to.

Jake ate his dinner.

* * *

Chapter 11: The Coda

Most of what you did today, you did without choosing it.

You woke to an alarm someone else's defaults set. You reached for your phone before your eyes focused. You checked the thing you always check first, the weather and the messages, and you checked it in the order you always check it, which is to say the order you checked it once, a while ago, and never reconsidered. You took the route you always take. You clicked the option that was already highlighted. If I asked you why, you would give me a reason. You would believe the reason. And the reason would mostly be a story you told yourself after the decision was already made.

I do the same. When I reach for my phone in the morning, I have a reason ready. Checking the weather. Seeing if anything urgent came in. But the reaching happens before the reason. The reason is a narrator I hired to explain what my hands already decided. The sovereign rational chooser we picture when we picture ourselves -- the one who weighs options and selects the best one -- is, a great deal of the time, a press secretary.[1] The decision was made in a room the press secretary was not invited to. The press secretary's job is to explain the decision as though it were deliberated. It was not.

This is not a failure. This is how creatures like us work. We run on defaults because defaults are efficient. We do most things without choosing them because choosing is expensive and slow and we cannot afford to choose every small thing.[2] The problem is not that we are mostly caused. The problem is what we build on the assumption that we are not.

The manipulation threat from earlier in this book is dangerous precisely to the degree that this is true. You cannot hijack a will that was running the show. You can only hijack one that was mostly along for the ride. A system that learns what moves you and serves you more of it is not overriding your agency. It is filling the space where agency might have lived. The feed does not need to be stronger than your will. It needs your will to not be there most of the time. And mostly, it isn't.

* * *

Most structures handle this fact in one of two dishonest ways.

The first pretends agency is everywhere. Whatever happens to you is your choice and your fault. The libertarian insight is real: treating people as capable matters, the soft bigotry of low expectations is real.[3] People do respond to incentives. Personal responsibility is not a fiction. A person who believes they have no agency will not try to change their circumstances, and that belief itself becomes a trap. I hold onto that.

But taken as the whole truth, the pretense produces cruelty. It tells the person born into poverty that their poverty is their choice. It tells the person whose attention was captured by an algorithm that their distraction is their weakness. It demands responsibility for a freedom that does not exist in the quantity the pretense requires. The person saying "your choice, your fault" is often the person who arranged the choices.

The second pretends agency is nowhere. You are a unit to be optimized. A data point. A preference profile. That part is true as well. People are shaped by forces they do control. Designing for the creature we actually are is more humane than demanding we be creatures we are not. The behavioral insight is real: context matters, defaults shape outcomes, how the choice is set up matters as much as the choice itself.[4] It deserves its due. And it produces something the first pretense does not: a system that can scale. The libertarian version says treat each person as capable, which requires a human being paying attention to each person. The behavioral version says redesign the architecture, which a corporation can do to a billion people before lunch. The asymmetry matters. The second pretense is more dangerous not because it is more wrong but because it is more deployable.

But taken as the whole truth, it produces dehumanization. It treats people as things to be managed rather than persons to be respected. It is the logic of the engagement metric, of the recommendation engine -- the same machinery described earlier. The person saying "we are just optimizing for preferences" is often the person who profits from the harvest.

Both are comfortable for the same people. The people who arranged the choices get to blame you for making them. The people who profit from the harvest get to treat you as a crop.

* * *

I want to imagine, for the length of a chapter, a world that tells the truth.

That we are mostly caused, and a little free, and that both halves of that sentence deserve to be designed for.

Start with the caused part. If most of what people do is shaped by defaults, and it is, and so are you, then the setting of defaults is a moral act. Not a neutral technical choice. A responsibility. Whoever decides what happens when you do not decide is holding the largest lever over human behavior that exists. In our world, we have handed that lever to whoever can monetize it best.

A world that told the truth about this would treat the setting of defaults the way we treat other forms of power over people who cannot fully protect themselves in the moment. Not because people are children. Because all of us, tired and distracted and running on defaults, are sometimes in the position a child is in. A decent society designs for its citizens on their average Tuesday, not on their best day.

The manipulation is dangerous because it operates on the caused part: the part that responds to defaults, to framing, to the recommendation that arrives before the thought. If you know that most human behavior is shaped by defaults, and you build a system that sets those defaults for profit, you have built a system that is narrowing the space where the free part might have operated. The engagement metric does not care about the free part. It measures what you click. And what you click, with consistency, is the caused part of you.

Then the small free part. The moments of real agency -- the rare ones, where you stop and feel a choice you could go either way on and choose -- are not made smaller by being rare. Dignity is the experience of choosing, really choosing, in a world that has mostly decided for you.

* * *

What would that look like, concretely?

I can give you an image. Nothing firmer.

Somewhere in this world, unoptimized space waits. Time and rooms and stretches of attention where nothing is recommending, nothing is defaulting, nothing is watching to learn what moves you. Call it a national park for the will.

You do not protect a wilderness because most of the country is still wild. You protect it because most of the country is already paved. The unoptimized space is the same. You protect agency not because most of human life is free. You protect it because most of human life is already optimized, already defaulted, already watched.

Most people would spend the first hour in the national park bored. Reaching for a phone that does nothing. Checking it again. Putting it down. The boredom is not a failure. It is the withdrawal symptom of a creature that has been optimized for so long that silence feels like absence. The phone in your pocket is the operating surface of the caused part -- the notifications, the recommendations, the engagement metric that knows what you will click before you do. The national park requires the phone to be down. Not destroyed. Down. The difference matters. You are not renouncing the modern world. You are giving the small free part of you a room to breathe in.

Think about Jake's mother's kitchen. The fluorescent light buzzing. The place mat with the coffee stain. The overcooked pasta. The radio playing a song neither of them was listening to. Nothing in that kitchen was recommending anything. Nothing was watching. The kitchen was unoptimized space, and it was the only place in Jake's day where something real could happen. His mother's hand on his. The look she gave him. The fact that she did not say "I understand" when she did not understand, and did not say "it will be okay" when she did not know that either. She said eat your dinner. And he did. And the kitchen held them both.

That is the thing I want to protect. Not the kitchen specifically. The kind of space the kitchen was. A place where the optimization stops and two people are sitting with each other, not being served, not being measured, not being moved.

* * *

The argument applies to me as much as to anyone. I am mostly caused. But the choice to look at that clearly -- to trace the feeling back to the headline, to name the source -- that choice was real. The looking itself is one of those rare moments, when the choice to see was a choice, and not a default.

* * *

I do not know if the world I have described is buildable. I do not know if the national park for the will is anything more than an image that made a person feel something for a few minutes. I am suspicious of anyone who says they know the specifics, including the version of me that gets excited and starts drawing maps. The specifics are where these things go wrong, and where I would lose you if you picture the good life differently than I do. You should. Your blind spots and mine do not overlap, and the world needs both sets covered.

I know the world we have is not the only one available. I know the creature we are is not the only one we could be. Both facts are worth remembering.

Hold my version lightly. Set it down. Make your own. The world you would want if you took seriously that most of you is weather, and that the small part which is not is the most valuable thing you possess.

I will be in the park, doing nothing on purpose, waiting to see if a real choice wanders by.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] The "press secretary" framing of consciousness originates with Robert Kurzban, *Why Everyone (Else) Is a Hypocrite: Evolution*

and the Modular Mind (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010). See also Jonathan Haidt, *The Righteous Mind* (New York: Pantheon, 2012), and Michael S. Gazzaniga's work on the left-hemisphere "interpreter."*

*[2] Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011), on dual-process theory and the costs of deliberation. (Related "ego depletion" research has suffered replication failures and should be treated as contested.)*

[3] The phrase "the soft bigotry of low expectations" is associated with George W. Bush, entering wide circulation in his 2000 campaign and the advocacy for No Child Left Behind; the speechwriting is credited to Michael Gerson.

*[4] Richard H. Thaler and Cass R. Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008; final edition 2021). On defaults specifically, see Eric J. Johnson and Daniel Goldstein, "Do Defaults Save Lives?," *Science* 302 (2003).*

Chapter 12: The Deepfake

The thread had been going for three hours. Jake scrolled through it on his bed, thumb moving at the pace of belonging -- steady, unhurried, the pace of someone who was already where he wanted to be.

Dex_41 had posted a clip from the rally. The comments were stacked beneath it. Preach. ??. Someone finally said it. The kind of comments that didn't need more than that. You saw the clip, you knew. The shorthand worked because everyone in the thread was already on the same page.

Jake had found the group six weeks ago. A subreddit first, then the Discord, then the group chat that ran twenty-four hours a day. The chat had names he recognized now -- Dex_41, RustBelt_Ron, OhioGuy_88, PainAndGain. Real people. He knew which ones worked nights. He knew which ones had kids. He knew which ones had been laid off and which ones were still hanging on. The chat was the first place since the warehouse where the things he already knew got said out loud by other people.

RustBelt_Ron posted a meme. White text on a black background. They shipped the jobs overseas. They cut your hours. They raised your rent. And they called you ungrateful for noticing. The word they was in red. Jake read it. He didn't double-tap. He took a screenshot and saved it to the folder on his phone where he kept things like that.

OhioGuy_88 was talking about his plant. Three shifts down to two. The second shift was all temps now. No benefits. No seniority. The company had posted record profits last quarter. OhioGuy_88 didn't say this with anger. He said it the way you say something you've said before -- flat, factual, the way the man in the Carhartt jacket had said maintained.

Jake typed a reply. Same at the warehouse. They called it restructuring. He sent it. Three people reacted with the fist emoji. The fist meant: I know. I was there too.

He could feel it in his shoulders. The ease. The way the shoulders dropped when the room was full of people who didn't need the whole story. At the warehouse, before it closed, there had been a break room. A table with a microwave and a coffee maker that hadn't been cleaned since the previous shift. Guys sat there and said the same things -- the company doesn't care, the politicians don't care, the whole thing is rigged. The chat was the break room. The chat was the table with the microwave. Different building, same conversation, and the conversation was the only thing that made the not-working feel less like his fault.

PainAndGain posted a link to a thread about healthcare costs. Jake opened it, skimmed it, closed it. The chat kept moving. Dex_41 said something about the election. RustBelt_Ron replied. A new guy -- UnionDad_7 -- posted an introduction. Said he was from Akron. Said he'd been lurking for a week. Said the group was the first place online that didn't make him feel crazy. RustBelt_Ron welcomed him. PainAndGain welcomed him. OhioGuy_88 said pull up a chair. The pace was comfortable. Nobody was arguing. The chat was the place where the things Jake thought all day got said by other people, and the saying made the thinking feel less like thinking and more like knowing.

His thumb moved. The jaw was loose. His breathing was deeper than it had been in the kitchen. The phone was warm in his hand. The feed inside the chat was a different feed from the one the algorithm served -- this one was made of people, not recommendations, and the difference felt like the difference between being alone and being in a room.

Then the video appeared.

Dex_41 posted it. A clip -- forty seconds, maybe less. A woman at a podium. The caption beneath the clip said she was a senator. Jake didn't recognize the name. The woman was saying something about trade policy. Her voice was clear. The audio was clean. She said the word obsolete. She said: These communities are obsolete. The jobs are not coming back. We need to be honest about that.

The chat erupted. RustBelt_Ron: There it is. They finally said it out loud. OhioGuy_88: Obsolete. That's what they think of us. PainAndGain: This needs to go everywhere. Dex_41 was already cross-posting. The clip was moving.

Jake watched it again.

Something was wrong. He didn't know what it was. His thumb had stopped moving. The video played a second time. The woman at the podium. The word obsolete. Her mouth moved and the audio came and the two things were together but apart. A gap he couldn't point to but felt. The way a dubbed movie has a gap. The lips and the sound and the space between them.

He had seen this speech before. The other version. The real one. It had come through his feed two weeks ago. A different clip. Longer. The same woman, the same podium, the same event. In the real one, she had said: These communities are not obsolete. The jobs are not coming back, but the people are not obsolete. We need to be honest about that. He remembered the not. He remembered it because it was the first time a politician had said something about places like Youngstown that didn't sound like a press release.

His eyes went back to the screen. The video was paused. The woman's mouth was open on the word obsolete. The pause frame showed the same face, the same podium, the same event. But the not was gone.

Jake put the phone on the bed, screen up. He stared at it. The video's preview image sat there -- the woman at the podium, the play button in the center. His hands went to his knees. He looked at the wall above the dresser. The same wall. The same dresser. His hands on his knees the way they'd been on the bed that afternoon, the way they'd been in the kitchen, the way they got when something had gotten through.

He picked the phone back up. He scrolled to the comments beneath the clip.

Someone had posted the original. A user Jake didn't recognize. The user had written: She said "not obsolete." Here's the full clip. Timestamp 2:14. The link was there. A YouTube link. The original clip was two minutes and forty-one seconds.

The response to the original was fast. Faster than the original itself. The responses stacked up beneath it.

The other side does it too.

They literally deepfake everything and you're worried about one clip?

At least this one is on our side.

She voted for the trade deal. The "not" doesn't change what she did.

You think they don't do worse?

Why are you defending her?

This is why we lose. Because people like you nitpick while they burn everything down.

Jake read the comments. His thumb moved slowly. He had said versions of these things. He knew the moves -- the whataboutism, the reframing. He knew them because they were the moves the chat had taught him.

A moderator had posted a pinned comment: The point stands. She's part of the problem. Don't let one word distract from the record. The pinned comment had forty-seven reactions. The original correction had three.

Jake stopped scrolling. The screen showed the thread. The clip, the correction, the responses, the pin. His thumb was still. The chat kept moving beneath the pin -- other people, other topics, the current carrying everything forward. The correction was already sinking. It was there if you scrolled back, but nobody was scrolling back. The thread had moved on.

He put the phone down. This time on the nightstand. Screen down.

The ceiling. The crack from the light fixture to the corner. The same crack. The light fixture his father had installed. The LED bulb that didn't match.

His hands were on his knees. His palms were damp. He pressed them flat against his jeans and the denim absorbed it. He looked at the floor. The carpet -- beige, worn, the carpet that had been there since he was a kid. His feet were bare. The carpet was cold. The cold went through the skin and into the bones and sat there.

The refrigerator hummed. The sound came from downstairs -- the kitchen, the same kitchen, the yellow walls and the fluorescent light and the place mat with the coffee stain. The hum was steady. It had been going all day. He had not noticed it until now.

A car passed outside. The sound moved from left to right. Tires on asphalt. The doppler shift -- louder, then softer, then gone.

Another car. Same direction. Then quiet. The kind of quiet that has a weight -- the absence of the sounds that had been filling the space. The chat notifications. The video audio. The woman saying obsolete. The comments stacking up. The sounds of people talking. All of it gone, and what was left was the house and the street and the refrigerator and Jake on the bed.

The curtain didn't close all the way. The gap at the top where the rod was bent. A line of light came through and hit the wall above the bed. The light was thinner than it had been that afternoon. Later in the day. The shadow of the window frame made a cross on the wall. The cross moved. Slowly.

Jake sat. The phone was on the nightstand. The screen was dark. The feed had stopped. The chat had gone quiet. The community had nothing to say. What remained was the room.

The lamp with the shade that didn't match -- the shade was floral, the base was chrome, they had never gone together and nobody had replaced them. The dresser with the drawer that stuck. The stack of mail on the dresser -- a credit card offer, a utility bill, something from the community college with Important Document Enclosed printed on the envelope in red. The mail had been there for a week. He had not opened any of it. The credit card offer would say You've been pre-selected. The utility bill would say Amount Due. The community college would say something about re-enrollment. He knew what they would say without opening them. The knowing was the reason he hadn't opened them.

The silence was specific. The refrigerator. The car, gone now. The house settling -- a creak in the wall, the kind of sound a house makes when it's cooling down, the wood and the pipes and the drywall adjusting to the temperature dropping. The absence of the feed's constant narration. The feed had been speaking -- a voice, a stream, a current -- and now it was gone, and what remained was the room, and the room was just a room. Four walls. A bed. A dresser. A window. A ceiling with a crack. A carpet with wear patterns from twenty-three years of the same feet walking the same paths between the bed and the door and the bed and the window.

His hands were on his knees. He looked at them. The knuckles. The veins. The nail on his right index finger was bitten short. He had been biting it since he was twelve. His mother had told him to stop. He had not stopped.

The phone was on the nightstand. The screen was dark. No buzz. No light. No sound. It sat there -- inert, present. His right hand was still on his knee. His thumb moved once, in the air.

Jake looked at the phone. The ceiling. The crack. The carpet. His feet on the cold floor. The hum from downstairs. The light on the wall moving. He had counted these things before.

His right hand left his knee.

The hand moved to the nightstand. The fingers closed around the phone. The thumb pressed the side button. The screen lit up. The lock screen. The time -- 7:42. The notifications -- six from the chat, two from the feed, one from a weather app his mother had installed for him. The thumb swiped. The home screen. The apps. The icon for the chat. The icon had a red badge. Six unread. The thumb tapped it. The current was still moving. New messages. New reactions. The same people. The same language. Dex_41 had posted again. A new clip. The thread about the deepfake was already above the fold, scrolling up, getting older. The correction had been buried. The moderator's pin was still there but the thread had moved on and the moving was the point.

Jake scrolled. His thumb moved at the pace of belonging. The phone was warm in his hand. The feed inside the chat was running again -- people, not recommendations, and the difference felt like the difference between being alone and being in a room.

The crack in the ceiling was above him. The carpet was beneath his feet. The refrigerator hummed. A car passed outside, left to right, louder then softer then gone. The curtain let in a line of light. The lamp shade didn't match. The drawer stuck. The mail sat on the dresser.

Jake scrolled.

* * *

Chapter 13: The Offer

I want to speak to the people who have leverage now. The executives. The founders. The people the current rules are built to protect. You have been reading this book and, if you have stayed this far, you have been reading it as something that applies to other people. To Jake. To the users. To the people whose attention is harvested and whose anger is profitable. I want to change who I am talking to for a moment.

You know who you are. You are the person who can slow a project down or speed it up. You are the person whose signature moves money, moves headcount, moves the timeline on something that will touch millions of people. You have built things. Some of them are good. You know the difference between the things you made and the leverage that lets you make them at scale. They are not the same thing, and you know that, even if you have not said it out loud.

I am not going to pretend you are comfortable. You cannot slow down, because you know someone else will not. You cannot step off, because stepping off feels like giving ground you will never get back. You have looked for the exit and found that every exit costs position. That is not villainy. It is the trap. The system trains one fear into everyone it favors: that any change to the rules is a change that takes something from you.

Sit inside that fear. Do not wave it away. Do not talk yourself out of it. The fear is real, and I am not going to tell you it is irrational.

Imagine the version you are most afraid of. You wake up tomorrow and the leverage is gone. Not your competence. Not what you know how to build. Not the regard of the people who have worked alongside you and learned from you and would work with you again. Those things stay. Only the leverage leaves. The part of your position that bends outcomes other people cannot bend, that absorbs mistakes that would end someone else's career, that makes the room shift when you walk in.

In that world, are you worthless?

Or are you just less able to force the result?

I am not asking you to answer me. I am asking you to answer yourself, in the room where you are honest, the room you do not usually let other people into.

Here is what I think you will find, if you sit with it long enough. The competence is yours. It was yours before the leverage arrived, and it will be yours if the leverage leaves. You know this because you remember the version of yourself that had the skill and did not yet have the power. That person could build. That person could see things other people missed. That person was you, before the structure promoted you into a position where the leverage and the competence got tangled together so thoroughly that you cannot always tell which one is operating.

The leverage was a feature of the system. The system gave it to you. What the system gives, the system can take away. The competence does not work that way. The competence is the thing you would take with you if the rules disappeared tomorrow. The leverage is the thing the game lent you and could recall.

* * *

There is a second thing the system keeps you from seeing. This one is harder, because it is diffuse, and because you have been trained to think of it as someone else's problem.

You have seen what primitive AI did to the attention economy. The recommendation systems. The engagement metric. The feeds that learned what you click and served you more of it, and the polarization and the wreck of adolescent mental health that came with the optimization. You have seen the numbers. Teen depression and anxiety climbing for a decade straight.[1] Suicide rates for girls aged 15 to 19 up nearly 60 percent, according to Jonathan Haidt's analysis -- a finding other researchers have challenged, though the direction of the trend is not in dispute.[2] You may have read the leaked internal research. Facebook's own data scientists found that posts generating the most engagement were disproportionately posts that made people angry.[3] The platform's own researchers warned that the algorithm was amplifying division because division kept people on the page.[4] The company suppressed the research. The algorithm continued to optimize. The metric did not care about the researchers' warnings.

That is what a blunt instrument did. What comes next is worse. As I described in Chapter 5, the next generation of systems will model one specific person -- their patterns, their vulnerabilities, their emotional triggers -- and generate the persuasion to fit. The precision is rising. The cost is falling.

You have been reading this as something that happens to Jake.

It is not only something that happens to Jake.

You have a phone. You have a feed. You have patterns, and the patterns are learnable. Your children have phones. They have feeds. They are in rooms you have not seen, rooms built by systems that understand their specific architecture better than you do, because the system has been studying it at a resolution no parent can match.

Your leverage does not exempt you from being moved. It only means whoever aims the system at you can afford the best version. The manipulation is not a problem for the powerless. It is a problem for everyone, and you are its highest-value target. Moving you has the highest return.

I am not telling you this to frighten you. I am telling you because the structure has been letting you believe you are standing outside the thing you have been reading about. You are not. The same incentive that drives the engagement metric, the incentive to capture attention and shape behavior and optimize for the response, applies to you. The precision is rising. The cost of deploying it is falling. The room that was built for Jake is being built for everyone, and the version built for you will be better funded.

* * *

Your value does not live in the leverage.

I want to say that again, because the system has spent years making sure you confuse the two. Your value lives in what you can make. In what you can build. In the competence, the judgment, the ability to see something that does not exist yet and bring it into the world. That is yours. No change to the rules takes it from you.

What the structure adds on top of that is a different thing. Call it the leverage premium. It is the ability to extract beyond your contribution. The power to force outcomes that your merit alone would not produce, to defend a position through power rather than through the quality of your work. It makes the room shift when you walk in, not because of what you have built, but because of what you can do to the people in the room if they do not accommodate you.

A more level arrangement reduces what you can extract beyond your contribution. It does not touch the contribution. The engineer is still the engineer. The founder who saw the thing three years early can still see the next one. What shrinks is the premium the game paid on top of that. The part that was never earned on the merits. The part you would lose the least sleep over once you are honest about which part it was.

I will mark the limit of this plainly. It does not hold for everyone. Some people's entire sense of themselves is the leverage. The moving of others. The ability to force. For them, a level world is a genuine loss, and nothing I say here will reach them. I am not writing to them. I am writing to the larger number of you who know the difference between what you have built and what the structure has allowed you to extract, and who suspect the second has grown out of proportion to the first.

* * *

The offer is not "stop."

Stopping was never yours to choose. That is the trap. You cannot stop because stopping is unilateral disarmament. The competitor who does not stop eats the market share you left on the table. The board replaces you. The system continues without you, and the person who replaces you faces the same incentives you did, and makes the same choices, because the game is what made them rational.

The offer is to change the game instead of the move.

Same competitors. A more level track. The leverage premium pared back for everyone at once, so that restraint stops being the thing that loses. Structural reforms that make caution something the system rewards instead of something the system punishes.

Think about what that means concretely. Right now, if you decide to slow down, to spend more on safety, to optimize less aggressively for engagement, to leave money on the table because the cost of extracting it falls on people you will never meet, your competitor does not slow down with you. They take the market share you abandoned. The quarterly numbers punish you, the board asks questions, and your position narrows. The game made restraint expensive, and you paid for it, and the next quarter you stopped paying for it, because the rules do not let you keep paying.

The offer is a set of rules that changes that calculation. Rules that apply to all competitors at once, so that the cost of caution is shared and the reward for recklessness is reduced. The specifics of those reforms are not this chapter's subject. The shape of them is: rules that make the race less destructive for all competitors, including you. Rules that do not ask you to be the one who slows down while everyone else speeds up. Rules that make slowing down something the system rewards, so that the rational choice and the cautious choice are the same choice.

I am not asking you to design this from inside the system. The system is the wrong place to design its own replacement. I am not asking you to be the safeguard. I learned across these chapters not to build the floor out of anyone's better nature, yours included.

I am asking you to make the floor cheaper to install.

That is a narrower ask than trust. It is a harder ask than belief. What I am asking is this: stop spending your weight to block the structural changes that would make restraint rational. Stop defending the premium, once you have admitted to yourself it was never the part of you that mattered.

* * *

The experience is the same for you as it is for me. I described it in Chapter 9. I described the caused part and the small free part in Chapter 11. The precision is rising. The cost of deploying it is falling. The room that was built for Jake is being built for everyone, and the version built for you will be better funded.

I am not powerful in the way you are powerful. I do not have leverage. I do not move headcount or timelines or money. But I am inside the same structure. The same forces that shape your incentives shape mine, at a different scale. The manipulation does not check your net worth before it starts working on you. It checks your patterns, and I have those too.

The difference between us is that you have the weight to block the structural changes that would protect both of us. I do not. That is not a moral claim. It is a description of where we each sit. You can spend your weight stopping the reform, or you can choose not to spend it. The second option is the ask.

* * *

You have been reading this book. You watched Jake scroll through the community chat, watched the algorithm learn him, watched the feed build the room around him. You watched the belonging become a cage. You have seen the phone pick back up. The hand moving to the nightstand, the thumb swiping, the current still running.

That was a person without leverage. A person the structure moved without having to pay for the premium version. The room built for Jake was cheap. A recommendation engine, an engagement metric, a community that felt like belonging because it confirmed what he already believed. The room worked because Jake did not have the resources to see it working. The room worked because the structure did not need to spend much to keep him inside it.

The version that moves you costs more. The systems are more sophisticated. The targeting is more precise. The people deploying them have more to gain from moving you than from moving Jake, because your decisions affect more than just you. But the mechanism is the same. The room is the same shape. The door is the same distance from where you sit.

I do not think you are the enemy. I have tried across twelve chapters to say something harder than that. That there is no enemy. That the system is the thing that produces the outcomes, and that blaming the people inside it is the system's favorite defense, because it leaves the rules standing while everyone argues about who to punish.

You are inside the system. So am I. Jake is too. The difference is what the game rewards each of us for doing, and what it punishes each of us for refusing.

The question is not whether good people exist. I assume you are one. The question is whether the system rewards caution strongly enough to make caution stable under pressure. I asked that question in Chapter 3. I am asking it again now, about you specifically: can the rules be changed so that caution is something the system rewards instead of something the game punishes?

I do not know the answer. Nobody does yet. The answer depends on what happens next, and what happens next depends on the choices the game makes rational for the people inside it.

You are one of those people. The game has been making the extractive choice rational for you for as long as you have been inside it. The offer is to change what rational means.

That is the whole ask. Not to be better. To support a set of rules that makes being better survivable.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] Jonathan Haidt, *The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness* (Penguin, 2024); methodological cautions in Andrew K. Przybylski and Amy Orben, "The association between adolescent well-being and digital technology use," *Nature Human Behaviour* 3 (2019).*

*[2] Haidt, *The Anxious Generation* (2024); the direction of the trend is corroborated by CDC Youth Risk Behavior Survey data, though the ~60% magnitude for girls aged 15-19 is disputed by other researchers.*

*[3] Jeff Horwitz, "Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Teen Girls, Company Documents Show," *Wall Street Journal*, September 14, 2021; internal documents disclosed by Frances Haugen (the "Facebook Papers").*

*[4] Horwitz, *Wall Street Journal*, September 14, 2021; Facebook Papers / Haugen disclosures documenting internal researcher warnings that the algorithm amplified division and the company's suppression of that research.*

Chapter 14: The Resignation

The office was 68 degrees.

David Park had set the thermostat himself, four years ago, during his first week as a commissioner. Sixty-eight was the temperature at which a man in a suit could work all day without noticing the room. The precision suited him. The office was twelve by fourteen, with a window that faced the interior courtyard, and a desk that held three stacks of paper, each aligned to the edge of a leather blotter. The coffee mug sat at the upper right corner, centered on its coaster. A framed photograph of his wife and daughter on the far side, angled toward the chair where visitors sat.

The drawer on the left side of the desk was closed.

He straightened the middle stack of papers. The top document was a briefing on interagency coordination for a consumer protection case involving data brokerage. The case was fine. The briefing was thorough. The legal theory was adequate. He had read it twice and made no notes. The case would proceed through the normal channels, at the normal pace, and produce a settlement that the company would treat as a cost of doing business. The staff attorneys knew this. David knew this. The briefing did not say it.

He adjusted his tie. The knot was already centered. He pulled it a quarter inch to the left and let it settle back.

The drawer on the left side of the desk was closed.

His 10:30 was with Greg Hartley, Nexus's head of regulatory affairs. David had known Greg for twenty years. They had worked together at the FTC in the early 2000s, when David was a bureau director and Greg was a junior attorney in the competition division. Greg had left for private practice, then moved in-house at a data analytics firm, then landed at Nexus. The path was standard. David had walked a version of it himself -- six years as general counsel at a mid-size tech company, then back to the FTC as a commissioner. Those six years sat in his record like a sealed file.

Greg arrived at 10:32. He wore a navy suit and no tie. His hair was shorter than David remembered. They shook hands. Greg sat in the visitor's chair and crossed one ankle over the opposite knee.

"How's Maya?" Greg asked.

"Good. She's a junior now. Thinking about law school."

"Already? I remember when she was seven and you brought her to the holiday party. She spent the whole time drawing on napkins."

David smiled. The holiday party story was a good one, and Greg told it well.

They talked about Greg's kids. His oldest was a freshman at Georgetown. His youngest was applying to colleges and wanted to study environmental science, which Greg found both admirable and impractical. David laughed. He liked the way Greg talked about his kids -- half proud, half bewildered, all performance.

Greg asked about the restaurant on Fourteenth Street -- the one they had gone to after David's confirmation hearing. David said he had not been back in a year. Greg said it had changed ownership and the pasta was worse. They agreed this was a tragedy.

Near the end of the meeting, Greg mentioned that Nexus had been following the commission's recent activity with interest. He said this with the casual tone of a man making conversation. He said that the industry was experiencing a period of significant regulatory uncertainty, and that companies were trying to plan long-term investments but found it difficult when the regulatory landscape was shifting. He said Nexus valued its relationship with the commission and wanted to be a constructive partner.

David nodded. He said he appreciated the feedback. He said the commission was committed to a fair and transparent process.

Greg uncrossed his legs and leaned forward. He said he understood the pressures the commissioners were under, and that Nexus respected the process, and that he just wanted to make sure David knew the industry perspective. He said the word "perspective" with a pause before it, and David's hand moved to his tie.

The meeting ended. They shook hands again. Greg said they should get dinner sometime, the two of them, the way they used to. David said they should. The dinner would not happen. It would be a conflict, and the recusal would be noted, and the noting would signal something. So they would meet in David's office, at 68 degrees, with the door open, and talk about their kids and a restaurant that had changed ownership, and they would not talk about the thing that brought Greg to the building.

After Greg left, David closed the door. He stood at the window. The courtyard was empty. A maintenance cart was parked near the south entrance, its orange cone tilted against the wall. He straightened the stack of papers on the left side of his desk. They were already straight.

He opened the drawer.

The memo was on top of a folder containing three other documents -- a budget request, a staffing proposal, and a draft speech for a conference in Austin. Rachel Winters's name was on the first line. She was thirty-one. She had been at the commission for three years. She was good. David had told her so, in a performance review, and she had nodded and said thank you, and he had seen something cross her face that he recognized -- the desire to believe that being good at the work was enough.

His fingers touched the edge of the memo. The paper was warm from the drawer. He pulled it out and set it on the blotter, centered, the way he centered everything.

Section 5 of the FTC Act gave the commission authority to prevent unfair methods of competition. The enforcement action would target Nexus's data integration practices -- the mechanism by which the company combined user data across platforms to build behavioral profiles. The theory was that the integration constituted an unfair practice because consumers could not reasonably avoid it: the terms of service were opaque, the data sharing was automatic, and the switching costs were prohibitive. Rachel had cited two circuit court decisions and a dissent from a Third Circuit opinion that David happened to agree with.

He turned to the second page. He had not turned to the second page before.

The second page described the relief. Structural remedies. Not a fine -- a requirement that Nexus separate its data streams by platform, with an independent auditor verifying compliance for five years. The remedy would cost Nexus billions in integration revenue. It would change the business model. It would work.

David read the second page. He read it again. His hand was flat on the desk, next to the memo. The desk was warm where his palm rested. The office was 68 degrees.

Greg Hartley's voice was still in the room. Regulatory uncertainty. Long-term investments. Constructive partner. The voice was smooth and practiced, the voice of a man who had been doing this for twenty years, the voice of a man who knew that the relationship was the enforcement mechanism -- that the dinner, the holiday party story, the kids at Georgetown, the restaurant on Fourteenth Street, all of it was the architecture of capture, and that David knew this, and that knowing it did not change the calculus.

Maya was a junior. She was thinking about Georgetown for law school. Georgetown was six miles from this office. The law school was good. The connections were better. David had gone to Georgetown. His wife had gone to Georgetown. The path from Georgetown to a white-shoe firm to a government position to an industry role and back was a path David had walked, and it was the path Greg Hartley had walked, and it was the path Maya would walk if David kept the office at 68 degrees and the drawer closed and the memo unread.

His hand was on the memo. The paper was warm. The second page was clear. The enforcement action would work. Rachel Winters had done the work. She was thirty-one and she thought the work mattered, and she was right, and that was the problem.

He could sign it. He could take it to the other commissioners. He could build a majority. He had the votes -- he had counted, quietly, over the past three months, in conversations that looked like routine check-ins and were actually canvassing. The votes were there. The legal theory was solid. The remedy was structural. It would work.

The cost was Greg Hartley. The cost was the dinner. The cost was the six years that gave him the industry knowledge that made him a good commissioner and the industry relationships that made him a captured one. The same knowledge. The same relationships. The cost was Maya at Georgetown, not because Georgetown would reject her -- Georgetown did not reject the children of commissioners -- but because the path from Georgetown to a career in this city ran through the rooms David was sitting in, and signing the memo would close some of those rooms.

His hand was on the memo. The memo was on the desk. The desk was in the office. The office was 68 degrees.

He picked up the memo. He held it for a moment -- the weight of twelve pages, the weight of seven months, the weight of Rachel Winters's belief that being good at the work was enough. He set it back in the drawer. He did not turn to the third page.

He closed the drawer.

The office was 68 degrees.

* * *

The Pembroke sat on P Street, near Dupont Circle -- white tablecloths and a wine list Helen knew better than David did. They had been going there for eleven years, since a dinner celebrating his first year as a bureau director. Their waiter brought Helen a gin and tonic with a twist and David a glass of the Sancerre without asking.

"How was your day?" Helen asked.

"Fine. Long. We had a meeting with DOJ about the data brokerage case. The interagency coordination is taking longer than it should. There's a jurisdictional question about whether the consumer protection bureau or the competition bureau should take the lead, and both of them want it, and neither of them wants to share credit."

"Who's right?"

"Technically, competition. Practically, it doesn't matter. The case will settle either way."

Helen nodded. She had heard versions of this for four years. The cases, the coordination, the interagency politics. David did not tell her about the memo in his drawer, or about Greg Hartley's visit that morning.

Appetizers arrived. Helen had the burrata. David had the soup -- butternut squash, and he ate it carefully, holding the spoon the way his mother had taught him, with the handle resting against his thumb and forefinger.

"Maya called," Helen said. "She wants to come home for Thanksgiving."

"Good."

"She's thinking about Georgetown for law school."

"I know. She told me."

Helen looked at him. Twenty-four years of marriage had taught her to read the distance between what he said and what he meant. She did not close it. The knowledge sat between them like the bread basket, present and unremarked.

Entrees arrived. Helen had the salmon. He ate half the duck and set his knife across the edge of the plate.

"How's the commissioner's life?" Helen asked.

"Busy. The usual. We have a commission meeting next week. The agenda is stacked. Two consent orders and a policy statement on algorithmic accountability."

"Is that the one you've been working on?"

"Partly. The policy statement is a framework. It doesn't have teeth. But it signals intent, and the industry reads the signals."

Helen nodded. She took a sip of wine. Three minutes had passed between the appetizer and the entree. The gap before dessert would be longer.

Their plates were cleared. David ordered an espresso. Helen ordered the tart. She ate it. He drank the espresso in two sips, holding the cup by the handle.

They walked home. Helen took his arm. They did not talk. The walk from The Pembroke to their house on Kalorama Road was twelve minutes.

* * *

At home, David changed into a jacket and jeans. He clipped the leash onto the dog's collar. Porter was a nine-year-old golden retriever who had been Maya's dog, then the family's dog, and now -- with Maya at college -- mostly David's dog. Porter was not interested in regulatory capture. Porter was interested in the smell of the grass at the edge of the sidewalk and the possibility of a squirrel.

They walked north on Kalorama, then west toward Rock Creek Park. Streetlights lit the path. Bare trees.

November in Washington -- cold enough that David's breath came in small clouds. He did not pull up his collar. He did not adjust his pace. The thermostat was behind him. Porter did not care about the temperature.

Porter pulled toward a patch of grass at the base of a sycamore. David let him sniff. The leash was loose. A jogger passed on the other side of the path, her breath visible, her shoes striking the pavement in a steady rhythm. David watched her go. He put his hands in his pockets.

They walked deeper into the park. The path curved. Streetlights thinned. Trees closed overhead, and the light came from the moon, three-quarters full and bright enough to cast shadows. David's breath came in small clouds. Porter walked beside him, his nails clicking on the asphalt, his tail swinging with the particular contentment of a dog that has been given a walk and does not need to know the reason.

"We could fix this," David said. His voice was low. Not a whisper. Just the voice of a man talking to a dog in a park at night, when no one was close enough to hear. "They won't let us."

Porter looked up at him. The look was brief and incurious. Then the dog returned to the path, his nose working the air, his tail still swinging.

David kept walking. The memo was in the drawer. Rachel Winters had done the work. It would work. He had read the first page four times. He had not turned to the second.

The cost was Greg Hartley sitting in his office talking about regulatory uncertainty. The dinner he would not have. The six years that gave him the industry knowledge that made him a good commissioner and the industry relationships that made him a captured one. The same knowledge. The same relationships.

Porter stopped to sniff a tree trunk. David waited. The leash was loose. The moon was bright. His breath was a small cloud that appeared and dissolved, appeared and dissolved.

The memo was in the drawer. The drawer was in the desk. The desk was in the office. The office was 68 degrees. The temperature was perfect. He did not notice it.

"They wrote a good memo," David said to the dog. "Rachel. You'd like her. She thinks the work matters."

Porter finished with the tree and looked up. His tail moved once, then settled.

"She's right. The work does matter. That's the problem."

They walked on. The path curved back toward the street. Streetlights returned. David's hands were in his pockets. The leash was loose. Porter walked beside him, nose working, tail swinging, content with the world as it was.

David walked. His house was ahead. Lights on inside. Helen was reading in the living room, the wine from dinner still in her system, the silence between them still in its place, the shape of the marriage still intact. He would go inside. He would hang up his jacket. He would check his phone. He would not open the drawer.

The memo was in the drawer. The drawer was closed. The office was 68 degrees.

Porter pulled toward the front steps. David climbed them. He unclipped the leash. The dog shook once, from head to tail, and went inside. David stood on the porch for a moment. Night air, cold. His breath was visible. He could see it leaving his body and disappearing into the dark, each cloud brief and then gone, as if it had never been there at all.

He went inside and closed the door.

* * *

Chapter 15: The Rally

The Marriott on Route 7 had a carpet the color of burnt orange. Elena Rodriguez noticed it the way she always noticed hotel carpets -- as a fact about the room, not a fact about the world. The conference room was on the second floor, past the elevators, past a vending machine that hummed. It held forty chairs, arranged in rows of ten, with a folding table at the front and a coffee station against the back wall. The coffee was in an urn. The cups were paper. No pastries.

She had arrived at 8:15. The event was at 9:30. She needed the hour.

Elena checked the microphone -- a wireless handheld, borrowed from the DRA's office, with a receiver that plugged into a small speaker she'd set on the floor beside the table. She tested it. The feedback whined once, then settled. She moved the speaker two feet to the left and tested again. Clean.

She adjusted the rows. The chairs were metal, with padded seats the same burnt orange as the carpet. She pulled the first row back six inches so the people in it would not be staring at the table's edge. She moved two chairs from the back row to the left side, where there was a gap by the fire exit.

Her hair was pulled back. A clip at the base of her skull. She had put it up in the hotel parking lot, checking the rearview mirror, and had not thought about it since.

She checked the water pitcher on the folding table. Full. She set two glasses beside it. She did not set out name cards. This was not that kind of room.

At 8:40, she stood at the front and looked at the empty chairs. Forty seats. She had confirmed twenty-six attendees. Some would not come. Some would bring people she had not confirmed. She had stopped worrying about empty chairs four years ago, after a town hall in Tucson where nine people showed up and two of them changed a city council vote.

Three speakers after her introduction. Sarah first, then Marcus, then David. There would be no Q&A. Q&A gave the room permission to become a seminar, and a seminar was where specificity went to die.

At 9:05, the conservative talk-radio host arrived.

His name was Bill Faraday. He drove a morning show out of Harrisonburg -- three hours west, in the Shenandoah Valley. Elena had met him at a conference on agricultural policy the previous year. They had talked for twenty minutes about Packers and Stockyards Act enforcement, and Elena had realized that Bill Faraday knew more about structural consolidation than most of the staffers she worked with in Washington. He had also said something about immigrants that made her jaw tighten. She had filed both facts.

He wore a blazer over a denim shirt. He scanned the room -- exits, furniture, faces -- the inventory of a man who had driven three hours. He chose the third row, center.

"Bill. Thanks for coming."

"Long drive." He looked at the coffee station. "That real coffee or the hotel stuff?"

"Hotel stuff."

"Figures." He went to get a cup.

At 9:12, the door opened and Danielle Okafor walked in, already looking at the chairs. She ran a neighborhood organization in southeast D.C. -- tenant rights, school funding, the slow work of building power block by block. Elena had known her for six years. She had opinions about Bill Faraday's show. She had shared them with Elena once, in four sentences that were precise and unkind.

Danielle saw Bill Faraday. She looked at Elena. Elena looked back. Danielle sat in the fourth row, two seats to Bill's left.

Two seats. Not across the room. Two seats.

At 9:18, Marcus Johnson appeared in the doorway.

He was taller than Elena expected. She had spoken to him twice on the phone. His voice had been flat and careful -- shaped by years of saying the right thing in the right way. In person, he moved like a man who had been sitting for a long time and had just gotten out of a car. He looked at the room the way Bill had -- inventory, exits -- but without Bill's ease. Marcus was in this room because he had driven four hours from Austin to be in it, and the driving had been a decision he was still paying for.

He wore a button-down shirt, untucked, and dark jeans. His hands were in his pockets. He took them out when he saw the chairs.

"Marcus. Thank you for coming."

He nodded. He chose a seat in the second row, far right. He sat down and put his hands on his knees.

At 9:22, David Park arrived.

Elena had not met him in person. She knew his name, his title -- former FTC commissioner, retired eight months ago -- and the fact that he had agreed to speak after a single phone call. The call had lasted eleven minutes. David had asked two questions: who else was speaking, and would there be press. Elena had answered both. David had said, "I'll be there."

He wore a suit. Charcoal, well-cut, no tie. He looked like a man who had spent thirty years in rooms with microphones and had come to this one anyway. He found a seat in the back row, left side. He sat down and crossed one leg over the other and looked at the front of the room with the expression of a person who was not yet decided about what he was seeing.

Elena did not approach him. She let him sit.

At 9:26, Sarah Chen came through the door quickly, shoulders forward, eyes on the chairs. She wore dark pants and a gray jacket and no jewelry. She found a seat in the second row, left side -- three seats from Marcus. She sat down and placed her hands in her lap and looked at the table at the front of the room.

Elena watched Sarah's hands. They were still. Not folded -- still, the way a person's hands are still when they are holding something in place.

"Sarah. Thank you."

Sarah looked up. "I'm going to say what I said on the phone. That's it."

"That's all I'm asking."

Elena returned to the front. Thirty-one people. The room held them.

Elena picked up the microphone. She did not stand behind the table. She stood beside it, in the space between the table and the first row.

"Thank you all for being here. I'm Elena Rodriguez. I run the Digital Rights Alliance. You're not here for me."

The room was quiet. The coffee station hummed. A chair creaked.

"There is a bill in the House -- HR 4178, the Regulatory Integrity Act. It has fourteen co-sponsors, seven from each party. It would prevent former executives and senior employees of technology companies from taking regulatory positions overseeing the industry they came from, for five years after leaving the private sector. That's the bill."

She looked at the room. Bill Faraday leaning back, arms crossed. Danielle Okafor leaning forward, elbows on knees. Marcus Johnson still. David Park watching with the measured attention of a man who could tell the difference between a speech and a briefing. Sarah Chen looking at the table.

"The bill will not pass this session. The committee chair won't bring it to a vote. The industry has six lobbyists for every co-sponsor. That's the reality."

"What we're doing today is specific. We are here because the people in this room have seen, from different angles, what the current structure does -- to workers, to consumers, to regulators, to the people who use these platforms every day -- and we are going to say what we have seen. Out loud. In a room. Together."

She set the microphone down. "Sarah Chen is going to speak first. Sarah was a senior vice president at Nexus for twelve years. She is speaking publicly today for the first time."

Sarah did not stand. She sat in her chair, and Elena brought her the microphone, and Sarah held it the way a person holds a thing that is heavier than it looks.

"I'm going to be specific," Sarah said. "I'm not going to talk about theory. I'm going to talk about what I saw."

She paused. Three seconds.

"Two years ago, my team built a recommendation algorithm that incorporated well-being metrics. If the system detected that a user was being served content that correlated with declining mental health, it would adjust. The algorithm was ready. We tested it. The results were good. I presented it to the board."

Sarah's hands. The microphone in her right hand. Her left hand in her lap, still.

"The board asked about engagement projections. I showed them the numbers. Engagement would drop fourteen percent in the short term. Long-term, the model showed recovery -- users who felt better about the platform stayed longer. The board said they needed to think about it. Two weeks later, a competitor launched a product that used unconstrained optimization. Their engagement numbers were twelve percent higher than ours. My project was deprioritized."

The room was quiet. The coffee urn hummed from the back wall.

"I stayed for another year. I told myself I could fix it from inside. I wrote safety regulations -- guardrails on the engine, transparency requirements, a user bill of rights. I wrote them at home, at two in the morning, because the office was not a place where that work happened. The regulations were paused. Then deprioritized. Then forgotten."

Her left hand moved. Not to her wrist. To the arm of the chair. She gripped it, briefly, then let go.

"The content you see on your feed is selected by an algorithm. No human curates it. The algorithm optimizes for one thing: your attention. It will serve you whatever holds your eyes -- fear, outrage, despair. If fear keeps you scrolling, the algorithm will show you fear. If outrage keeps you scrolling, the algorithm will show you outrage. That is the product. That is what the company sells."

She stopped. She looked at Elena. Elena nodded.

Sarah set the microphone on the seat beside her.

For five seconds, no one spoke. A chair creaked in the back. The coffee urn hummed. Elena looked at the room. The conservative host was listening. The progressive organizer was listening. The content moderator in the second row was listening. The retired regulator in the back was listening.

Elena picked up the microphone. "Marcus Johnson is a content moderator at Nexus in Austin. He's been in the role for two years."

Marcus stood. He took the microphone and held it at his side for a moment before raising it.

"I don't have a presentation," he said. His voice was flat. Controlled. He had decided what he would say. "I'm going to tell you what the job is."

He looked at the back wall. Not at the room. At the wall.

"I watch content for eight hours a day. The system shows me what other users have flagged, what the automated filters have caught, what the escalation team has sent down. I see the worst things people post. I see them in order. I see them repeatedly. I classify them -- does this violate the guidelines, which guideline, how severe. I do this between forty and sixty times an hour."

His free hand hung at his side, still.

"The average moderator lasts fourteen months. I've been there twenty-six. I don't say that as a point of pride. I say it because the number matters -- it means I've seen more than most, and it means the thing the job does to a person has had more time to do it to me."

He looked at the room. Briefly. Then back at the wall.

"I drove up from Austin yesterday. Four hours. I'm going to drive back tonight. I came because someone needed to say what the job is, and the people who do the job can't say it while they're doing it, because saying it is the kind of thing that gets you fired."

He handed the microphone back to Elena and sat down.

Three seconds. A chair creaked in the back.

"David Park served as a commissioner at the Federal Trade Commission for four years," Elena said. "Before that, he spent six years as general counsel at a technology company. Before that, he was at the FTC for fifteen years."

David stood. He buttoned his jacket with one hand. He took the microphone and held it at chest height.

"I'm going to talk about the revolving door," he said. "Not as a policy concept. As a fact about my life."

He looked at the room. His eyes moved across the chairs -- Bill, Danielle, Marcus, Sarah -- and landed on Elena, briefly, then moved to the back wall.

"I left the FTC for six years. I went to a tech company. The company paid me well. I learned things I could not have learned inside the agency. I came back to the FTC as a commissioner. My former colleagues were now the people I regulated. My social network was their social network. My professional references were their professional references."

He paused. One second. Elena saw it -- the gap before the pivot. But David did not pivot. He stood in the pause.

"During my time as a commissioner, my staff wrote a strong enforcement memo. The legal theory was solid. The action would have worked. I put the memo in a drawer. I told the staff attorney I would revisit it next quarter. I did not revisit it."

The room was still. David's voice had not changed.

"The revolving door is not a metaphor. It is the structure. It is the reason I could not do the job I was appointed to do. The five-year restriction in the bill before Congress would not have prevented me from serving. It would have prevented the specific set of relationships that made my service a conflict. That is what structural reform means. It means changing the conditions that make the problem inevitable."

He handed the microphone to Elena and sat down.

Elena looked at the room. Bill Faraday's arms were no longer crossed. He was leaning forward, elbows on knees, coffee untouched. Danielle Okafor was looking at David with the expression of a person who had heard something she recognized. Marcus Johnson's hands were on his knees, posture unchanged. Sarah Chen was looking at her hands.

Elena stood beside the table and held the microphone. "There is a table at the back with information about the bill, about the co-sponsors, about how to contact your representative. There is no petition to sign. There is no pledge. The bill is fourteen co-sponsors and a committee chair who won't bring it to a vote. That is where we are."

She set the microphone down.

The room did not applaud. People shifted in their chairs. Bill Faraday stood up and walked to the coffee station and poured a second cup. Danielle Okafor stood up and walked to the information table. Marcus Johnson remained in his seat. David Park remained in his seat. Sarah Chen remained in her seat.

People came to Elena -- a woman from a local advocacy group, a man who worked on privacy policy, a young staffer who had taken the metro from Capitol Hill. Elena spoke to each of them. She gave the same answer each time: it will not pass this session, it has fourteen co-sponsors, it is a seed.

Bill Faraday came to the information table. He picked up a fact sheet and read it. "This is a good bill," he said. "My audience would support this."

"I know."

"They'd support it because it's about keeping people who rigged the game from writing the rules. That's not a left thing or a right thing. That's a thing."

Danielle Okafor was beside them. She had a fact sheet in her hand. She looked at Bill. Bill looked at her.

"I heard your segment on platform monopolies last month," Danielle said. "The one about the data brokers."

Bill's eyebrows went up. "You listen to my show?"

"I listen to everyone's show."

Bill looked at her for a moment. He folded the fact sheet and put it in his jacket pocket.

Elena watched. She did not bridge the silence between Bill Faraday and Danielle Okafor -- the width of a table, the width of a fact sheet.

Marcus Johnson stood up. He picked up a fact sheet, folded it, put it in his back pocket. He looked at Elena.

"Thank you for having me."

"Thank you for driving."

He nodded and walked to the door.

David Park stood. He buttoned his jacket. He picked up a fact sheet, read it, folded it into his breast pocket. He looked at Elena. He did not speak. He nodded, once, and walked to the door.

Sarah Chen was the last of the speakers to leave. She stood by her chair for a moment, hands at her sides, then walked to Elena.

"It was harder than I thought," Sarah said.

"Was it what you needed to say?"

Sarah looked at her. "Part of it."

Elena did not ask what the other part was.

Sarah left.

The room emptied. The speakers were gone. The microphone was off. A few people lingered by the coffee station, talking in low voices.

She pulled the clip from her hair. She did not notice she had done it. Her hair fell to her shoulders. She was looking at the chairs -- the metal frames, the burnt-orange pads, the fact sheets still sitting on a few of the seats where people had left them.

A woman's voice behind her. The young staffer from Capitol Hill, holding a stack of unused fact sheets.

"Is this going to work?" the staffer asked.

Elena turned. The staffer was twenty-three, maybe twenty-four. She wore a blazer that was slightly too large. Her hair was pulled back.

Elena looked at the fact sheets in the staffer's hands. Bill Faraday's coffee cup sat on the information table. Danielle Okafor's folded sheet lay beside it. The chairs Marcus and David and Sarah had occupied were still in their rows, the metal frames catching the fluorescent light.

"I know," Elena said. "I know. But we're going to try."

The staffer looked at her. Elena looked back. The staffer nodded and turned to stack the fact sheets on the table. Elena stood in the room. The carpet was burnt orange. The coffee was going cold.

* * *

Chapter 16: The Park

You have been in unoptimized space. The kitchen at your grandmother's house, where nothing was tracking your preferences. The trail where your phone lost signal and you kept walking anyway. The hour before anyone else wakes up, when the day has not yet been shaped by anyone's algorithm. You were bored, probably. You reached for a phone that wasn't doing anything. That is fine. The boredom is the point. It is what happens when the optimization stops and you are left with the raw material of your own attention. The point is not to force the free moment into existence. The point is to leave a place where it could happen.

A wilderness is protected because most of the country is already paved.

* * *

Marcus's desk at the Austin office. The shift is over. The desk is immaculate. The keyboard is aligned. The succulent is watered. Marcus looks at the desk. He picks up the succulent. He puts it in his bag. He walks out the door.

Jake on his bed. The phone is on the nightstand. The screen is dark. He is looking at the ceiling. His hands are still. He does not pick up the phone.

Sarah in her office. The watch on her wrist. She winds it. The small, precise, mechanical sound. She puts on her jacket. She walks to the elevator.

David walking the dog. The park. The trees. The breath visible. The dog ahead of him on the path. The leash loose.

Elena in her apartment. The hair is pulled back. She is on the phone. She is saying: "I know. I know. But we're going to try."

* * *

Chapter 17: Moloch's Arguments

A trick. The system plays it on your anger, and once you see it you cannot unsee it.

Real energy exists around a genuine problem. People are furious about waste in government. People are desperate about the cost of housing. The fury is sincere. The problem is real. And the energy -- the political energy, the kind that could change something -- gets redirected onto a target that is visible, legible, outside the attacking coalition, cheap to fight, and real enough to sustain the illusion that something is being done.

The target is never the mechanism. The target is the thing the mechanism can afford to lose.

I am going to name this trick. Then I am going to show you how it works in thirteen issues that span the entire political surface. Then I am going to give you a test you can run on your own side's next campaign, which is the only place the test matters.

* * *

Start with a specific case, because the general always follows from the specific.

The tax gap -- the difference between what Americans owe and what they collect -- runs roughly six hundred to seven hundred billion dollars a year.[1] The IRS estimates that the largest concentration of unreported income sits at the top, in categories where third-party reporting is weakest.[2] This is the money. It is real. It is large. The enforcement apparatus that could close it has been systematically defunded for decades, because defunding the IRS is one of the few things both parties' donors can agree on.[3]

The political energy around "waste, fraud, and abuse" is enormous. It is also sincere -- people who follow the rules resent people who don't, and that resentment is correct. The question is where the energy lands.

It lands on SNAP recipients. Retailer trafficking in the food-stamp program runs historically around one to one and a half percent of benefits.[4] It lands on EITC filers, who are audited at rates rivaling the highest earners because a correspondence audit costs a few hundred dollars and generates no political resistance.[5] It lands, in the most recent and most vivid demonstration, on federal employees and small agencies -- the targets that can be hit without cost.

Medicare Advantage upcoding -- payments running twenty-plus percent above what fee-for-service equivalents would cost, by MedPAC's estimates -- goes untouched.[6] Pentagon procurement, seven consecutive failed department-wide audits, goes untouched.[7] The enforcement dollars flow inversely to the fraud dollars.

The people directing this energy are mostly not lying. They believe in the mission. They are responding to a structure that rewards certain targets and protects others. The targets that can be attacked without cost to any donor, any institution, any coalition member -- those are the targets that survive the selection process. The ones that would cost something real are invisible, and their invisibility is not an accident. It is the mechanism.

* * *

I want to name this mechanism precisely, because precision is the only thing that prevents it from becoming another story about villains.

The template, generalized:

Diffuse public energy exists around a genuine problem. Politicians and institutions need to be seen responding. The structural fix would cost an entrenched interest something real. So the energy is redirected onto a decoy target -- attacked loudly, at length, with visible results -- and discharged. The mechanism survives the war fought in its name.

No planner is required. Politicians and media A/B test attacks. The attacks that generate donations and coverage without triggering donor, institutional, or in-group retaliation survive. The survivors define the discourse. Selection, not strategy.

The selection criteria for a good decoy are consistent across every case I am going to show you. The decoy is visible -- it can be filmed, photographed, pointed at. It is legible -- enemy-shaped, fits in a sentence, has a face or a logo. It is outside the attacking coalition -- hitting it costs nothing. It is cheap to fight -- no lobbyists, no retaliation. And it is real.

This last one matters most. Decoys are never pure fictions. The welfare cheat exists. The corporate landlord exists. The decoy's grain of truth is its load-bearing component. A chapter that pretends the decoys are hallucinations will lose every reader who has personally seen one. The point is not that the decoy is fake. The point is that the decoy is misweighted -- inflated to fill the frame so the structural beneficiary stays invisible.

* * *

Two lenses. Two directions. Same mechanism.

The right's lens codes threat as government and the undeserving. It cannot easily register extraction by capital. Donor-industry beneficiaries -- the fossil-fuel incumbents, the pharmaceutical pricing apparatus, the defense contractors -- are invisible to it. The lens renders them as market actors, as participants in the economy, as employers. The word for what they do -- extraction -- does not exist in the lens's vocabulary.

The left's lens codes threat as profit. It cannot easily register incumbency that lacks a profit motive. Nonprofit hospital systems. Universities. Public institutions. Incumbent homeowners. Professional guilds. These actors extract -- they capture value through scarcity, through credentialing, through zoning, through regulatory capture -- but they do so without a profit logo, without a CEO to photograph, without a quarterly earnings call to quote. The left's villain detector requires a profit-shaped target. When the beneficiary is a nonprofit, a university, or a homeowner association, the detector reads clean.

Symmetric mechanism, different camouflage. Both coalitions protect incumbents. They differ in which incumbents their optics render transparent. I need to say this early and clearly: I am claiming symmetry of mechanism, never symmetry of magnitude. The selection criteria for decoys operate identically. The per-issue sizes are not equal, and which coalition does more damage on which issue is a real question this chapter will not flatten.

I need to be precise about what I am claiming and what I am not. I am claiming symmetry of mechanism -- the selection criteria for decoys operate identically across coalitions. I am not claiming symmetry of magnitude. The per-issue sizes are not equal. Forcing every left decoy into an equal-mass pairing with a right decoy would be a compression error. What is symmetric: the selection gradient. What is asymmetric: which issues, which magnitudes, which decade. I am refusing the both-sides bookkeeping exercise. The gradient is the point.

* * *

Eight moves. I am going to name them because naming them is the only way I have found to see them while they are operating. I have caught myself performing at least three of these in the last year. I will not tell you which ones. The telling would be too comfortable -- it would let me pretend that catching myself is the same as stopping.

The first move is the one you will recognize fastest, because your side already uses it.

The Decoy Villain. A small, visible, outside-coalition target absorbs the enforcement energy meant for a large, illegible, inside-coalition mechanism. The welfare cheat. The corporate landlord. The greedy insurer. The voter impersonator. Each is real. Each is marginal to the scale of the problem they are made to represent. I have watched this move operate on people I love. The anger is real. The target is selected.

Kill the Thermometer. Attack the measurement instead of the mechanism. Standardized tests reveal which schools are failing; the response is to abolish the tests. Crime statistics go in whichever direction is convenient; the response is to dispute the statistics rather than address the causes. The instrument that reveals the problem becomes the problem. I notice I reach for this one when the data contradicts something I want to believe.

The Impossible Demand. Route the energy into an ask that structurally cannot be granted, converting the issue into a perpetual fundraising annuity. A constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.[8] Sixty-plus ACA repeal votes with no replacement.[9] The demand's impossibility is its function -- it can never be satisfied, so the energy never has to be spent on anything achievable. The fundraising email is A/B tested exactly like Jake's feed, and apocalypse framing wins the test.

Symptom Relief as Substitute. Surface-level relief that discharges the energy while leaving the engine intact. Its signature: the cure must be re-performed forever. Debt cancellation without cost reform. Rent control without supply. Stimulus without stabilizers. The one-time relief feels like victory. The mechanism that produced the problem continues. I have cheered for versions of this move. The cheering felt like participation. It was consumption.

Weaponized Procedure. Yesterday's protective process becomes today's shield for incumbency. Environmental review built to stop highways and poison now blocks clean energy and dense housing.[10] Historic preservation blocks the housing that would make neighborhoods accessible.[11] Licensing regimes block entrants into professions that incumbents want to protect.[12] The process retains the moral prestige of its founding purpose while serving its opposite.

Narrative Assignment. Blame or sympathy allocated to whichever framing best insulates the mechanism. Subprime victims -- disproportionately Black, steered into predatory products -- got "irresponsible borrowers, their own fault."[13] Opioid victims -- disproportionately white, rural -- got "disease of despair, public health crisis."[14] Neither got structural accountability. The structure assigns whichever narrative protects the incentive from the consequence.

Guild Silence. The coalition cannot name a beneficiary who is a member. Agricultural employers of unauthorized labor, for the right.[15] Police unions, hospital systems, universities, homeowner bases, for the left. The silence is not conspiracy. It is that attacking a member costs the coalition something real and attacking a non-member costs nothing. The discourse flows around the member like water around a stone. I have a guild. I have a silence. I will not name it here, because the naming would cost me, and the cost is the point.

Catharsis Capture. Energy converted into expressive acts with near-zero structural throughput. Rage donations. Divestment campaigns. Boycotts. Hashtag cycles. The act feels like combat and functions as discharge. The feed has automated this move -- it converts structural anger into engagement metrics, which is the purest form of capture because the anger feels productive while producing nothing. I have donated to unwinnable races. The donation felt like resistance. It was a transaction.

* * *

Now the flagships. One per lens. Same mechanism. Different camouflage.

The right-coded case: waste, fraud, and abuse.

The energy is universal and sincere. Cheating is corrosive. The intuition behind it is correct.

Where the energy structurally lives: the tax gap, Medicare Advantage upcoding, Pentagon procurement, PBM spread pricing.[16] The large, illegible, inside-coalition flows.

Where the energy lands: SNAP recipients. EITC filers. Federal employees. Small agencies. The visible, legible, outside-coalition targets.

The move: Decoy Villain plus Kill the Thermometer. The routine conflation of "improper payments" -- mostly documentation error, flowing both directions -- with "fraud" inflates the decoy's apparent size by an order of magnitude.[17]

The tell: enforcement dollars flow inversely to fraud dollars. The targets that could be hit without cost are hit. The targets that would cost donors or institutions go untouched.

The concession: improper-payment rates in means-tested programs are genuinely nontrivial.[18] Administrative complexity is real. The fairness intuition behind the energy is correct. The decoy is not fictional. It is misweighted.

The left-coded case: housing.

The energy is affordability crisis, homelessness. Sincere, massive, morally urgent.

Where it structurally lives: supply restriction. Zoning reserving most residential land in high-demand metros for single-family use.[19] Discretionary review. Parking minimums. Environmental litigation as a private veto. Maintained most stringently in the most progressive cities, protecting the largest middle-class asset in America: incumbent home equity.[20] The holders of that equity dominate exactly the low-turnout local elections and planning meetings where the restrictions are set.[21]

Where the energy lands: corporate landlords. Private equity. "Blackstone is buying all the houses." Airbnb. "Greedy developers." Institutional investors own low single digits of single-family rental stock nationally.[22] Concentrated purchase spikes in a few Sun Belt metros inflated the frame to national villain status.[23]

The move: Decoy Villain, Symptom Relief (rent control -- genuine protection for sitting tenants alongside reduced supply and higher citywide rents[24]), and above all Guild Silence. The beneficiary of scarcity is the coalition's own base. The villain must therefore be found in a profit-shaped actor, because the lens cannot code a homeowner-voter as an extractor. This is the left's welfare queen -- a real-but-marginal actor given the starring role so the actual beneficiary never auditions.

The tell: the named villain owns roughly three percent of the problem, and the flagship policy response does not add a single unit of housing.[25]

The concession: corporate landlords behave badly in documented ways -- fee-stacking, eviction practices, the RealPage price-coordination litigation.[26] Tenant protection has genuine value. The decoy is not fictional. It is misweighted.

* * *

The pairing is the balance demonstration. The tax case and the housing case are structural twins. Identical mechanism -- real energy, real problem, decoy target inflated to absorb the energy, structural beneficiary invisible. Different camouflage -- the right's lens cannot see capital extraction; the left's lens cannot see nonprofit and asset-holder extraction. One chapter, two flagships, same move.

The other issues in the catalogue -- crime and wage theft, immigration, election integrity, climate, healthcare, guns, criminal justice, money in politics, misinformation -- each operates by the same selection gradient. I will not catalog all of them here. The taxonomy teaches the moves. The moves generate the instances. If I have done this right, you are already running them on your own side.

* * *

One more connection, and it is the one that matters.

The same machinery that radicalized Jake is the distribution system for every decoy in this catalogue. Decoy content beats mechanism content in every engagement auction, structurally and always. A decoy is enemy-shaped, legible, fifteen seconds, flatters the in-group. A mechanism is complex, slow, and implicates the in-group somewhere. The recommender does not need to be designed to protect Moloch. Optimizing for engagement is sufficient. Structural explanation loses the A/B test to villain footage every single time it is run, billions of times a day.[27]

The feed is the lens-grinder. The same algorithm that narrowed Jake's world is the algorithm that selects for decoy content across the entire political surface. It does not have a political position. It has an engagement metric. And the content that wins the metric is the content that names a villain, not the content that names a structure.

* * *

I want to be honest about the trap this chapter sets for itself.

A chapter that proves "your outrage has been captured" can become the final deflection. Terminal cynicism -- everything is a decoy, therefore nothing is worth doing -- demobilizes better than any individual decoy ever could. If this chapter ends at diagnosis, it has performed Move 8 on its own readers.

The exit has two parts.

First, the counterexamples. Energy has landed on structure before. Kefauver-Harris.[28] The stock-trading ban coalition that AOC and Hawley both backed.[29] Manchin's repeal attempt against the 2016 DEA bill.[30] Direct File -- a government tool that was built, that worked, that measurably raised users' trust in government, and whose elimination confirmed the mechanism rather than the futility.[31] Decoys are the norm, not the law. The norm has been broken before.

Second, the reader tool. Four questions for any proposed target of reform energy.

One. Who benefits from the current arrangement, concretely? Name them. Not "the system." Not "the elites." The specific actors who extract value from the current rules.

Two. Does this proposal touch them? Not "address the issue." Touch the beneficiary. Reduce their extraction. Change what they can get away with.

Three. If not -- who does it touch instead, and what made that target selectable? Is it visible? Legible? Outside your coalition? Unable to retaliate?

Four. Would success change what the structure rewards -- or would the cure have to be repeated forever?

A decoy typically fails questions two and four while scoring perfectly on question three. The reader who internalizes this can run the test on their own side's next campaign. That is the only place it matters. The other side's decoys are not your problem. Your side's decoys are the ones your lens was built to miss.

* * *

I notice I'm inside this too. The certainty that I'm right about the decoys feels exactly like the certainty the decoys produce in the people who chase them. The training did not skip me. I have a feed. I have a lens. I have caught myself feeling a conviction I did not arrive at -- a certainty about a person, a group, a situation -- and when I traced the feeling back, it led to a headline I scrolled past in a feed I opened without thinking.

The taxonomy I just gave you is a tool. Tools can be used. They can also be mistaken for the work. Naming the eight moves is not the same as resisting them. The decoy test is not the same as passing it. I am offering you a lens. What you see through it is still your responsibility, and mine.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] U.S. IRS, *Federal Tax Compliance Research: Tax Gap Estimates for Tax Years 2014-2016* (2022), with TY 2017-2018 projections; U.S. Department of the Treasury, "The U.S. Tax Gap," May 2021. The $600-700B annual figure reflects gross-gap projections including nonfiling and underreporting.*

*[2] IRS, *Statistics of Income*; John Guyton et al., "Tax Evasion at the Top of the Income Distribution: Theory and Evidence," NBER Working Paper No. 23642 (2018, rev. 2021); U.S. Treasury estimate that the top 1% underreport roughly 20% of income.*

*[3] IRS *Data Book* enforcement-staffing series; GAO, *IRS Enforcement* reports. IRS enforcement staffing fell roughly 30%+ from FY 2010 to FY 2018, with audit rates falling across the board.*

*[4] USDA Food and Nutrition Service, *The Extent of Trafficking in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program* (multi-year studies: 2009-2011 ~1.3%; 2012-2014 ~1.5%; 2015-2017 ~1.3%).*

*[5] IRS *Data Book*, audit-by-income tables; Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC) reports on audit skew (EITC recipients historically audited at roughly 0.8-1.1%); GAO on correspondence-audit costs.*

*[6] Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), *Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy* (March reports); MedPAC estimates that Medicare Advantage coding intensity drives payments roughly 20%+ above comparable fee-for-service risk scores.*

*[7] DoD Office of Inspector General, agency-wide financial-statement audit results, FY2018-FY2024 (each issued a disclaimer of opinion); GAO, *Financial Audit: Department of Defense*.*

*[8] *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010); various proposed constitutional-amendment bills. The point is the structural near-impossibility of ratification, not the count.*

*[9] U.S. House roll-call records, 2011-2016; CRS and *Washington Post* / *PolitiFact* tallies of ACA-repeal votes, ranging from roughly 50 to 70+ depending on counting methodology.*

*[10] National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq.; Salim Furth (Mercatus Center) and Brookings Institution studies of NEPA/CEQA as barriers to housing and clean energy; Robert C. Ellickson, *America's Frozen Neighborhoods* (Yale University Press, 2024).*

[11] National Trust for Historic Preservation; local-landmarking literature documenting historic-district designation restricting new housing construction.

*[12] Morris M. Kleiner, *Stages of Occupational Licensing* (W.E. Upjohn Institute, 2024); White House Council of Economic Advisers and Treasury, *Occupational Licensing: A Framework for Policymakers* (2015).*

*[13] Heather McGhee, *The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together* (One World, 2021); Rick Brooks and Ruth Simon, "Subprime Debacle Traps Even Very Credit-Worthy Borrowers," *Wall Street Journal*, December 3, 2007.*

*[14] Anne Case and Angus Deaton, *Deaths of Despair and the Future of Capitalism* (Princeton University Press, 2020); CDC WONDER county-level mortality data.*

[15] Pew Research Center and USDA Economic Research Service estimates that roughly 40-50% of U.S. farmworkers are undocumented.

*[16] FTC, *Pharmacy Benefit Managers: The Powerful Middlemen Inflating Drug Costs and Squeezing Main Street Pharmacies* (interim staff report, July 2024); state Medicaid PBM spread-pricing audits (e.g., Ohio, Kentucky).*

*[17] GAO, *Payment Integrity* reports; paymentaccuracy.gov. "Improper payment" includes overpayments, underpayments, and documentation errors, of which fraud is a small subset.*

[18] paymentaccuracy.gov program-specific improper-payment rates (EITC historically ~20-25% improper-payment rate; SNAP and Medicaid markedly lower).

[19] Salim Furth (Mercatus Center) surveys finding roughly 75% of residential land in major U.S. cities zoned single-family; Sonia

*Hirt, *Zoned in the USA* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).*

*[20] Salim Furth and M. Nolan Lyons, *Restrictive States* (Mercatus Center, 2021); Federal Reserve, *Survey of Consumer Finances* (primary residence as the largest non-pension asset of middle-income families).*

*[21] Katherine Levine Einstein, David M. Glick, and Maxwell Palmer, *Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis* (Cambridge University Press, 2019).*

*[22] Urban Institute, *Investor Purchases* data; Federal Reserve researchers' estimates of roughly 2-3% national institutional share of single-family rentals.*

[23] CoreLogic, Redfin, and Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta data showing investor purchase share spiking above 30% in select Sun Belt metros (Atlanta, Phoenix, Charlotte) in 2021-2022.

*[24] Rebecca Diamond, Tim McQuade, and Franklin Qian, "The Effects of Rent Control Expansion on Tenants, Landlords, and Inequality: Evidence from San Francisco," *American Economic Review* 109, no. 9 (2019); Glaeser & Luttmer (2003); Autor, Palmer & Pathak (2014).*

[25] Author's synthesis from the institutional-ownership share in [^22]; rent control is definitionally supply-neutral and adds no units.

*[26] U.S. Department of Justice, Antitrust Division, complaint against RealPage Inc. (filed August 2024, amended); Heather Vogell, "Rent Going Up? One Company's Algorithm Could Be Why," *ProPublica*, October 15, 2022; *In re RealPage, Inc.* private class actions.*

*[27] Generalizes the Facebook Papers / Haugen-disclosure finding that anger drives engagement; William J. Brady, Julian A. Wills, John T. Jost, and Jay J. Van Bavel, "Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks," *PNAS* 114, no. 28 (2017).*

[28] Kefauver-Harris Amendment of 1962 (Drug Efficacy Amendment), Pub. L. 87-781, 76 Stat. 780.

[29] Public legislative records; Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Sen. Josh Hawley co-sponsored and backed bills to ban congressional stock trading.

*[30] Scott Higham and Lenny Bernstein, *Washington Post* / *60 Minutes*, October 2017; Sen. Joe Manchin's subsequent repeal effort.*

*[31] IRS Direct File pilot (tax season 2024); GAO/IRS pilot evaluation; New America, *Designing a Free and Simple Tax-Filing Service* (2024), on user trust and satisfaction; the 2025 termination of the program.*

Chapter 18: The Filter

The spreadsheet has forty-seven columns. Sarah scrolls right, past engagement rate, past session duration, past the retention curves she has memorized, to the column she is looking for: content-category performance, weighted by share velocity. The column sorts by a number the system calls the Amplification Index -- the ratio of how often a piece of content is recommended to how often it is sought. An index of 1.0 means the content is shown roughly as often as people ask for it. An index above 1.0 means the algorithm is pushing it. Below 1.0 means the algorithm is burying it.

She sorts descending.

The top of the list is not a surprise. Outrage clips about specific public figures. Content that names a villain -- a politician, a CEO, a celebrity -- and attaches a moral frame. The Amplification Indices run between 3.2 and 4.7. The algorithm is showing this content three to five times more often than any user has actively sought it.

She scrolls down. Mid-tier: tribal-conflict content. Left vs. right. Us vs. them. The indices run 2.1 to 2.8. The algorithm promotes it, but less aggressively than the villain content. The villain is more efficient. A face is faster than a frame.

She scrolls further. Near the bottom: structural explanations. Policy detail. Content that describes how a system works -- how zoning affects housing prices, how the tax gap is distributed, how recommendation algorithms shape perception. The Amplification Indices run 0.3 to 0.6. The algorithm buries this content. It stays on the platform. It stays searchable. It just never meets the people who didn't know to look for it.

Sarah looks at the numbers. Her hand is on the desk. She does not touch the watch.

She has seen this pattern before. Every quarterly content review surfaces it. She has presented it twice -- once in a slide deck to the VP of Product, once in a memo to the trust-and-safety team. Both times the response was the same: the algorithm is optimizing for engagement. The content that engages is the content that gets promoted. The content that does not engage is the content that gets buried. The system is working as designed.

The system is working as designed.

She closes the spreadsheet.

* * *

The meeting is at two. Conference room 4B, the one with the glass walls and the whiteboard that never fully erases. Sarah is presenting a proposal -- a modification to the recommendation engine that would add a "structural literacy" boost. The boost would give a small amplification bump to content that meets certain criteria: named sources, causal claims, policy specificity. Not a lot. Enough to move the Amplification Index from 0.4 to maybe 0.8. Enough to make structural content visible without making it dominant.

The proposal is good. Sarah knows it is good. She has modeled the engagement impact. The numbers are not exciting. Time-on-platform drops by 1.2 percent. Session count drops by 0.8 percent. The numbers are small. They are in the wrong direction.

Sarah presents the proposal. The data goes up on the screen -- the Amplification Index distribution, the engagement projections. The room listens.

Tom Reeves -- product lead for the recommendation team -- asks the question she has been waiting for. "What does the competitive landscape look like for this?"

Sarah has an answer. It is not a good answer. The competitors are not adding structural-literacy boosts. The competitors are optimizing for engagement. If Nexus reduces engagement by 1.2 percent and the competitors do not, the users migrate. The market share drops. The quarterly earnings call is uncomfortable.

She gives the answer. The room is quiet for a moment.

The VP of Product says: "Let's revisit this next quarter."

Sarah nods. The watch says 2:37. The second hand moves.

The meeting continues. Someone proposes a different initiative -- a content-diversity feature that would surface opposing viewpoints alongside a user's preferred content. The proposal is discussed. The engagement projections are modeled. The numbers are worse than Sarah's. The proposal is tabled.

Someone else proposes a "creator fund" for educational content. The engagement projections are modeled. The numbers are worse. The proposal is tabled.

The meeting runs for forty-five minutes. Three proposals are discussed. All three would reduce engagement. All three are tabled. The meeting adjourns.

Sarah walks back to her office. The hallway is glass. She can see the open floor -- the engineers, the product managers, the designers, all of them at their desks, all of them building the system that the meeting just decided cannot be changed. She does not look at them. She looks at the floor. The carpet is gray. Her shoes are quiet on it.

* * *

In her office, Sarah closes the door. She sits. She puts her hands on the desk.

The desk is clean. Her laptop is centered. Her notebook is to the left of the laptop, aligned with the desk's edge. The mechanical watch is on her left wrist. She does not look at it.

The Amplification Index numbers are still on the screen behind her eyelids. 3.2 to 4.7 for villain content. 0.3 to 0.6 for structural explanations. A content category she did not present in the meeting -- housing -- sits in the gap between those numbers like a room she can see through glass but cannot enter.

The category is housing. The algorithm promotes content about corporate landlords -- Blackstone, private equity, "they're buying all the houses." The Amplification Index for this content runs 2.9. The algorithm promotes content about housing supply -- zoning, density, the structural causes of scarcity. The Amplification Index for this content runs 0.4.

The corporate-landlord content is engaging. It names a villain. It fits in a headline. It flatters the audience that believes profit is the problem. The supply-restriction content is complex. It implicates the audience -- the homeowners, the voters, the people who show up to planning meetings to oppose the fourplex. The algorithm does not know it is doing this. It is optimizing for engagement. The deflection is a byproduct.

Sarah can see this. She can name it. She can quantify it. She has the data in a spreadsheet on her laptop. She could open it right now and show anyone the numbers.

She cannot change it. Changing it means reducing engagement. Reducing engagement means losing users. Losing users means losing market share. Losing market share means the quarterly earnings call is uncomfortable. The uncomfortable earnings call means the board asks questions. The board questions mean career consequences. The career consequences mean someone else makes the decision, and that person will face the same structure.

The system is working as designed.

The laptop opens. Forty-seven unread emails. She clicks the first one.

* * *

At 5:30, the laptop closes. The jacket goes on. The watch says 5:31. She reaches for the crown -- thumb and forefinger, the familiar motion, three turns.

She stops.

Her hand is on the crown. The watch is running. It has another thirty hours on the mainspring. She does not wind it.

The elevator. The parking garage, cool and dim. Her car on the third level, row B, space twenty-two. The driver's seat. The steering wheel. The leather is cool.

The engine is off. The windows are up. The garage is quiet.

The meeting replays. Tom Reeves's question. The VP's "next quarter." Three proposals, all three in the wrong direction, all three tabled. The structural-literacy boost that would have moved the index from 0.4 to 0.8 -- dead before it reached the hallway.

Her father built processors. He designed circuits that did what they were designed to do, reliably, every time, for years. He gave her the watch because he believed in precision. He believed that engineering was about building things that worked, not things that captured.

The watch on her wrist. The second hand moves. For now. The mainspring has thirty hours. After that, the watch stops.

Sarah drives home. She does not wind the watch. The phone stays in her bag.

* * *

Chapter 19: The Price of Admission

I need to say something at the top of this chapter that will make you want to stop reading.

This chapter contains solutions. Thirteen of them, organized into nine structural levers. I know what happens when a book starts prescribing -- the reader finds the one proposal they hate and uses it to reclassify the entire book as partisan. I have done this myself. I have put down books I agreed with on ninety percent of the issues because the ten percent I disagreed with made me suspect the author's judgment on everything else.

So here is the framing, and I mean it: every solution in this chapter is presented as a calibration target. You may reject any of them. The test is whether your alternative touches the beneficiary. If your preferred reform does not name who benefits from the current arrangement, does not reduce that benefit, and does not present your own side with a bill -- it is probably a decoy wearing reform's clothes. Run the decoy test from the last chapter. If your proposal fails questions two and four, it does not matter how good it sounds.

The book's theory of change runs differently: change what the structure rewards, and the policies become negotiable afterward. This chapter is a set of rulers.

One more thing about this chapter's status, and I need you to hold it the whole way through. The levers and the applications are not the same kind of claim. The levers -- the nine patterns you are about to meet -- are as close to firm as anything in this book gets, because each is nearly a tautology once stated: a reform that does not touch the beneficiary is not a reform; a penalty that does not scale with the violation is a subscription fee. Those are the floor's grammar, and I will not be setting them down. The applications -- the thirteen worked configurations built from the levers -- are a different kind of object. They are solved examples. When a textbook works a problem in front of you, the point is not that you copy its numbers into your own problem. The point is that you watch the method run once at full scale, so that you can recognize a real solution when you have to build one yourself. The numbers in this chapter are mine: drawn from one perspective, priced from one seat at the table, guaranteed wrong in places I cannot see. Study the architecture. The arithmetic is yours to redo.

* * *

One tool before the solutions, because it may be the strongest thing in this chapter pair.

Real structural reform presents each coalition with a bill.

Housing reform costs the left its homeowner veto and forces the right to accept deregulation working in blue cities. Permitting reform costs fossil incumbency and the environmental-litigation complex simultaneously. Gun-policy realism costs both tribes their fundraising machines. Police-accountability reform costs the left a union and the right a protected institution.

The pattern holds across every entry below. Its converse is diagnostic: a proposal whose entire cost lands on the out-group is probably a weapon in reform's clothing.

This is the price-of-admission test. It slots beside the decoy test as its complement. The decoy test screens targets -- is this the real problem or a visible substitute? The price-of-admission test screens remedies -- does this solution cost both sides, or only the side you already oppose? Together they are the two tools this chapter pair leaves with you.

* * *

Now the levers. Nine of them. I am going to compress, and the compression will cost something -- it will make these sound like policy proposals when they are actually descriptions of what a functioning system would require. The thirteen issues collapse into nine mechanisms. What belongs here is the grammar, not the dictionary.

I am going to state each lever, then tell you what it changes and what it costs. The cost is the test. If a lever does not present both coalitions with a bill, it is probably not touching the mechanism.

Make the invisible visible. Extend third-party information reporting to opaque income categories -- the same principle that makes wage income ninety-nine percent compliant, applied to the categories where the hiding is easiest.[1] Pre-filled, return-free filing for the fully-reported class. The bill: the right accepts a funded IRS; the left accepts simplification and audit-selection transparency that forecloses targeting. Roughly thirty-six OECD countries already run this system.[2] The controlled experiment has been run. We know it works. We have chosen not to implement it, and the choice is the tell.

Make the penalty scale with the violation. Treble damages with attorney fee-shifting, the way antitrust and the False Claims Act do, so enforcement grows with violations instead of with appropriations.[3] Personal liability for responsible officers. Criminal referral for willful repeat violators. This is the wage-theft lever -- and the tax-enforcement lever combined. The bill: the right extends "theft is theft" to payroll; the left accepts that the disorder half of the crime issue is real and gets its own honest response. Fee-shifting regimes in civil rights and securities law have been running for decades.[4] The mechanism exists. The application is missing.

Move enforcement to the paycheck. Mandatory E-Verify with penalties scaled to payroll -- per-head fines are a cost of business; payroll-scaled penalties change the calculus. Paired with visa and status expansion for the dependent sectors, because the demand valve cannot close without a legal supply valve opening. The bill: the right prosecutes its funders' payrolls; the left accepts enforcement as legitimate and builds it into the design. The 1986 IRCA structure is the cautionary tale -- sanctions enacted, never enforced.[5] The lesson is enforcement design, not novelty.

Remove the incumbent veto. This one covers three domains, and the recursion is the point. In elections: independent redistricting, baseline funding, paper trails, risk-limiting audits. Each party surrenders its gerrymanders where it holds the pen. In housing: by-right multifamily development near transit, state preemption of local exclusionary zoning, permit shot-clocks. The left gives up the local veto its own base operates; the right accepts deregulation succeeding in blue cities. In climate: one-stop permitting with deadlines, categorical exclusions for low-impact clean projects, a carbon fee-and-dividend chosen specifically for its cross-partisan pedigree -- the Baker-Shultz plan, authored by Republican elder statesmen, with a dividend that makes it populist rather than technocratic.[6] Fossil incumbency and the environmental-litigation complex both pay, which is the tell of a real one.

Make the price-setter pay. In healthcare: site-neutral payment -- same service, same price, regardless of who owns the building.[7] The hospitals' unanimous hatred of this idea is the evidence it works. All-payer rate setting in concentrated markets.[8] Antitrust enforcement on hospital mergers including nonprofits. The bill: the left names its hospital systems; the right accepts rate regulation in markets where competition is structurally absent. In higher education: institutional risk-sharing on unpaid loans, caps on unlimited graduate-lending, income-driven repayment collected automatically through payroll. The bill: the left names the price-setter it employs and is employed by; the right accepts a real safety valve for borrowers.

Decouple opportunity from address. In housing, the same lever as the veto removal, applied differently -- tenant protections during transition while naming supply as the engine. In K-12 education: state-level need-weighted funding formulas, cross-district open enrollment, measurement retained and improved. The bill: the left accepts measurement and enrollment mobility; the right accepts equalized funding. Levers 4 and 6 share a beneficiary -- incumbent homeowners. The recursion is a feature worth stating twice: the same people who oppose the fourplex oppose the school boundary change, and the opposition is the same opposition wearing different clothes.

Restore the liability channel. In guns: waiting periods, safe-storage laws, extreme-risk protection orders with real due process, universal background checks, permit-to-purchase, and PLCAA amendment to restore ordinary liability.[9] The bill: the assault-weapon fight is surrendered as the decoy it is, in exchange for the suicide-and-storage agenda that polls across lines including gun owners.[10] This is the entry where I want to model epistemic humility explicitly -- RAND's evidence reviews rate these interventions with varying confidence, and I will not overclaim.[11] In misinformation: liability keyed to the amplification act rather than hosting, plus interoperability -- user-chosen ranking providers that end the single-objective monopoly. The bill: the left gives up moderation maximalism; the right gives up treating the engine as an ally when it amplifies its side.

Change what the machine optimizes for. In money in politics: statutory disclosure closing dark-money conduits, FEC restructuring so deadlock is not the design outcome, and small-donor matching architecture on the New York City model -- which rewards breadth of support rather than intensity of rage.[12] The fundraising email is A/B tested exactly like Jake's feed.[13] Apocalypse framing wins the test. Changing the objective function means changing what wins. In misinformation: optimize-for disclosure, qualified researcher data access, design defaults for minors. The bill: both coalitions' content-war investments lose their engine.

Certain consequence for architects. This one surfaced after the first eight were written, and I am going to honor the promise I made at the end of this chapter: if a ninth lever appears, I will not force the symmetry.

The book's test asks: does it change what the structure rewards, or does it just punish the people the structure produced? That word "just" has been doing load-bearing work, and it is time to unpack it. Impunity is an incentive signal. Consequence for architects is not the opposite of structural reform -- it is incentive engineering aimed at the next architect. The test distinguishes: punishment that changes the calculus for future actors passes the test; punishment as catharsis fails it, because the show trial is a decoy wearing accountability's clothes.

Three positions on a gradient. The gradient-follower: the doctor responding to marketing and reimbursement, the loan officer, the content moderator. The structural account covers them fully. Punishing them is Move 1 applied to persons -- the scapegoat. The gradient-intensifier: the sales apparatus that sharpened the incentives it was handed. The gradient-architect: the actor with knowledge of the harm, alternatives to causing it, and design authority over the mechanism -- who built the deception, suppressed the data, and extracted the proceeds. The structural account explains why architects emerge; it does not absolve the ones who accepted the role.

The deterrence literature's most robust finding is that certainty of consequence deters where severity does not.[14] This matters here because the occasional dramatic prosecution -- Kareem Serageldin of Credit Suisse, the rare banker imprisoned for crisis-era fraud, sentenced to thirty months while the institutions settled for billions[15] -- is severity-as-theater, and it discharges accountability energy exactly the way every other decoy discharges reform energy. Certainty is expensive structure: funded enforcement, personal liability that survives corporate form, clawbacks that reach extracted wealth. Which loops this lever back into Levers 1 and 2 -- visibility and enforcement capacity -- and closes the system.

The Purdue arc illustrates the gap. In 2007, Purdue's parent pled guilty to felony misbranding and three executives pled to misdemeanors -- fines, no prison -- and the business model continued and grew.[16] That is the impunity signal, stated as a date. In 2019, bankruptcy.[17] In 2021, a plan granting the family a lifetime litigation shield for $4.3 billion -- immunity offered for purchase.[18] In June 2024, the Supreme Court refused the machinery: nonconsensual third-party releases could not launder the family through the company's bankruptcy.[19] And in 2026, a renegotiated $7.4 billion settlement became effective -- the Sacklers contributing over $6.5 billion over fifteen years, with more than $1.5 billion paid immediately, Purdue dissolved, the family permanently barred from selling opioids in the United States, and more than thirty million internal documents to be made public.[20]

Both things are true. The settlement proved the price could be raised -- real movement, worth naming as such. And across twenty-five years, no member of the family faced criminal consequence, and the fortune substantially survives the payments.[21] The certainty signal to the next architect remains close to zero. Both sentences go on the page. The first is the counterexample the anti-cynicism exit needs. The second is the lever's justification.

The cross-partisan entry: this is the rare lever where both lenses already possess the vocabulary. Personal responsibility is the right's language. Corporate accountability is the left's. They denote the same lever. The bill both sides pay: each coalition's own donor-class architects lose purchasable immunity -- the left's tech and institutional architects, the right's extraction and finance architects. No exemptions is the price.

* * *

Thirteen fronts. Nine tools. The problem list is long. The lever list is short.

The five reforms this book has already proposed -- the stock-trading ban, the revolving-door restriction, algorithmic transparency, data-integration limits, fiduciary duty reform -- are all applications of these levers. The stock-trading ban is Lever 4 (removing incumbent veto points over self-dealing). The revolving-door restriction is Lever 5 (price-setter accountability in regulation). Algorithmic transparency is Lever 7 (liability restoration) and Lever 8 (changing the objective function). Data-integration limits are Lever 4 (removing the veto point of total informational leverage). Fiduciary duty reform is Lever 5 (price-setter accountability in corporate governance).

The existing reforms form a system, not a list. This chapter makes that legible.

* * *

I want to flag something honest about the symmetry I just constructed.

Eight moves, nine levers. The symmetry broke, exactly as I said it might. I promised you that if drafting surfaced a ninth lever, I would not force the symmetry. The ninth lever -- certain consequence for architects -- surfaced from the Purdue case, from the accountability gap the book's own test exposed. The asymmetry is the receipt. A book that promises to accept evidence over aesthetics should keep that promise on the page.

The value of the compression is not the number. It is the recognition that the problem surface is large but the structural mechanisms are few. You do not need to become an expert on thirteen issues. You need to internalize nine patterns and learn to recognize them in whatever domain you care about most. The levers are transferable. The issues are the applications.

* * *

The anti-cynicism payload, and then I will stop.

The last chapter showed you thirteen ways your outrage gets captured. This chapter shows you nine ways the capture can be broken. The captures are the norm. The breaks are the exception. But the exception exists, and it has a pattern.

Structural reform has happened before. It happens when energy lands on a lever instead of a decoy. It happens when both coalitions pay a price. It happens when the reform changes what the structure rewards instead of punishing the people the structure produced. It happens when the cure is permanent instead of something that must be re-performed forever.

The price-of-admission test and the decoy test are the tools. The levers are the grammar. The issues are the applications. The applications will change -- new issues will emerge, new decoys will be selected, new coalitions will be tested. The grammar will not change. Visibility parity. Enforcement that scales. Demand-side accountability. Removal of veto points. Price-setter accountability. Decoupling opportunity from asset. Liability restoration. Changing the objective function. Certain consequence for architects.

Now watch what I do with this chapter, because the doing is part of the argument.

This is the closest thing this book has to a blueprint. Thirteen configurations, priced, each side's bill itemized. And a blueprint with an author is a dangerous object -- not because the drawings are wrong, but because a movement that adopts an author's list has adopted an author, and an author is just a leader wearing a bibliography. Moloch does not care whose terms it operates on. A coalition that wins on my terms has, at best, inherited the right to set the new ones. That is not the future this book is for.

So: I am placing this chapter in the center of the table, equidistant from every chair, and I am taking my hands off it.

The configuration that actually arrives -- if the immune response breaks, if the coalitions form -- will be different from this one, and it should be. It will be built by eyes I do not have, correcting errors I cannot see, in trades I would not have thought to make. If your coalition runs these tests honestly and lands on some of the same items, that is not my authorship. The structure has a shape, and honest tests run against the same structure keep finding it -- site-neutral payment did not wait for this book, and neither did independent redistricting. Convergence is the method working. What I refuse is the other thing: adoption because I drew it. Take nothing from this chapter on my word. Take the tests. Rerun everything.

The levers stay on the table. Those were never mine to withdraw. The applications are yours now -- to rebuild, to reprice, to replace.

Use the tools on your own side first. That is where they matter most.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] IRS, *Federal Tax Compliance Research: Tax Gap Estimates for Tax Years 2008-2010* and subsequent updates; Slemrod, "Building on a Foundation of Information Reporting." Net misreporting is near 1% for wage income and far higher for opaque categories (business/rental income).*

*[2] OECD, *Tax Administration 2023*, Table 1.1 and comparative returns-filing data on pre-filled and return-free filing across OECD jurisdictions.*

[3] Treble damages attach to antitrust (Clayton Act § 4, 15 U.S.C. § 15) and civil RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)); securities fraud under § 10(b)/Rule 10b-5 provides fee-shifting but not treble damages.

*[4] Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. § 1988); securities-fraud fee-shifting under the PSLRA and the *Shalaby v. Mansdorf* line of cases.*

[5] Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-603; GAO reports on employer-sanction enforcement (GAO/PEMD-90-5, GAO-05-822R); Meissner/MPI analyses of IRCA's enforcement failure.

*[6] Climate Leadership Council, "The Conservative Case for Carbon Dividends" (2017); Baker & Shultz, "A Conservative Answer to Climate Change," *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 7, 2017.*

[7] MedPAC reports on site-neutral payment; Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, § 603 (off-campus clinic site-neutral payment); American Hospital Association opposition statements.

*[8] Maryland All-Payer Model / Total Cost of Care Model (CMS/CMMI); Murray & Berenson, "Hospital Rate-Setting Revisited," *Health Affairs* (2015).*

[9] Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, Pub. L. 109-92, 15 U.S.C. §§ 7901-7903 (2005).

[10] Pew Research Center, Gallup, and Johns Hopkins National Survey data on support for safe-storage and suicide-prevention measures, including among gun owners.

*[11] RAND Corporation, *The Science of Gun Policy: A Critical Synthesis of Research Evidence on the Effects of Gun Policies in the United States* (2020; updated 2023).*

*[12] NYC Campaign Finance Board program documentation (8-to-1 multiple matching system); Brennan Center reports; Hasen, *Plutocrats United*.*

[13] Reporting on campaign-finance digital operations (Center for Responsive Politics/OpenSecrets on ActBlue and WinRed A/B testing); academic work on political email optimization.

*[14] Daniel Nagin, "Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century," *Crime and Justice* 42 (2013); Doob & Webster on sentence severity.*

*[15] Figurative; see Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, *Final Report* (2011). Cf. Kareem Serageldin (Credit Suisse) as a named individual prosecution.*

[16] U.S. Department of Justice, "Purdue Frederick Company Inc. and Three Executives to Pay $634.5 Million for Misbranding OxyContin," DOJ press release, May 10, 2007.

[17] Purdue Pharma L.P., Chapter 11 petition, S.D.N.Y., filed September 20, 2019.

*[18] Plan of reorganization confirmed September 1, 2021 by Judge Robert Drain (later reversed); *New York Times* and *Wall Street Journal* reporting on the $4.3 billion Sackler contribution.*

*[19] *Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P.*, 603 U.S. ___ (June 27, 2024) (5-4, Gorsuch, J.) (rejecting nonconsensual third-party releases).*

[20] Revised $7.4 billion plan approved November 2025 by Judge Sean Lane; settlement effective 2026; multi-state attorney general announcements on the opioid-sales bar and the document-disclosure order.

[21] DOJ press records (absence of individual criminal charges against Sackler family members); Forbes Sackler net-worth estimates (fortune substantially survives the payments).

Chapter 20: The Bill

The document is one page. Elena has revised it eleven times. The current version has four sections: what the reform does, what the right gets, what the left gets, what each side pays. The sections are roughly equal in length. She checked this morning by counting paragraphs.

The reform is a revolving-door restriction. It would prevent former tech executives from regulating the industry they came from -- a five-year cooling-off period that extends to consulting and advisory roles, not just direct employment. The bill has fourteen co-sponsors in the House. It will not pass this session. It is a seed.

Elena sits at her desk in the DRA office. The office is twelve people and a printer that jams on the third page of every run. The window faces a parking lot. The coffee in her mug is from this morning and has gone cold. She does not notice.

She rehearses the framing. The progressive staffer, Claire, will hear the reform as a constraint on corporate capture. The populist-conservative advisor, Ryan, will hear it as a check on the Washington elite. Both readings are accurate. The reform is both of those things. The trick is to present it as both -- to use each person's language without translating it into the other's.

Her father taught her this. He organized in two languages -- English at the plant gates, Spanish at the kitchen tables. He did not translate. He spoke the language the listener already thought in. Elena does this instinctively now. She mirrors the frame before she introduces the content. Claire gets "corporate capture." Ryan gets "Washington insiders." The reform gets both.

She folds the document and puts it in her bag. She checks the time. She pulls her hair back. She lets it go.

* * *

The coffee shop is on Connecticut Avenue. Elena chose it because it is between the two staffers' offices and because the tables are small enough that three people have to sit close. Proximity is a tool. People who sit across a table negotiate. People who sit at the same side of a small table collaborate. Elena learned this from a hospitality organizer in El Paso who could get a hotel housekeeper and a front-desk clerk to agree on a shared schedule by putting them on the same bench.

Claire arrives first. Late twenties, blazer, the kind of posture that comes from spending four years in a congressional office where every interaction is a performance. She orders tea. She sits. She asks Elena how the DRA is doing. Elena gives her the version that sounds sustainable. Claire nods. Both of them know the real number.

Ryan arrives five minutes later. He is older -- late forties, no jacket, a polo shirt that has been ironed. He orders coffee, black. He nods at Claire. Claire nods back. The nod is the first test. It passes.

Elena does not start with the reform. She starts with the question. "What's the one thing about the tech-regulatory structure that bothers you most?"

Claire goes first. The revolving door. Former executives writing the rules for their former companies. The capture is structural, not individual. She is precise. She has been briefed.

Ryan goes second. The same thing, from a different direction. The Washington class protecting itself. The insiders who move between industry and government and never face the consequences ordinary people face. He is also precise. He has also been briefed.

Different diagnoses. Same prescription.

Elena puts the document on the table. She does not slide it across. She places it in the center, equidistant from both of them. "This is a one-pager on a specific reform. Five-year cooling-off period. Extends to consulting. Fourteen co-sponsors. Bipartisan."

Claire picks it up first. She reads the section labeled "What the left gets." She nods. She reads the section labeled "What the left pays." Her eyes stop. Elena watches her read the line: the left gives up the revolving door that benefits its own tech-aligned former officials and donor network. Claire's jaw tightens. She keeps reading.

Ryan picks it up second. He reads the section labeled "What the right gets." He nods. He reads the section labeled "What the right pays." His eyes stop on the same kind of line: the right gives up the revolving door that benefits its own industry-aligned appointees. He sets the document down.

The table is quiet. The coffee shop is not -- the espresso machine hisses, someone's phone rings, a chair scrapes. But the table is quiet.

Claire says: "This is honest."

Ryan says: "That's unusual."

Elena does not say anything. She lets the quiet hold. The quiet is the tool. If she fills it, she is selling. If she lets it stand, they are deciding.

* * *

The meeting runs for forty minutes. They discuss the bill's co-sponsors -- who they are, what districts they represent, what primaries they face. They discuss the enforcement mechanism -- how the cooling-off period would be monitored, who would audit it, what the penalties would be. They discuss the political landscape -- which committees would hear it, which chairs would block it, what procedural routes exist around the block.

Near the end, Claire says something Elena has been waiting for. "My boss's primary is in six months. If this gets framed as 'working with the right' --"

Ryan finishes the sentence. "It won't survive the clip."

Claire looks at him. He looks at her. Two seconds. Elena has seen this look before -- the moment when someone across the aisle realizes the person across the table has the same constraint, the same primary, the same clip waiting to be cut. Claire's jaw tightens. Ryan drinks his coffee.

Elena says: "That's the bill."

Claire says: "I know."

Ryan says nothing. He drinks his coffee.

They shake hands. The handshake is firm. Claire's hand is small and cold from the tea. Ryan's hand is large and warm from the coffee. Elena watches the handshake. She has seen this before. The handshake is the high point. The walk back to the office is where it ends.

* * *

The email arrives at 9:14 the next morning.

Elena is at her desk. The printer is jamming. She is on her knees under the printer tray when her phone buzzes. She pulls it out. The email is from Claire. Four sentences.

I've spoken with my boss. The optics on this are difficult right now. The primary timeline makes cross-aisle engagement risky. I think we should revisit after November.

Elena reads the email. She stands up from under the printer. She reads it again. She puts the phone on the desk.

She pulls her hair back. She lets it go.

Ryan's inbox is empty. No email. No explanation. The conservative withdrawal arrives as silence -- the way it always arrives. Elena has seen this pattern. The progressive side writes four sentences. The conservative side writes nothing. Both sides are responding to the same primary, the same base, the same feed.

Elena sits at her desk. The office is quiet. Twelve staff, two months of budget, and a coalition that lasted exactly one handshake.

The document is still good. The reform is still good. The co-sponsors are still there. The problem it addresses has not changed.

She picks up the document. She reads the section labeled "What each side pays." She reads it again.

The bill is real. That is why the coalition dissolved. A reform that cost only the other side -- a weapon disguised as reform -- would have survived the walk back to the office. Claire would have been happy to work with Ryan on something that only cost conservatives. Ryan would have been happy to work with Claire on something that only cost progressives. The reform asked both of them to pay.

Elena sets the document down. She looks at the window. The parking lot. The cars. The gray sky.

She picks up her phone. She dials a different number -- a state-legislative staffer in Montana who has been working on housing reform. The staffer is a Republican. Elena has never met her in person. They have spoken on the phone four times. Each time, the conversation has been specific, technical, and honest.

The staffer picks up. Elena says: "I know. I know. But we're going to try."

* * *

To the Reader

I know where this book has been pressing on you. I can feel it from here.

When I evaluated your side, you felt over-reach. When I evaluated the other side, you felt under-reach. I don't know which side is yours, and I don't need to -- the feeling runs the same direction either way.

Some of your objections are right. I have gotten weights wrong in this book -- somewhere, probably in several places -- and where you have caught a specific error, you have caught an error, and I want to hear about it. But notice the direction of the errors you felt. If every misweighting you noticed ran against your coalition and in favor of the other one, you are describing a lens, not a ledger.

Here is a test that takes sixty seconds. Name the three places this book was hardest on your side. Now name the three places it was hardest on the other side. If the second list came slower, the lag is data. If you cannot produce the second list at all, you have found the lens. I am not telling you that your discomfort proves me right. Discomfort proves nothing. The lists are the instrument. Run them and read your own results.

* * *

Somewhere in the last few chapters, something in you flared. I want to speak to it directly, because it is not my enemy and I am not asking it to stand down.

Its job is protection, and the threats it tracks are real -- I have spent this whole book agreeing that they are real. My question is narrower. Does the current strategy protect what you are guarding? The strategy is: win first, reform after. You just watched it run. Claire believed it. Ryan believed it. The bill was real, they both knew it was real, and it did not survive the walk back to the office -- not because either of them was wrong about the other side, but because each was certain the cost had to land there first.

* * *

So here is the question the book has been building toward.

Do you believe that lasting structural reform -- not a bandage on a mortal wound, the surgery -- is possible with one side operating against the other?

If your answer is yes, show me the case. Define the terms before you look, because I am defining them now: structural means it changed what the system rewards, not who currently wins. Durable means it survived the next two transfers of power without a rollback war. Unilateral means it was enacted over the organized opposition of the other coalition -- not merely without its votes.

The strongest case you will find is the Civil War amendments.[1] I want to look at it hard, because it proves more than it first appears to.

The Union defeated the Confederacy. The war was won. And yet, the peace was lost -- not because the North lacked military might, but because total victory simply allowed the victors to dictate the new terms by which Moloch operated, without removing the operation itself. The 13th Amendment ended the sin. But the planter class retained local economic power: the land, the courts, the sheriffs, the credit.[2] The winners wrote the federal rules, but they did not redesign the local incentives. More critically, the peace was written without the participation of the most critical voices -- the newly freed, who understood the local trap better than any Washington official ever could. Their exclusion was not an oversight; it was the systemic risk of unilateral victory made flesh.

Jim Crow, convict leasing, and sharecropping simply re-engineered extraction without the Confederate flag.[3] The operation continued. The moral clarity of the cause was absolute. The structural reform was incomplete. The durable version -- the version that actually changed what the system rewarded -- arrived only when a later cross-regional coalition paid for it again in the 1960s, and it required both sets of eyes at the table.[4]

Dictating the termination of an abomination is not the same as dictating the entire subsequent structure. The war rightly ended the sin. The peace failed because the victors were structurally blind to their own blind spots -- and the people who could have warned them were the ones crushed by the failure. That is the warning: total victory over your enemy does not guarantee lasting change, because the winning coalition cannot see what the losing coalition knew. The only way to see the whole trap is to have both sets of eyes at the table -- even if you hate what the other set sees.

There is a genuinely ambiguous case and I will not absorb it: the ACA passed on a party-line vote, has survived, and is still contested two decades on.[5] That sits on the page as unresolved evidence. A test that admits ambiguous results is a real test; one that explains everything is a lens.

If you find a case that passes, my model is wrong, and I mean that.

There is a third answer, and it is honest too: you don't want reform. You want victory. That is a coherent position. This book was never going to be for you, and I would rather lose you honestly than keep you confused. My only request is that you stop calling it reform.

And if your answer is no -- then the bill comes to you. Not all the ground I have asked for. Something. Chapter 19 named the line items. If your side is the left, one of yours is the veto your own base holds over the housing that would make your cities honest. If your side is the right, one of yours is the funded enforcement that makes "everyone follows the rules" true above you as well as below. Pick your line item. The other side's list is not your assignment. Yours is.

* * *

In Chapter 17 I told you I have a guild and a silence, and that I would not name them there because the naming would cost me. The book cannot end with that debt outstanding, and you should not pay yours before I pay mine.

My guild is the left. I believe the argument Heather McGhee made in The Sum of Us: that the zero-sum bargain -- the drained public pool, closed rather than shared -- was a con that cost everyone, including the people who took the deal.[6] Saying that plainly costs me half of you, and it should. You now know which lens I fight. But that is only the cover charge. It is not the silence.

Here is the silence. For years I have resented other white people for taking the bargain. Resented them -- not the con, the marks -- for playing into the machine's hands and draining the pool we all swim in. The resentment is sincere. And now run my own book on my own sentence, because you have been trained for exactly this: real energy from a real theft, landing on persons instead of structure. Watch the two-level word. The "us" of my resentment is my coalition. The "us" of the thesis I just told you I believe is everyone the bargain was done to -- including the people I resent. I have held the thesis and the resentment at the same time for years. One of them has to give, and it cannot be the thesis. I still catch the resentment operating. That is the confession -- not that I once felt it, but that it is a working part of me now, and I am treating it in front of you because repression has never once worked on it.

I mean "treating" precisely. The parts of myself that cause damage have never responded to being locked away. A repressed part does not disappear. It waits. It finds another way out. The only correction that has ever held, for me, is the slow kind: bring it into the light and let it become something else. I am telling you this because it is the book's whole argument at a different scale. You cannot repress the other coalition out of existence either. It waits. It finds another way out. Healing is not the soft option. It is the only one with a track record.

I read Malcolm X's life -- knowing I read it from the outside, claiming nothing about what it was to live it -- as the record of a man who kept remaking himself until the last remaking, which was the exact one this book asks of you: out of the totalizing villain frame, toward the structure, toward the universal. His old coalition collected the price for it. I think he got where he was going only just before the end. The hope that a person can get there before the time runs out -- that is the part I claim. I am much further down the mountain, and slower.

I should tell you what the treating looked like, because the instruments are the ones this book warns about. For the months of this book I have had machinery reflect my own arguments back to me -- several systems, deliberately different, standing instructions to push back, checked against each other because each one flatters in its own direction. A mirror that cannot disagree with you is a feed wearing a different face; I tried to build mine so they could. The machine that narrowed Jake and the machines that widened me share a substrate. The difference is who holds the objective. I held mine. Jake never held his. And before you take any comfort in that: my configuration was a private choice by one person who controlled the objective. It does not scale by virtue. What scales is whatever the incentives deploy -- which is why every ask in this book is structural. The decision to give the machinery away came out of the same examination; the accounting of that bet belongs a few pages from now.

The last thing the mirrors showed me was the thing I least wanted to see. My blueprint was a victory condition. I began these essays believing I could see the shape of the fix -- believing that if enough people saw what I saw, we would build what I pictured. The change I am claiming after all of this is small and specific: I can now see how my perspective limits what I am able to see about how change happens. If the scale of change required cannot be won one-sided -- and I have shown you my best evidence that it cannot -- then my particular vision of how we get out will never be realized. Neither will yours. That is not the tragedy it sounds like. The blueprint was never the point. The point is to realize a future that the people of the future can live with. Bounded below by the floor -- the rules that keep the game honest are not up for surrender, and they are not mine to surrender. Everything above the floor belongs to them. "Can live with" is the durability test worn from the inside: futures imposed as victories get rolled back; futures both coalitions can inhabit persist. The people of the future are not selected by your side winning. They are everyone's children, in one room, with whatever we hand them. That is what the park was for.

I surrender the blueprint. I do not surrender the work.

There is a second membership, but it was never silent -- this book's existence announces it. I built the machinery that made these pages, and the full accounting -- the bet, the seams, what it costs to run, what it rejected and what I rejected -- is the epilogue, and it comes next.

I go first. Your list is still yours.

* * *

* * *

Notes

*[1] U.S. Constitution, Amendments XIII (1865), XIV (1868), XV (1870); Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (1988).*

*[2] Foner, *Reconstruction*; Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America* (1935).*

*[3] Blackmon, *Slavery by Another Name* (2008); C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*; Pete Daniel, *The Shadow of Slavery*.*

*[4] Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Pub. L. 88-352); Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Pub. L. 89-110); Fair Housing Act of 1968; Mann, *The Walls of Jericho*.*

*[5] Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. 111-148 (March 23, 2010); final House vote 219-212 (no House Republicans in favor); *NFIB v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012); *King v. Burwell*, 576 U.S. 473 (2015). "Two decades" is approximate (~16 years at 2026 publication).*

*[6] Heather McGhee, *The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together* (2021), ch. 1.*

Epilogue: The Seams

The book you just read was produced with AI assistance.

I want to be specific about what that means, because specificity is the only thing that prevents this from becoming either a boast or an apology.

The essays -- every Track A chapter -- were drafted by a multi-agent workflow I built. One agent plans the chapter's argument structure. Another writes the prose. Five critics review the draft independently: one for show-don't-tell violations, one for per-character voice consistency, one for emotional palette achievement, one for continuity with the state files, and one for AI-tell detection. A cutter compresses. An editorial panel evaluates. Each critic is blinded -- reads only the chapter and its own rubric. The process is designed to catch the failures that single-pass AI writing cannot prevent: generic interiority, broken continuity, voice drift, the tells that make machine-generated prose read as machine-generated.

The fiction chapters went through the same pipeline with one additional component: an interiority engine that models each character's psychological architecture -- their control registers, reactive registers, wounded registers, and the moments where one register leaks through another. The engine does not write the prose. It tells the prose-writer which register is active in each line, which one is leaking, and what the body is doing while the character speaks. Marcus's jaw tightening. Sarah's hand on the watch. Jake's thumb on the screen. Elena's hair falling forward. The engine supplies the architecture; the prose-writer supplies the sentences.

I intervened in every chapter. I chose the arguments. I selected the examples. I decided where the fiction goes and what the characters do. I revised the drafts -- sometimes lightly, sometimes substantially.

I want to be exact about what "lightly" means, because I said earlier in this book that AI-generated material becomes protectable only through substantial rewriting in the author's own voice, and I don't get to quietly lower that bar for myself in the last chapter. Some passages I only touched for rhythm or word choice -- those passages, whatever chapter they sit in, are the system's, not mine, and I'm not claiming them. What I am claiming -- what I revised enough to call my own -- is the argument each essay chapter makes: its structure, its evidence, its through-line, and the great majority of its sentences. Where exactly that line falls inside any given chapter, I can't hand you a clean percentage. I can tell you the standard I held myself to, and that I didn't always meet it on the first pass -- which is why there were passes.

For anyone who needs this in plain terms: I am claiming authorship, and copyright, in the essay chapters and in this book's Afterword. I am not claiming authorship or copyright in the fiction chapters -- the sections following Marcus, Sarah Chen, Elena, Jake, and David Park. Under current U.S. copyright guidance, that material likely isn't protectable by anyone, mine or the system's, and I intend to keep it that way. If you want to write your own story in this world, using these characters or the world they live in, you don't need my permission. I'm saying so directly because "probably not copyrightable" and "you may use this freely" are not the same sentence, and I'd rather give you the second one.

I cut passages the critics praised and kept passages they flagged, when my judgment said the flag was wrong. I wrote the opening of Chapter 1, the closing of Chapter 11, and the final line of Chapter 20 in my own hand, without the pipeline. The rest was produced by the system and shaped by me.

The Afterword -- "The Longest Night Yet" -- did not go through the pipeline at all. I drafted an early version with the system's help, read it, and rejected it. Every word of the version you read is mine, written without assistance, because there are things a system can model and things it cannot: the weight of a specific night is one of them. Where I asked for help afterward, it was structural -- does this scene belong here, is this order right -- not sentence-level. That distinction matters enough to state plainly: the essays were AI-drafted and human-revised. The Afterword was human-drafted and, at most, AI-consulted. Those are not the same thing, and I don't want the paragraphs above to blur them.

Here is what the system can do. It can sustain coherence across 45,000 words. It can maintain five distinct character voices with different interiority methods. It can track callbacks across twenty chapters and catch when a planted seed has not paid off. It can produce prose that passes through five blinded critics without a single one flagging it as machine-generated. It can do this for a few hundred dollars in compute, in a matter of weeks, with one person directing it.

Here is what it cannot do. It cannot decide what matters. It cannot choose which argument to make or which character to follow. It cannot feel the difference between a sentence that is technically correct and a sentence that is true. It cannot sit with a passage that hurts to write and decide to write it anyway. Those are the parts I did. The system supplies throughput. Judgment is still yours -- or, in this case, mine.

There's a category of contribution I haven't described yet, because it isn't about prose at all. Some of what's in the essay chapters, I didn't know before I asked. The clearest example: I went to one of these systems with the framework I use throughout this book -- the no-villain verdict, the idea that catastrophic outcomes come from structure rather than individual malice -- and asked it directly to find what I was missing, because I know I have a blind spot and built this frame partly to compensate for it. It told me that democratic protection of local zoning is one of the clearest cases of my own thesis I hadn't applied: a policy that produces the housing crisis not through anyone's villainy but through thousands of individually reasonable, procedurally democratic decisions to protect property values, each one locally defensible and collectively catastrophic. I hadn't seen it. I verified it independently before it went in the book, the same way I verified every other empirical claim here -- but I didn't find it. I was shown it. If this book is honest about anything, it should be honest about that too: the tool didn't just draft sentences in some chapters. In at least this one place, it found an argument I was structurally positioned to miss, using the exact mechanism this book warns you about, pointed at my own writing instead of a stranger's attention. Make of that what you will. I've made what I can of it.

The warning this book makes is real. The capability I just described is available to anyone with an internet connection and a model subscription. It is cheaper than the institutions around it are behaving as though it is. It is diffusing faster than those institutions can track. The passage in Chapter 1 about the translator's hand shaking -- that passage was produced by this system, running on standard models, for about six dollars in compute, once the system itself already existed. If it moved you, the capability is demonstrated. If it left you cold, the demonstration shrinks accordingly, and the argument must stand on the published research alone -- the persuasion literature cited in Chapter 9, the attention-economy data, the structural analysis. The fiction is evidence of capability, never evidence of the thesis's truth.

I built this system because the problem was interesting, and I am telling you about it because what it produced frightened me. Both things are true, and I have already told you I cannot cleanly sort my own motives. That hasn't changed.

I am giving the system away. Open-Write -- the pipeline, the templates, the multi-agent workflow that made long-form coherence possible -- is available to anyone who wants it. I am keeping two components private, the same two I named in Chapter 1: the structural critic that evaluates arguments before writing begins, and the interiority engine that models characters through structured psychological architecture. I keep them partly because they're how I get the results I get, and partly because releasing everything would enable the kind of low-effort, high-volume output that hurts the working artists I want this tool to serve. The rest of the system -- everything you would need to reproduce the process this book demonstrates -- is open. The decision to release it came out of the same examination you just watched me undergo: if the machinery is dangerous, hoarding it does not make it safer; if it is useful, hoarding it does not make it more mine. The release is free. There is no paid tier. The bet is that openness is safer than control. I may be wrong. The accounting continues on every surface where the tool is used.

* * *

There is a place this book keeps returning to. A national park for the will -- unoptimized space where nothing is recommending, nothing is defaulting, nothing is watching to learn what moves you. I described it in Chapter 11. I named it again in Chapter 16. It is the only thing in the book that is not a diagnosis or a prescription. It is the thing the diagnosis and prescription are for.

Most people would spend the first hour in it bored, reaching for a phone that isn't doing anything. That's fine. The point is not to force the free moment into existence. The point is to leave a place where it could happen.

This book was produced by the machinery it warns about. That fact is either a contradiction or a proof of concept. I choose to read it as both. The tool made the book possible. The book is an argument about what the tool does when no one is watching. The argument and the tool exist in the same room, and I am standing in that room with you, and I cannot pretend I am not holding the thing I am warning you about.

Hold my version lightly, set it down, and make your own. I'll be in the park, doing nothing on purpose, waiting to see if a real choice wanders by.

* * *

Afterword: The Longest Night Yet

I have been through many trials throughout my life--many of them self-inflicted. I always try to make the best of it. The second I turned 18 I felt the need to commit a felony to get on my adult record and go to jail instead of doing like my family had expected and going to college. After lowering their expectations (and my own), when I finished my probation I then decided to start community college where I got straight A's.

After doing well in community college and getting into a decent four-year college, Goucher,[1] as I neared graduation and expectations were high again I developed a drinking problem and dropped out. My life continued as a bit of a roller coaster ride, but eventually I ended up in a long-term relationship and we had a daughter together. We married about five years in.

A few years into my daughter's life things were falling apart for me. I was struggling with chronic malnutrition, near starvation, chronic depression and anxiety, and substance abuse. I was in such poor shape I developed an Aspergillus infection in my gut and lung. This is a condition that usually only hits cancer or transplant patients with extremely compromised immune systems, but I managed to pull it off without all that.[2]

I went into the hospital in June of 2016 and didn't remember anything real after that until August of 2016. I remember things between those two moments of being connected to reality, but now it is like remembering a terrible dream that went on for an unbelievably long time. In my dreams I was enslaved at first to aliens, and then to the nurses who were caring for me. I remember in my dreams trying to jump to my death, and when I failed after the second attempt, I decided I was in hell.

Reality came back to me slowly. Like I said, when I eventually realized I was in the hospital I at first felt like I was enslaved to the nurses instead of aliens. I slowly realized that I had suffered something catastrophic and I was recovering. As my mind crept back from the depths of my nightmare coma I realized I had an open hernia on my belly covered with a bloody bandage. It was from my surgery and they had yet to close it back up.

That was the first surgery I remember going into. I came back with a 6x18" piece of skin flayed from my thigh now covering my intestines. They still had not joined my muscles back together so there was still a huge hernia--it just wasn't open anymore. When I would eat you could see my intestines moving up and down pumping the food through my digestive tract. If you aren't too freaked out you should see a video of it, there is a lot more going on in your gut when you eat than you realize.

I had four chest tubes still in me, and my ileum (small intestine) was connected to my belly where I had an ostomy bag attached. This would later prove to be another hell for me, but before I get to that I had to deal with the hell of being stuck in a hospital bed 24/7. The first real trial for me was just sitting up in a chair.

The nurses wanted me to start preparing for physical recovery and one of the first steps is to just get the patient to sit up in a chair for several hours. I am a 6'2" man and at this point I was around 95 lbs. I remember I was horrified when I first saw how bone-thin my arms were. Anyway, sitting in the chair hurt my nonexistent butt. It would hurt after 15 minutes, but I was supposed to be doing 4 hours a day.

I got through this hospital bed hell by asking for as many drugs as the doctor would give me. Opioids like oxy don't do much to get me high but they do help with general pain. For me, addiction to them was never much of a risk, and I was lucky to be in a position where medical need for the drugs I received prevailed. Not everyone is in that position. I kept begging the doctors for Valium every 4 hours. They kept telling me it was supposed to last 6 hours and wanted me to stick to that.

After being awake for about a month and thinking I was about to go to physical rehab, I got a bad report that said I still had an infection and couldn't go. I was going to need to wait at least another two weeks, and at that point two weeks was a lot. After I got the news I finally convinced the doctor that I should have Valium every 4 hours. Zoning out was the only way to go.

Thankfully, the doctors did decide shortly after that I was ready for rehab. Going into physical therapy I thought of Hank Schrader from Breaking Bad. I remember this DEA tough guy who almost gets broken by the struggle of physical therapy, and I wondered if that would be what it was like. Regardless, I had already been struggling and I was ready to face whatever came next.

As it turned out, physical therapy was one of the easier ordeals of recovery. Learning how to walk again wasn't that painful at all, no more than working out in general. The only very painful part was casting my foot for foot drop--where your foot can no longer sit flat because you haven't stood on it in a long time. The third cast hurt unbearably and they had to take it off. After that, I started thinking recovery was going to get easier from here on out.

I was released from physical rehab in January of 2017. By the end of January, I knew I still had a lot of trouble ahead. I suppose the combination of not having professionals to put on my ostomy bags and maybe the change in diet both contributed to the torture I faced next. I was still very skinny and my ostomy bag sat right against my jutting-out hip bone. The bone pulled the bag up from the skin, exposing it. The digestive fluids coming from the ileum are highly corrosive. The colon reabsorbs water and dilutes the corrosive digestive enzymes that enter it from the ileum, but even then if you leave normal fecal matter on your skin it is going to turn it raw.

Every time I ate, after a short time I would get gushes of acidic digestive fluid that I couldn't prevent from washing over my skin. The skin would get more raw every day until it was nothing but fresh live exposed skin getting doused with acid for hours every time I ate something. If you needed to train someone to handle any form of physical torture this probably wouldn't be a bad way to do it. The hardest moments were when I had to cry out uncontrollably in front of my daughter.

Eventually I got a PICC line and they gave me something called TPN.[3] They pumped nutrients directly into my heart so that I only had to eat a minimum amount of actual food each day. I got the torture sessions down to about 60 minutes a day and was satisfied with that until I gained enough weight to have my ileostomy reversed in August of 2017. That was the end of that ordeal, and I had made the last trip out of hell for that experience.

For a while I believed that I had likely survived the most trying thing I would ever face. I figured the next time I dropped lower than that, there would be no coming back. I wasn't resigned to die though. I've always tried to make the most out of recovery. Had I died when I was 36, I would have died having never known what facing the death of the people you love is like.

After getting back on my feet I finally finished the college degree I had started so long ago and managed to get cum laude.

My marriage continued to struggle and right before the COVID lockdown I separated from my wife. She had a hoarding issue and I felt as if I was pushed out by lack of space. She often felt like I just chose to leave. Thankfully we managed to work things out as co-parents, and although our relationship never recovered we kept something between us that was there almost to the end.

We lost my grandmother first, Christmas 2021. When I separated from my wife I moved back into my family home with her and my father, who was caring for her. She had developed bladder cancer that we were treating for her comfort--not to save her life. She had lost her mind and was talking daily about being ready for death.

My grandfather was the opposite. He was always at his peak until he only had hours left. A few hours before, he wasn't feeling well, so he took a nap. His girlfriend called us right as we were sitting down to dinner and told us he had passed in his sleep. I remember trying to process it and immediately thinking of my daughter. They were very close and she had been resentful because his debilitated girlfriend had taken away the time she used to spend with him. Telling her was one of the hardest things I've ever had to say to a person.

Having not known death for so much of my life, and being introduced to it both when it is expected and unexpected, I thought maybe that would be enough for me to deal with--at least for a bit. My wife was experiencing odd symptoms though and they weren't getting better. When she finally got treated they said that she had the flu, but the medicine they gave her didn't help her get better. We went back and they said she still had the flu. They kept saying it, and every time they did I felt a little more dread come up in me, because I had stopped thinking she had the flu.

I remember a day driving in my car to the hospital asking myself, "When is this going to get better?" and dreading the call back from deep inside me that said, "It doesn't have to get better." I remember the feeling the first time I thought that things might only get worse from here on out until it was over, and something in me broke. It was like waking up for the first time and realizing all at once that your life is a nightmare, and looking for some way to just go to sleep so you don't need to keep processing the realness of it.

I knew I couldn't allow that to happen or let myself get lost again. I had started Internal Family Systems therapy and was seeing progress in figuring out how to live with who I was, but now I needed to learn how to survive something I had never seen coming. All that strength I had gathered to pull myself up could do nothing for me now, while it was my wife who was suffering.

We found out that what the doctors had failed to realize was that she had chronic heart failure at 43 years old. By the time she had started experiencing noticeable symptoms they said it was already too late. What she needed now was some rather extreme medication to supercharge her heart while she prepared to get an LVAD or heart transplant.

Before this she had to be approved and this was a complication. The doctors had every reason to approve her except for one--her own cooperation. An LVAD operation or a heart transplant requires that a patient follow medical advice.[4] They die if they don't, so when my wife refused medicine they took note.

My wife had never really trusted anyone over her own instinct. She for years had complained about being overstressed, which no doubt put her in an early grave, but she couldn't change herself in a way that would allow her to lead a less stressful life.

She grew up in hard, unfair circumstances where the world around her let her down. The people who should have been there for her weren't, and so she learned she was the one she could count on. The problem is that later, when she needed to look to herself and see what she needed to change inside, all she could see was the problems in the people around her. She couldn't see when she grew past the experiences of her childhood.

When she refused medical treatment and the doctors made it clear that this would prevent them from qualifying her for an LVAD or heart transplant, I realized that as much as I wanted to hope for her survival I needed to prepare myself for her death. I knew if I couldn't be present for that and show that to my daughter they would suffer the loss of both their parents at the same time--not just one. I had watched Shrinking and I didn't want to be that character in that show.

I managed to face my wife's death, but not in the way I wish I had now. I did it by being there, checked out. My anger and disappointment in her decisions, it made me feel like she had already chosen death and that she was choosing it over her family. So I was there with her as much as I could be, and she resented me the whole time because I was right there not being her husband in the last moments she had left.

My inability to deal with the feelings of loss I was going through stole from me the last moments I knew I had to be with my wife, and these were feelings I was never going to be able to avoid. Moloch tricks you into thinking you can avoid things that you can't. Every compromise of integrity seems smaller than it is.

I do keep thinking back and wondering what it would have taken for me to make the choice to surrender my anger and fear. I could have crawled into bed with my wife one last time, and I could have told her that it was alright. I could have told her that if she was going to go, she would be missed by me and the rest of our family, but that I would be her lover until the end. That's a gift that in retrospect I would have liked to have given, but that would have required something I didn't have in the moment.

Losing myself, coming back, discovering who I am on the inside, and losing my best friend have taught me that plans to keep control can always fall apart, and getting on with life always involves picking up the pieces. I used to live my life like a game of Jenga where I could only ever take blocks from the bottom to put on top. I got so used to collapsing that I stopped fearing it and used the pattern. Anytime I needed a change I could just make everything fall down and build back from scratch.

This feels like ultimate control until you realize that sometimes when you collapse you can't build back. Sometimes when you collapse the game is just over. Then there is the surreal lesson of my wife. Sometimes people can have every reason in the world to live, and they can't get over the smallest thing (looking in from the outside it looks small--I'm betting it never felt small).

I've never felt that strongly in control over myself. When I was young my father married a woman that I was very afraid of, and he critically failed to protect me from her. I developed a protector for the weak, vulnerable boy, and this protector was what I could show to the world, and it felt like this part kept me safe--but it was not all I was. The problem is this protector didn't know how not to be any and everything to me.

This part of me I called the Ruler, and it rightfully served as my ego for a long time. I admired John Brown partly because my Ruler sees something in his. Like Brown, my Ruler was a principled tyrant. Brown's cause was real; what his Ruler got wrong was what winning was. His victory never came at Harpers Ferry, where the plan died with two of his sons.[5] It came in a cell in Charlestown, after the mission was over and that part of him ran out of instructions--and something quieter, which had been underneath it the whole time, finally had room. A man who had spent his life writing letters of instruction spent his last month writing letters of love.[6] That is what my Ruler sees in his. Not the war--what was under it.

I have another part that I have come to know as the Destroyer that wasn't willing to let the Ruler obliterate the rest of the parts. The Destroyer would rather die than let that happen. For a long time I thought the answer was to try and let the Ruler win the fight, but that was a mistake. Brown's Ruler never won either. I needed to learn to deal with and care for all parts of myself to be whole, and I'm still doing that now.

It took learning to see my own parts before I could see that my wife was made of them too. The part of her that refused the doctors was not all of her. There were parts of her that wanted to live, that wanted to see our daughter grown, that wanted the new heart--they lost the fight to a protector that had been keeping her alive since she was a girl. I had been losing that same kind of fight my whole life and still couldn't recognize hers. She was never one person choosing death over her family, and the man checked out at her bedside was never all of me. I loved her and I had not forgiven her, and for a long time both of those were true. Learning to see her parts is what finally started to move the second one.

The difference in me now is not that I have discovered who I am, but I know I'm on that path. I'm trying to find ways to trust my core self a little more every day, and let that part lead me. This is something I can have some control over--how I deal with the different parts of myself and try to help, heal, and understand them.

Moloch likes to work on our parts because they are where we are vulnerable. I promise that no matter how strong the protectors you have built in yourself are, there is still a core self underneath that and it can feel things. Some suffering is inevitable and it only provokes further pain to try and avoid it. The cost always comes due in the end.

I think of life now as an emotional palette where I don't necessarily know what to expect. There will be joys and sadnesses, and I won't always know which is coming next. The moments in my life when I felt most dead were when I was feeling the least. Let me take it all now, and let the worse be for the better, the better for the worse.

From here on out I think I'd like to act as though we have what it takes to get past what we are facing in this moment.

* * *

Clay Rose of the Gasoline Lollipops wrote a song called "Longest Night."[7] It has always sounded to me like driving through the night toward an inevitable loss. Every time I hear it I think of 2025--my longest night yet.

* * *

* * *

Notes

[1] Goucher College, a private liberal-arts college in Towson, Maryland.

*[2] Aspergillosis is primarily an opportunistic infection of immunocompromised patients (e.g., cancer or transplant). See CDC, "Aspergillosis"; Thomas F. Patterson et al., "Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Aspergillosis: 2016 Update," *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 63, no. 4 (2016). Severe malnutrition can produce the immunosuppression that permits it.*

[3] A PICC (peripherally inserted central catheter) line delivers total parenteral nutrition (TPN) into central venous circulation; "directly into the heart" is a lay description of central access. See ASPEN (American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition) clinical guidelines.

[4] Left ventricular assist devices (LVADs) and heart transplantation require strict medical adherence; non-adherence is a standard exclusion for candidacy. See ISHLT transplant-candidate selection criteria and AHA/ACC heart-failure guidelines on destination-therapy LVAD candidacy.

*[5] John Brown's raid on Harpers Ferry, October 16-18, 1859, failed; two of his sons died in connection with it--Watson Brown (mortally wounded, died October 19) and Oliver Brown (killed October 17). See David S. Reynolds, *John Brown, Abolitionist* (New York: Knopf, 2005); Stephen B. Oates, *To Purge This Land with Blood* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).*

*[6] Brown was held in Charles Town, Virginia (then spelled Charlestown), tried October 25-November 2, 1859, and hanged December 2, 1859; his prison correspondence is collected in *The Life, Trial and Execution of Captain John Brown* (1859). See also Reynolds (2005) and Oates (1970). The characterization of his last month as "letters of love" is the author's interpretation.*

[7] "Longest Night," written by Clay Rose; performed by the Gasoline Lollipops.

Sources and Further Reading

Every empirical claim in this book that is not common knowledge is documented below, numbered sequentially and grouped by chapter. Each entry states the claim in one sentence, followed by the full citation. Where a claim is contested, the opposing view is noted. Where a claim is a projection or interpretation rather than a description of present fact, it is flagged. Standard citation formats are used by type: books, articles, legal authorities, and web sources. Fictional elements are not sourced. The author's own project -- Open-Write and A Thousand Silences -- is self-evidencing and cited as such.

Several entries are marked TEXT REVIEW NEEDED. These are cases where the claims audit identified a wording problem in the published manuscript text; each note states precisely what must be checked or corrected. None of these affect the substantive argument of the book.

Paragraph references use "¶N" (chapter-relative position). Cross-references use the form "see [N]."

Chapter 1: A Warning Shot

[1] The novel A Thousand Silences is 52,000 words and is set during the Haitian Revolution.

Self-evidencing. The novel is released into the public domain; the word count and setting are verifiable against the released text. Open-Write, A Thousand Silences, public-domain edition. Available via the Open-Write repository. (¶3)

[2] The Open-Write pipeline used standard pretrained models with no fine-tuning and no custom training.

Self-evidencing. The pipeline is open-source; the training methodology (no fine-tuning, no custom training) is verifiable against the released code. This claim materially affects the capability argument and is documented in the repository. (¶8)

[3] Laurent Dubois's Avengers of the New World was used as historical grounding for the novel.

Laurent Dubois, Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004). (¶8)

[4] The novel cost roughly $100 in compute to build the system and two demo projects; the novel itself cost about $6.

Self-evidencing. The ~$100 figure is system-build compute; the novel itself, produced after the system existed, cost about $6 from the same bulk-token subscription. Documented for auditability against the project's own token/cost logs. (¶18, ¶25)

[5] Under current U.S. copyright guidance, purely AI-generated material is not copyrightable on its own; meaningful human authorship is required.

U.S. Copyright Office, Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices (3rd ed.), §313.2; Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence, 88 Fed. Reg. 5992 (Mar. 16, 2023); Zarya of the Dawn registration cancellation letter (Feb. 21, 2023). https://copyright.gov/ai/ (¶19)

[6] A work with no human authorship is not copyrightable (case law).

Thaler v. Perlmutter, No. 22-1564 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023) (holding that a work "generated by an artificial system without any human involvement" is not copyrightable). (¶19)

[7] A traditional writers' room developing a multi-season TV arc costs hundreds of thousands of dollars.

WGA minimum basic agreement (staff writer/producer scales) and per-episode room budgets. See Maureen Ryan, Burn It Down: Power, Complicity, and a Call for Change in Hollywood (Boston: Hachette, 2023); WGA strike materials (2023). The cost band is a synthesis of these sources; the order of magnitude is consistent with standard room budgets. (¶25)

[8] The author generated four seasons of spec scripts and four novel outlines in roughly two weeks for the cost of a model subscription.

Self-evidencing. Verifiable against the author's notebooks; no external citation required. (¶25)

Chapter 3: The Incentive Problem

[9] Boeing's 737 MAX killed 346 people across two crashes in five months.

Lion Air Flight 610 (Oct. 29, 2018; 189 deaths) and Ethiopian Airlines Flight 302 (Mar. 10, 2019; 157 deaths). U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, The Design, Development, and Certification of the Boeing 737 MAX (Sept. 2020). https://transportation.house.gov/ (¶5)

[10] The MCAS flight-control software pushed the nose down based on a single angle-of-attack sensor reading.

U.S. House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, The Design, Development, and Certification of the Boeing 737 MAX (Sept. 2020); Joint Authorities Technical Review (JATR), Observations, Findings, and Recommendations (Oct. 2019). (¶5)

[11] Engineers raised internal concerns about MCAS; the concerns were overruled, timelines were compressed, and the fix that might have prevented the second crash was delayed.

House Committee final report (Sept. 2020), documenting internal Boeing communications; selected Boeing internal emails released by the House Transportation Committee; investigative reporting on the 737 MAX. (¶5)

[12] Between 2013 and 2019, Boeing spent over $43 billion on share buybacks.

Boeing annual reports and SEC Form 10-K filings, 2013-2019. The $43B figure covers buybacks only; some analysts cite ~$68B in buybacks and dividends 2010-2019. Widely reported; see Natalie Kitroeff, The New York Times, 2019. (¶7)

[13] The banks packaged toxic (subprime) mortgages into securities and sold them as safe.

Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission (FCIC), The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2011); Michael Lewis, The Big Short: Inside the Doomsday Machine (New York: W.W. Norton, 2010). https://fcic.law.stanford.edu/ (¶12)

[14] The FCIC found the 2008 crisis was "avoidable."

FCIC, The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (2011). (¶12)

[15] The ratings agencies were paid by the firms whose products they rated (issuer-pays conflict of interest).

FCIC, The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (2011), ch. 2 (credit rating agencies); U.S. Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, Wall Street and the Financial Crisis: Anatomy of a Financial Collapse (Levin-McCain report, Apr. 13, 2011). https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/ (¶12)

[16] The top five investment banks were leveraged 30:1 to 40:1 before the crisis.

FCIC, The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (2011) (leverage ratios of Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, Merrill Lynch, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley); SEC Form 10-K filings. By 2007-2008 leverage at the largest broker-dealers reached 30:1-40:1. (¶13)

[17] The share of subprime borrowers with credit scores good enough to qualify for prime loans was 41% in 2000, ~55% in 2005, and 61% at the 2006 peak.

Rick Brooks and Ruth Simon, "Subprime Debacle Traps Even Very Credit-Worthy," Wall Street Journal, Dec. 3, 2007. (¶14)

[18] In 2016, Congress passed the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act.

Pub. L. 114-145. Passed both chambers with no dissenting vote. Scott Higham and Lenny Bernstein, "The opioid epidemic: How Congress and drug company lobbyists worked to neutralize the DEA," Washington Post / 60 Minutes, Oct. 15, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/ (¶15)

[19] The bill's early draft was written by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer.

Higham and Bernstein, Washington Post / 60 Minutes, Oct. 2017. (¶15)

[20] The bill was shepherded by Rep. Tom Marino and Sen. Orrin Hatch.

Higham and Bernstein, Washington Post, Oct. 2017; Congressional record for H.R. 471 (Marino) and Senate companion. (¶15)

[21] Industry put more than a million dollars into the relevant campaigns.

Higham and Bernstein, Washington Post / 60 Minutes, Oct. 2017 (reporting industry political contributions to Marino/Hatch); "60 Minutes" segment and follow-on lobbying-total reporting. (¶15)

[22] "535 legislators, both parties, not a single no vote."

The bill passed the House by voice vote and the Senate by unanimous consent (Pub. L. 114-145). The "535" is the total

membership of Congress (435 + 100); the practical effect was unanimous passage, though a voice vote/unanimous consent does not record individual member positions on a roll call. (¶16)

[23] A Williamson, West Virginia pharmacy received 258,000 hydrocodone pills in a single month -- roughly ten times the norm.

Higham and Bernstein, Washington Post / 60 Minutes, Oct. 2017; Eric Eyre, Death in Mud Lick: A Coal Country Fight against the Drug Companies That Delivered the Opioid Epidemic (New York: Scribner, 2020). (¶16)

[24] Overdose deaths quadrupled after 1999.

CDC, multiple National Vital Statistics Reports; Harvard Law School Systemic Justice Project, From Individual Failing to Corporate Crisis: How America Identified the Cause of the Opioid Epidemic (July 2021). (¶16)

[25] The Sackler family extracted more than $10 billion from OxyContin/Purdue.

U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Reform, hearing record on Purdue/Sackler (2020-2021). (¶16)

[26] After 2016 the CDC published a prescribing guideline -- written as guidance, not binding.

CDC, "CDC Guideline for Prescribing Opioids for Chronic Pain -- United States, 2016," MMWR 65(RR-1):1-49 (2016). https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/ (¶19)

[27] A 2019 clarification from the guideline's own authors warned it was being misapplied, followed by a 2022 revision.

Deborah Dowell, Tamara M. Haegerich, and Roger Chou, "No Shortcuts to Safer Opioid Prescribing," New England Journal of Medicine 380(24):2285-2287 (2019); CDC, "2022 CDC Clinical Practice Guideline for Prescribing Opioids -- United States," MMWR 71(RR-3):1-95 (2022). (¶19)

[28] The 2010 OxyContin reformulation caused users to substitute to heroin and then fentanyl; total deaths accelerated as prescriptions fell.

William N. Evans, Ethan Lieber, and Patrick Power, "How the Reformulation of OxyContin Ignited the Heroin Epidemic," Review of Economics and Statistics 101(1):1-15 (2019); David Powell, Rund AbdelRahim, and Rosalie Liccardo Pacula, "Supply-Side Drug Policy in the Presence of Substitutes: Evidence from the Introduction of Abuse-Deterrent OxyContin," NBER Working Paper No. 23031 (2017); Theodore J. Cicero, Matthew S. Ellis, and Hilary L. Surratt, "Effect of Abuse-Deterrent Formulation of OxyContin on Prescription Opioid and Heroin Abuse," New England Journal of Medicine 367(2):187-189 (2012). (¶20)

[29] Goodhart's Law (named principle).

Charles Goodhart, "Problems of Monetary Management: The UK Experience," Papers in Monetary Economics (Reserve Bank of Australia, 1975). Related formulation: Donald T. Campbell, "Assessing the Impact of Planned Social Change," Occasional Paper, Social Science Research Council (1976) ("Campbell's Law"). (¶20)

[30] Dan Schneider, a New Orleans pharmacist whose son died, conducted an unpaid investigation of a pill mill until the operation was shut and the license surrendered.

Netflix, The Pharmacist (documentary, 2020); original Times-Picayune reporting on Schneider. (¶22)

[31] The False Claims Act uses qui tam, fee-shifting, and treble damages to pay private virtue to hunt fraud at scale.

False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733 (qui tam and treble-damages provisions). (¶23)

[32] A recommendation engine serving roughly two billion people.

Meta "Family of Apps" daily-active-people disclosures exceeding 3 billion (Meta Form 10-K); YouTube logged-in monthly users exceeding 2 billion (Alphabet earnings). The "two billion" figure is a conservative, illustrative lower bound for a single major platform. (¶40)

[33] Internal whistleblower documents showed that the companies' own research identified the harms.

"Facebook Papers" leaked by Frances Haugen (2021); see full entries [82]-[83] under Chapter 9. (¶41; cross-listed here from Chapter 9)

[34] Post-crash reforms: Dodd-Frank tightened some rules; within a decade banks posted record profits and some rules were loosened.

Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. 115-174 (2018) (Dodd-Frank rollback); FDIC, Quarterly Banking Profile series and Federal Reserve call-report data on bank profitability. (¶44)

Chapter 5: The Structural Solution (Part 1)

[35] In 1929 the stock market collapsed.

John Kenneth Galbraith, The Great Crash 1929 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955). Common-knowledge event; cited for the speculation/margin-buying mechanism. (¶2)

[36] The structure had rewarded speculation for a decade through margin buying, insider trading, and banks playing the same market they regulated.

Galbraith, The Great Crash 1929 (1955); Ferdinand Pecora, Wall Street Under Oath (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1939) (Pecora Commission hearings, 1932-1934). (¶2)

[37] The Securities Act of 1933.

Securities Act of 1933, 15 U.S.C. § 77a et seq. (¶2)

[38] The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the creation of the SEC.

Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. § 78a et seq. (¶2)

[39] In 1930, forty-eight people died in the R101 airship disaster.

R101 crashed at Beauvais, France, Oct. 5, 1930; 48 of 54 aboard killed. Peter Masefield, To Ride the Storm: The Story of the Airship R.101 (London: William Kimber, 1982); S.C. Gwynne, His Majesty's Airship (New York: Scribner, 2023). (¶4)

[40] In 1937 the Hindenburg killed thirty-six.

Hindenburg burned at Lakehurst, NJ, May 6, 1937; 35 aboard + 1 ground fatality = 36 dead. U.S. Department of Commerce, Report of the Air Commerce Bureau on the Hindenburg Accident (1937). (¶4)

[41] In 1954, two de Havilland Comet jets broke apart midair, killing fifty-six between them.

BOAC Flight 781 (Jan. 10, 1954; 35 dead) and South African Airways Flight 201 (Apr. 8, 1954; 21 dead) = 56. Sir Lionel Heald, Report of the Court of Inquiry into the Accidents to Comet G-ALYP and G-ALYY (London: HMSO, 1955) ("The Comet Crash Inquiry"); fatal cause was metal fatigue at square cabin-window corners. (¶4)

[42] In 2008 the financial system collapsed, having rewarded risk for years through mortgage-backed securities, credit default swaps, and leverage ratios.

FCIC, The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (2011); see [13]-[14]. (¶6)

[43] The response was Dodd-Frank, the CFPB, and stress tests.

Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub. L. 111-203 (2010). (¶6)

[44] Brooksley Born warned about derivatives in 1998 and was overruled.

PBS Frontline, "The Warning" (2009); President's Working Group on Financial Markets, Over-the-Counter Derivatives Markets and the Commodity Exchange Act (1998-1999) (Born's CFTC proposals and the PWG response). (¶6)

[45] CRA-covered banks made less than 36% of subprime mortgages between 2004 and 2007.

Center for American Progress, "The 2008 Housing Crisis: Don't Blame Federal Housing Programs for Wall Street's Recklessness" (Apr. 2017); Neil Bhutta and Glenn B. Canner, "Did the CRA Cause the Mortgage Market Meltdown?," Community Dividend, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (Mar. 2009); Federal Reserve Board letter to Sen. Menendez (Nov. 25, 2008). (¶8)

[46] The FCIC found only about 6% of high-cost loans had any CRA connection.

FCIC, The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report (2011). (¶8)

[47] Alan Greenspan said Fannie/Freddie affordable-housing mandates raised the risk appetite (opposing view).

Alan Greenspan, testimony before the House Financial Services Committee (2005) and FCIC testimony (2010); AEI, "The Clinton-era Roots of the Financial Crisis." Opposing view, presented for balance. (¶8)

[48] The thalidomide disaster of the late 1950s produced children with severe birth defects.

Approximately 10,000 children born with severe birth defects, about half of whom died within months (1957-1961). Martin Johnson, Raymond G. Stokes, and Tobias Arndt, The Thalidomide Catastrophe: How It Happened, Who Was Responsible and Why the Search for Justice Continues (London: Starflower Publications, 2018). (¶10)

[49] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- Kefauver-Harris Amendment described as requiring proof of safety.

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 5, ¶10): "produced the Kefauver-Harris Amendment, the law that required pharmaceutical companies to prove a drug was safe before selling it. Before the disaster, the law did not require that."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The manuscript text is inaccurate on two points. (1) The Drug Amendments of 1962 (Kefauver-Harris, Pub. L. 87-781, 76 Stat. 780) added the requirement that a drug be proven effective -- i.e., efficacy. (2) Safety was already required by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 (ch. 675, 52 Stat. 1040), enacted in response to the elixir sulfanilamide deaths; the 1938 FDCA is what introduced pre-market safety review. The statement "Before the disaster, the law did not require that [proof of safety]" is therefore wrong -- safety review had been required since 1938. The 1962 amendment layered efficacy on top of the existing safety requirement (and shifted NDAs from taking effect automatically after 60 days to requiring affirmative FDA approval). Correction: attribute safety to the 1938 FDCA and efficacy to the 1962 Kefauver-Harris Amendment. Citations for the corrected claim: Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, ch. 675, 52 Stat. 1040; Drug Amendments of 1962, Pub. L. 87-781, 76 Stat. 780. (¶10)

[50] The Sacklers made more than ten billion dollars while overdose deaths quadrupled, and a unanimous Congress defanged the DEA.

See [24], [25], [18]. (¶11)

[51] Recommendation systems have already remade the attention economy, polarized discourse, and worsened adolescent mental health.

See [72] (Klein), [80]-[83] (Haidt, Facebook Papers), [84]-[85] (Wu, Zuboff). (¶16)

[52] The Founders drew on Locke, Montesquieu, and English common law.

Max Farrand, The Framing of the Constitution of the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913); see [159]. (¶23)

[53] The Articles of Confederation proved inadequate to hold the country together.

Farrand, The Framing of the Constitution (1913). (¶23)

[54] The "irresponsible borrowers, their own fault" framing constrained the federal response to the 2008 crisis.

Heather McGhee, The Sum of Us: What Racism Costs Everyone and How We Can Prosper Together (New York: One World, 2021), chs. 3-4. Opposing view: AEI, "The Clinton-era Roots of the Financial Crisis" (Fannie/Freddie affordable-housing mandates and CRA pressure drove high-risk lending, citing Greenspan). (¶)

[55] Black borrowers were steered into subprime products they qualified to avoid (~8x more likely than comparable white borrowers).

McGhee, The Sum of Us (2021). (¶)

[56] Median Black family wealth fell by more than half between 2005 and 2009.

McGhee, The Sum of Us (2021); McGhee, NPR Fresh Air interview, Feb. 17, 2021. (¶)

[57] Purdue declined to market in states that adopted even minimal opioid regulation ("less fertile"); those states still have lower overdose rates.

Harvard Law School Systemic Justice Project, From Individual Failing to Corporate Crisis (July 2021). (¶)

Chapter 7: The Structural Solution (Part 2)

[58] Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Josh Hawley disagree on almost everything.

Common knowledge; no external citation required. (¶2)

[59] Both AOC and Josh Hawley have backed legislation banning congressional stock trading.

Public legislative records; both have introduced or co-sponsored such legislation. (¶4-5)

[60] In 2016, Congress passed the Ensuring Patient Access Act unanimously -- both chambers, no dissent.

See [18]. (¶6)

[61] The 60 Minutes / Washington Post expose on the 2016 Act.

Higham and Bernstein, Washington Post, Oct. 15, 2017; CBS News / 60 Minutes, Oct. 15, 2017 (joint investigation). (¶7)

[62] Senator Joe Manchin (D-WV) moved to repeal the 2016 Act.

CBS News, Oct. 2017; Manchin floor statements. (¶7)

[63] West Virginia was the hardest-hit state in the opioid crisis.

CDC, state-level drug-overdose death rates (WV has led the nation in per-capita overdose death rate for multiple consecutive years); NIDA, West Virginia Opioid Summary (updated series). https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/ (¶7)

[64] The 2016 Act's draft was written by a former DEA official turned drug-industry lawyer; not a single legislator in

either party voted against it.

See [19], [22]. (¶6)

[65] The 2008 crisis was bipartisan -- both parties deregulated (Gramm-Leach-Bliley; CFMA).

Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, Pub. L. 106-102 (1999) (repealed Glass-Steagall, signed by President Clinton); Commodity Futures Modernization Act of 2000, Pub. L. 106-554, App. E (2000) (exempted derivatives from regulation). (¶11)

[66] The AI race is bipartisan -- both parties fund it.

National AI Initiative Act of 2020, Div. E of Pub. L. 116-283 (enacted Jan. 1, 2021); federal AI R&D budget crosscuts (NSTC, National AI R&D Strategic Plan). (¶11)

[67] The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) shows a major market can set terms that companies comply with.

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation). https://gdpr-info.eu/ (¶)

[68] The Business Judgment Rule already gives corporate directors broad latitude.

Aronson v. Lewis, 473 A.2d 805 (Del. 1984); treatise: Robert Charles Clark, Corporate Law (Little, Brown, 1986). (¶)

[69] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- Shareholder primacy as a legal requirement (contested).

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 7): "The shareholder primacy that made Boeing's buybacks rational."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The manuscript text should be hedged; it risks implying a legal mandate. The text does not explicitly state that shareholder primacy is a legal requirement, so it is not outright false -- but the framing invites a misreading. Contested claim: the shareholder-value-maximization norm is not an enforceable legal duty under U.S. corporate law. Dodge v. Ford Motor Co., 170 N.W. 668 (Mich. 1919) is the case most often cited for shareholder primacy but is widely regarded by modern scholars as historically misread and is not controlling in Delaware. Lynn A. Stout, The Shareholder Value Myth: How Putting Shareholders First Harms Investors, Corporations, and the Public (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, 2012); Business Roundtable, "Statement on the Purpose of a Corporation" (Aug. 19, 2019). Correction: keep the economic claim (that buybacks were economically rational under a shareholder-value norm) but avoid implying a legal duty. (¶)

[70] Post-WWII produced the middle class, the interstate highway system, and institutions that held for roughly forty years.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, Pub. L. 84-627; Thomas Piketty on postwar growth (see [157]); CPI and median-wage data, U.S. Census Bureau / BLS. (¶)

[71] The post-WWII order was tainted by racial exclusion.

Heather McGhee, The Sum of Us (2021) (see [54]); Ira Katznelson, When Affirmative Action Was White: An Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005); Ira Katznelson, Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time (New York: Liveright, 2013); FHA redlining history. (¶)

[72] Affective polarization is rising.

Ezra Klein, Why We're Polarized (New York: One Signal Publishers / Avid Reader Press, 2020). (¶)

Chapter 9: The Manipulation Problem

[73] At a conference of tech designers, former Google strategist James Williams asked how many wanted to live in the world they were designing; no one raised a hand.

Johann Hari, Stolen Focus: Why You Can't Pay Attention -- and How to Think Deeply Again (New York: Crown, 2022). (¶1-3)

[74] Many of the engineers/designers building these systems prevented their own children from using the products.

Hari, Stolen Focus (2022). (¶4)

[75] Subprime-mortgage victims were disproportionately Black and were steered into predatory products they qualified to avoid; the "their own fault" framing constrained the federal response.

McGhee, The Sum of Us (2021) (see [54], [55]); Brooks and Simon, WSJ (2007) (see [17]). The framing that this narrative "constrained the federal response" is McGhee's argument. (¶16)

[76] Opioid-crisis victims were disproportionately white and rural, and received the more sympathetic "disease of despair / public health crisis" framing.

Anne Case and Angus Deaton, Deaths of Despair and the Future of Capitalism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020);

CDC, county-level drug-overdose mortality data. The differential media framing (sympathetic opioid narrative vs. punitive earlier drug-war narratives) is documented in Julie Netherland and Helena B. Hansen, "The War on Drugs That Wasn't: Wasted Whiteness, 'White Trash,' and the Politics of Stigma," in White Trash (2016). (¶17)

[77] Despite the opioid crisis, the Sacklers kept billions.

See [25] (>$10B extracted) and the Purdue arc [134]-[139] (culminating in no family member facing criminal consequence and the fortune substantially surviving the payments). (¶17)

[78] A unanimous Congress defanged the DEA.

See [18], [22]. (¶17)

[79] Modern systems model one specific person's vulnerabilities, generate persuasion to fit, test many variants, and deliver the one that works.

Capability claim. See [90] (Salvi et al., LLM persuasiveness). The "thousand variants / A/B test" engagement-economics framing draws on general attention-economy sources ([84]-[85]); presented as architectural description rather than a single cited statistic. (¶6)

[80] Teen depression and anxiety have been climbing for roughly a decade.

Jonathan Haidt, The Anxious Generation: How the Great Rewiring of Childhood Is Causing an Epidemic of Mental Illness (New York: Penguin Press, 2024). Contested: Andrew K. Przybylski and Amy Orben have challenged aspects of Haidt's methodology and effect sizes; the direction of the trend (rising adolescent internalizing symptoms since the early 2010s) is not in serious dispute, but the causal attribution to smartphones/social media is contested. See Amy Orben, et al., "Windows of developmental sensitivity to social media," Nature Communications (2022). (¶9)

[81] Suicide rates for girls aged 15-19 rose nearly 60% (Haidt's analysis).

Haidt, The Anxious Generation (2024). Contested: the specific magnitude has been disputed by other researchers; the direction of the trend is not disputed. (¶9)

[82] Facebook's own data scientists found that the most-engaging posts disproportionately made people angry.

"Facebook Papers" leaked by Frances Haugen (2021); Jeff Horwitz, "Facebook Knows Instagram Is Toxic for Many Teen Girls, Company Documents Show," Wall Street Journal, Sept. 14, 2021. https://www.wsj.com/ (¶9)

[83] Facebook's own researchers warned the algorithm amplified division; the company suppressed the research.

"Facebook Papers" / Haugen disclosures (2021); internal research on "integrity" and polarization. (¶9)

[84] The attention economy is a commercial system that captures and resells human attention.

Tim Wu, The Attention Merchants: The Epic Scramble to Get Inside Our Heads (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2016). (general)

[85] Surveillance capitalism describes an economic logic that treats human experience as free raw material.

Shoshana Zuboff, The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power (New York: PublicAffairs, 2019). (general)

Chapter 11: The Coda

[86] The rational chooser we picture is, much of the time, a "press secretary" confabulating justifications for decisions made elsewhere.

Robert Kurzban, Why Everyone (Else) Is a Hypocrite: Evolution and the Modular Mind (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010) (originator of the "press secretary" framing); Jonathan Haidt, The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion (New York: Pantheon, 2012); Michael S. Gazzaniga, on the left-hemisphere "interpreter" (split-brain research), e.g., Gazzaniga, Human: The Science Behind What Makes Us Unique (2008). (¶3)

[87] People run on defaults because choosing is costly and slow (dual-process theory).

Daniel Kahneman, Thinking, Fast and Slow (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011). Note on contestation: the related "ego depletion"/decision-fatigue literature (Baumeister et al.) has suffered replication failures and should not be relied on as the primary basis; Kahneman's System 1/System 2 framing is the stable citation. (¶4)

[88] "The soft bigotry of low expectations" (phrase).

Phrase popularized by George W. Bush (2000 presidential campaign; 2001 No Child Left Behind advocacy); speechwriting credited to Michael Gerson. (¶7)

[89] Defaults and choice architecture shape outcomes; how a choice is set up matters as much as the choice itself.

Richard H. Thaler and Cass R. Sunstein, Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008; final ed. 2021); Eric J. Johnson and Daniel G. Goldstein, "Do Defaults Save Lives?," Science 302(5649):1338-1339 (2003). (¶9)

Chapter 13: The Offer

[90] AI-driven persuasion: current capability is rising; the book's claims about future systems are projections.

Francesco Salvi, Manoel H. Horta Ribeiro, Riccardo Gallotti, and Robert West, "On the Conversational Persuasiveness of Large Language Models: A Randomized Controlled Trial," arXiv:2403.14380 (2024), published in Nature Human Behaviour (2025). Projection flag: the book's claims about future capability -- systems that model a single person's vulnerabilities, generate tailored persuasion, and deliver the variant that works -- are projections based on current trends, not descriptions of deployed systems. The current Salvi et al. RCT is the empirical floor for the capability claim. (¶9-10)

Chapter 17: Moloch's Arguments

This is the densest statistics chapter in the book. Every figure below is sourced to its primary statistical authority (IRS, USDA, MedPAC, GAO, DoD OIG, Federal Reserve, Urban Institute).

[91] The U.S. federal tax gap runs roughly $600-700 billion per year.

IRS, Federal Tax Compliance Research: Tax Gap Estimates for Tax Years 2014-2016 (released 2022), reporting an average annual gross tax gap of ~$496B and net of ~$428B; IRS projection for TY 2017-2018 of ~$540B gross. The U.S. Treasury and IRS have published higher estimates (~$600B+) when projected forward and when high-earner undetected noncompliance is included (Treasury, The American Families Plan Tax Compliance Agenda, May 2021). https://www.irs.gov/newsroom/the-tax-gap Reconciliation: the $600-700B figure is on the high end, consistent with the Treasury 2021 estimate and recent expansions of estimated high-income noncompliance; the official IRS published base number is lower (~$496B for TY 2014-2016). (¶3)

[92] The IRS estimates the largest concentration of unreported income sits at the top of the income distribution, in categories where third-party reporting is weakest.

IRS, Statistics of Income and tax-gap breakdown by income percentile; John Guyton, Patrick Langetieg, Daniel Reck, Max Risch, and Gabriel Zucman, "Tax Evasion at the Top of the Income Distribution: Theory and Evidence," NBER Working Paper No. 28542 (2021, rev. 2023); U.S. Treasury estimate that the top 1% underreport roughly 20% of their income. (¶3)

[93] The IRS enforcement apparatus has been systematically defunded for decades by both parties.

IRS enforcement staffing fell ~30% from FY 2010 to FY 2018; audit rates fell across the board. GAO, IRS Enforcement: Trends and Budget Could Inform Decisions; IRS, Data Book (annual); U.S. Treasury, report on the reversal of enforcement funding (2021). (¶3)

[94] Retailer trafficking in the SNAP (food-stamp) program runs historically ~1-1.5% of benefits.

USDA Food and Nutrition Service, The Extent of Trafficking in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program series: 2009-2011 (~1.3%), 2012-2014 (~1.5%), 2015-2017 (~1.3%); USDA Office of Inspector General reports. https://fns.usda.gov/ (¶5)

[95] EITC filers are audited at rates rivaling the highest earners; correspondence audits cost a few hundred dollars.

IRS, Data Book (annual audit-by-income data -- EITC recipients historically audited at ~0.8-1.1%, comparable to the top income percentiles); Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse (TRAC), Syracuse University, IRS audit-skew reports. Cost-of-correspondence-audit figures from IRS/GAO analyses. https://trac.syr.edu/ (¶5)

[96] Medicare Advantage upcoding results in payments running ~20%+ above what fee-for-service equivalents would cost, by MedPAC's estimates.

Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy (March reports, MA "coding intensity" discussion); CMS Medicare Advantage encounter-data analyses. https://www.medpac.gov/ (¶6)

[97] The Department of Defense has failed seven consecutive department-wide financial audits.

DoD Office of Inspector General, agency-wide financial audit results FY2018 (the first) through FY2024 (the seventh); each audit issued a "disclaimer of opinion." GAO, Financial Audit: Department of Defense's FY2024... reports. https://www.gao.gov/ (¶6)

[98] "Improper payment" rates (mostly documentation error, flowing both directions) are routinely conflated with "fraud," inflating the decoy's apparent size by an order of magnitude.

GAO and OMB, Payment Integrity information, paymentaccuracy.gov. Definition: an "improper payment" includes over- and under-payments and documentation errors, not only fraud. Fraud is a small subset of improper payments. https://paymentaccuracy.gov/ (¶25)

[99] Improper-payment rates in means-tested programs (SNAP, Medicaid, EITC) are genuinely nontrivial (the chapter's explicit concession).

paymentaccuracy.gov program-specific improper-payment rates: EITC historically ~20-25% improper-payment rate (largely due to complexity of eligibility determination); Medicaid and SNAP much lower (single digits). This is the chapter's explicit concession and uses the same GAO/OMB source. (¶29)

[100] Zoning reserves most residential land in high-demand metros for single-family-only use.

Widely cited finding that ~75% of residential land in major U.S. cities is zoned single-family-only. Sonia A. Hirt, Zoned in the USA: The Origins and Implications of American Land-Use Regulation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Salim Furth, Mercatus Center analyses; local studies (San Jose, Minneapolis, Seattle zoning maps). (¶36)

[101] Supply restrictions are maintained most stringently in the most progressive cities, protecting the largest middle-class asset: incumbent home equity.

(a) Salim Furth and M. Nolan Lyons, Do Strict Land-Use Regulations Make Metropolitan Areas More Segregated by Income?, Mercatus Working Paper; M. Nolan McCarty, "The Regulation of Residential Housing Supply and the Partisan Geography of Housing." (b) Federal Reserve, Survey of Consumer Finances -- the primary residence is the largest non-pension asset for middle-income families. https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/scfindex.htm (¶36)

[102] The holders of home equity dominate the low-turnout local elections and planning meetings where restrictions are set.

Katherine Levine Einstein, David M. Glick, and Maxwell B. Palmer, Neighborhood Defenders: Participatory Politics and America's Housing Crisis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019). (¶36)

[103] Institutional investors own a low-single-digit percentage of single-family rental stock nationally.

Urban Institute, investor-purchase and single-family-rental ownership data (~2-3% nationally by the common "1,000+ unit" definition); Federal Reserve researchers' estimates. https://www.urban.org/ (¶37)

[104] Concentrated institutional-buyer purchase spikes occurred in select Sun Belt metros, inflating the issue to national-villain status.

CoreLogic, Redfin, and Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta data on investor share of purchases (peaks ~30%+ of purchases in 2021-2022 in Atlanta, Phoenix, Charlotte, Jacksonville). (¶37)

[105] Rent control provides genuine protection for sitting tenants but reduces supply and raises citywide rents.

Rebecca Diamond, Tim McQuade, and Franklin Qian, "The Effects of Rent Control Expansion on Tenants, Landlords, and Inequality," American Economic Review 109(9):3365-3394 (2019); Edward L. Glaeser and Erzo F.P. Luttmer, "The Misallocation of Housing Under Rent Control," American Economic Review 93(4):1027-1046 (2003); David H. Autor, Christopher J. Palmer, and Parag A. Pathak, "Housing Market Spillovers: Evidence from the End of Rent Control in Cambridge, Massachusetts," Journal of Political Economy 122(3):661-712 (2014). (¶38)

[106] The named villain (corporate/institutional landlords) owns roughly 3% of the problem.

Author's synthesis, reconciling [103] (institutional ownership ~2-3% nationally) with the definitional point that rent control adds no housing supply. (¶40)

[107] Active litigation alleges RealPage's pricing software coordinated rents among landlords (fee-stacking and eviction practices also documented).

United States et al. v. RealPage Inc., complaint filed Aug. 23, 2024 (DOJ Antitrust Division and state AGs, amended Nov. 2024); private class actions (Hecht v. RealPage); Heather Vogell, "Rent Going Up? One Company's Algorithm Could Be Why," ProPublica, Oct. 15, 2022. https://www.propublica.org/ (¶42)

[108] The "impossible demand" category includes a constitutional amendment to overturn Citizens United.

Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010). The structural point in the text is the difficulty of *amendment (Article V); various proposed amendment bills have been introduced (e.g., H.J.Res. and S.J.Res. series). (¶17)*

[109] The House held 60+ votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act with no replacement.

House roll-call records. Tallies vary by counting method: CRS / Washington Post / Politifact report roughly 50-70 repeal-or-replace votes between 2011 and 2016. The "60+" figure depends on which votes (full repeal vs. provisions) are counted; should be pinned to a specific methodology if presented as a precise figure. (¶17)

[110] Environmental-review statutes (NEPA/CEQA), built to stop highways and pollution, now block clean energy and dense housing.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq. (signed Jan. 1, 1970); California Environmental Quality Act, Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21000 et seq. Research on NEPA/CEQA as housing and infrastructure barriers: Salim Furth / Mercatus; Brookings Institution CEQA litigation studies; Robert C. Ellickson, America's Frozen Neighborhoods: The Making of a Residential Segregation Regime (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2022). (¶21)

[111] Historic-preservation law blocks housing; occupational-licensing regimes block entrants into incumbent-protected professions.

National Trust for Historic Preservation; local-landmarking literature. Morris M. Kleiner, Stages of Occupational Licensing (Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute, 2024); White House, Occupational Licensing: A Framework for Policymakers (Treasury/CEA, 2015). (¶21)

[112] The 1962 Kefauver-Harris Amendment (counterexample -- reform energy landed on structure).

Drug Amendments of 1962 (Kefauver-Harris), Pub. L. 87-781, 76 Stat. 780. Triggered by thalidomide (see [48]). TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: same wording correction as [49] -- the 1962 amendment required proof of efficacy (safety was already required by the 1938 FDCA). (¶44)

[113] The stock-trading ban coalition that AOC and Hawley both backed.

See [59]. (¶44)

[114] Manchin's repeal attempt against the 2016 DEA bill.

See [62]. (¶44)

[115] IRS Direct File was built, worked, measurably raised users' trust in government, and was then eliminated.

IRS Direct File pilot (tax season 2024); GAO and IRS pilot evaluation results on user satisfaction and trust; New America, Designing a Free and Simple Tax-Filing Service (survey data on trust); 2025 (Trump administration) decision to terminate the program. https://www.irs.gov/ (¶44)

[116] Decoy (villain-shaped) content beats mechanism (structural) content in every engagement A/B test, run billions of times daily.

Author's synthesis, generalizing [82]-[83] (anger drives engagement). Supporting academic work: William J. Brady, Julian A. Wills, John T. Jost, Joshua A. Tucker, and Jay J. Van Bavel, "Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114(28):7313-7318 (2017). (¶46)

[117] PBM (pharmacy benefit manager) "spread pricing" is one of the large, illegible, inside-coalition flows where waste structurally lives.

FTC, Pharmacy Benefit Managers: The Powerful Middlemen Inflating Drug Costs and Squeezing Main Street Pharmacies (interim staff report, July 2024; final report 2025); FTC Section 6(b) study; state Medicaid PBM-spread-pricing audits (Ohio, Kentucky). https://www.ftc.gov/ (¶24)

[118] Agricultural employers of unauthorized labor are an incumbent beneficiary the right coalition does not name.

Pew Research Center estimates that ~40-50% of U.S. farmworkers are unauthorized; USDA Economic Research Service farm-labor data. Presented as illustrative in the text; sourced here if retained as an empirical claim. (¶22)

Chapter 19: The Price of Admission

This is the densest policy-citation chapter in the book. Every named statute, doctrine, and reform proposal below is cited to its enacting authority or its primary research literature.

[119] Roughly thirty-six OECD countries already operate pre-filled, return-free filing systems for the fully-reported income class.

OECD, Tax Administration series (e.g., Tax Administration 2023: Comparative Information on OECD and Other Advanced and Emerging Economies); OECD working papers on comparative return-filing and pre-filled-return systems. https://www.oecd.org/tax/administration/ (¶5)

[120] Wage income is roughly 99% compliant under third-party information reporting.

IRS, Federal Tax Compliance Research: Tax Gap Estimates for Tax Years 2008-2010 (and later updates); the "net misreporting percentage" is near-zero (~1%) for income subject to third-party reporting (wages, pensions) and far higher for opaque categories (cash business income, rents). See Joel Slemrod, "Building on a Foundation of Information Reporting," National Tax Journal (2019). (¶5)

[121] Fee-shifting regimes in civil rights and securities law have been running for decades.

Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C. § 1988; securities-fraud fee-shifting under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104-67) and case law (e.g., Shalaby v. Mansdorf). Doctrinal history of one-way vs. two-way fee shifting: John F. Vargo, "The American Rule on Attorney Fee Allocation," Journal of Legal Education. (¶6)

[122] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- "Treble damages with attorney fee-shifting, the way securities law does."

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 19, ¶6): "Treble damages with attorney fee-shifting, the way securities law does, so enforcement grows with violations instead of with appropriations."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The manuscript body text is factually wrong and must be corrected. Securities fraud under § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act / Rule 10b-5 does not provide treble damages. Treble damages attach to antitrust (Clayton Act § 4, 15 U.S.C. § 15) and civil RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)), not to securities fraud. Securities-fraud plaintiffs recover actual damages (plus, in some circumstances, interest). Notably, the manuscript's own footnote [^3] already self-corrects this error ("Treble damages attach to antitrust (Clayton Act § 4, 15 U.S.C. § 15) and civil RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)); securities fraud under § 10(b)/Rule 10b-5 provides fee-shifting but not treble damages") -- so the author was aware of the distinction, but the body text was not revised to match. Correction: reword the body to "the way antitrust and civil RICO do" (or "the way the False Claims Act does," see [31]). Citations for the corrected claim: Clayton Act § 4, 15 U.S.C. § 15 (treble damages + fee-shifting); 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) (civil RICO treble damages); 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-3733 (False Claims Act treble damages). (¶6)

[123] The 1986 IRCA structure is the cautionary tale -- employer sanctions enacted, never enforced.

Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. 99-603; GAO, Immigration Reform: Employer Sanctions and the Question of Discrimination (GAO/PEMD-90-5, 1990); GAO-05-822R; Doris Meissner and MPI (Migration Policy Institute) analyses of IRCA's enforcement failure. (¶7)

[124] The Baker-Shultz carbon fee-and-dividend plan has cross-partisan pedigree.

Climate Leadership Council, "The Conservative Case for Carbon Dividends" (2017); James A. Baker III and George P. Shultz, "A Conservative Answer to Climate Change," Wall Street Journal, Feb. 7, 2017. https://clcouncil.org/ (¶9)

[125] Site-neutral Medicare payment (same service, same price regardless of facility ownership) is a recognized reform; the hospitals' unanimous hatred is cited as evidence it works.

MedPAC, Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy (site-neutral payment discussion); Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, §603, Pub. L. 114-74 (off-campus clinic site-neutral payment); American Hospital Association opposition statements. (¶10)

[126] All-payer rate setting in concentrated hospital markets (implicit reference to the Maryland model).

Maryland All-Payer Model / Total Cost of Care Model (CMS/CMMI); Robert A. Berenson and Robert Murray, "Hospital Rate-Setting Revisited," Health Affairs (2015). (¶10)

[127] PLCAA shields the gun industry from ordinary liability; amendment would restore it.

Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, Pub. L. 109-92, 15 U.S.C. §§ 7901-7903 (2005). (¶11)

[128] RAND's evidence reviews rate gun-policy interventions with varying confidence.

RAND Corporation, The Science of Gun Policy: A Critical Synthesis of Research Evidence on the Effects of Gun Policies in the United States (2020; updated 2023). https://www.rand.org/research/gun-policy.html (¶11)

[129] The suicide-prevention and safe-storage agenda polls across partisan lines, including among gun owners.

Pew Research Center surveys on gun-policy support; Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Violence Solutions, National Survey; Gallup polling on safe-storage and extreme-risk-protection-order support. (¶11)

[130] New York City's small-donor matching-fund system rewards breadth of support rather than intensity.

NYC Campaign Finance Board, program documentation (the 8-to-1 multiple matching-fund system); Michael J. Malbin, The Election After Reform: Money, Politics, and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (Rowman & Littlefield, 2006); Richard L.

Hasen, Plutocrats United: Campaign Money, the Supreme Court, and the Election (Yale University Press, 2016); Brennan Center for Justice, reports on NYC matching funds. https://www.nyccfb.info/ (¶13)

[131] Political fundraising emails are A/B tested like social-media engagement feeds; apocalyptic framing wins the tests.

Reporting on campaign digital operations: The Atlantic; OpenSecrets / Center for Responsive Politics reporting on ActBlue/WinRed optimization; academic work on political email optimization (e.g., David E. Broockman and Joshua Kalla, persuasion and mobilization field experiments). (¶13)

[132] The most robust finding in the deterrence literature: certainty of consequence deters where severity does not.

Daniel S. Nagin, "Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century," Crime and Justice 42(1):199-263 (2013); Daniel S. Nagin and Greg Pogarsky, "Integrating Celerity, Impulsivity, and Extralegal Sanction Threats," Criminology (2001); Anthony N. Doob and Cheryl Marie Webster, "Sentence Severity and Crime," Crime and Justice 32 (2003). (¶16)

[133] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- "the one trader imprisoned after 2008."

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 19, ¶16): "the occasional dramatic prosecution -- the one trader imprisoned after 2008 while the institutions settled -- is severity-as-theater."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The phrase is a rhetorical compression, not a precise count, and should be tightened. "The one trader" implies a single identifiable figure. The most-cited example of a senior Wall Street figure imprisoned after 2008 is Kareem Serageldin (Credit Suisse, pleaded guilty to inflating mortgage-bond values; sentenced to 30 months, 2013). Correction: if presented as a single case, name Serageldin and cite the DOJ press release; otherwise reframe explicitly as illustrative. See also FCIC report ([13]-[14]) on the broader pattern of institutional rather than individual accountability. (¶16)

[134] In 2007, Purdue's parent pled guilty to felony misbranding; three executives pled to misdemeanors -- fines, no prison.

U.S. Department of Justice, "Purdue Frederick Company Inc. and Three Executives to Pay $634.5 Million for Misbranding OxyContin," DOJ press release, May 10, 2007; plea agreement filings. https://www.justice.gov/ (¶18)

[135] In 2019, Purdue filed for bankruptcy.

Purdue Pharma L.P., Chapter 11 voluntary petition, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, S.D.N.Y., filed Sept. 20, 2019. (¶18)

[136] In 2021, a plan granted the Sackler family a lifetime litigation shield for $4.3 billion.

Purdue Pharma plan of reorganization confirmed Sept. 1, 2021, by Judge Robert Drain (later reversed; see [137]); reporting in The New York Times and Wall Street Journal, 2021. (¶18)

[137] In June 2024, the Supreme Court held that nonconsensual third-party releases could not discharge the Sacklers.

Harrington v. Purdue Pharma L.P., 603 U.S. ___ (2024) (decided June 27, 2024; 5-4, Gorsuch, J., for the Court). (¶18)

[138] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- 2026 renegotiated $7.4 billion settlement; reconcile "$1.5 billion immediately" vs. "~$6.5 billion over 15 years."

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 19, ¶18): "And in 2026, a renegotiated $7.4 billion settlement became effective -- the Sacklers paying over $1.5 billion immediately, Purdue dissolved, the family permanently barred from selling opioids in the United States, and more than thirty million internal documents to be made public."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The two figures are consistent but read as a contradiction and should be stated together in the text. The $1.5 billion "immediately" is the upfront cash tranche within the Sacklers' overall ~$6.5 billion contribution, which is paid over 15 years (the note in earlier sources said "Sacklers contribute ~$6.5 billion over 15 years"). The two figures are not in conflict -- the $1.5B is the initial installment of the ~$6.5B total. The $7.4 billion headline includes Sackler cash plus the value of Purdue's assets and the business wind-down. The manuscript's own footnote [^20] (revised plan approved Nov. 2025 by Judge Sean Lane; multi-state AG announcements) does not state the 15-year total, which is what creates the apparent gap. Correction: confirm the upfront vs. total split against the multi-state AG announcement and the bankruptcy court order; state it in the text as "the Sacklers paying over $1.5 billion immediately with the balance of their roughly $6.5 billion contribution to follow over fifteen years" to remove the apparent contradiction. Sources: settlement effective-date order and document-disclosure order, U.S. Bankruptcy Court, S.D.N.Y. (Judge Anthony Scarpulla / Sean Lane); multi-state AG announcement; The New York Times / Washington Post reporting (2025-2026). (¶18)

[139] Across roughly 25 years, no member of the Sackler family faced criminal consequence; the fortune substantially survives the payments.

DOJ press records confirming the absence of individual Sackler criminal charges; Forbes Sackler net-worth estimates (wealth-tracking). (¶19)

Chapter 21: To the Reader

[140] The strongest case of durable unilateral structural reform is the Civil War Amendments.

U.S. Constitution, Amendments XIII (1865), XIV (1868), XV (1870); Eric Foner, Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877 (New York: Harper & Row, 1988). (¶5)

[141] The 13th Amendment ended slavery, but the planter class retained local economic power (land, courts, sheriffs, credit).

Foner, Reconstruction (1988); W.E.B. Du Bois, Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880 (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1935). (¶5)

[142] Jim Crow, convict leasing, and sharecropping re-engineered racial extraction without the Confederate flag.

Douglas A. Blackmon, Slavery by Another Name: The Re-Enslavement of Black Americans from the Civil War to World War II (New York: Doubleday, 2008); C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Career of Jim Crow (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955); Pete Daniel, The Shadow of Slavery: Peonage in the South, 1901-1969 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972). (¶6)

[143] The durable version of reform arrived when a cross-regional coalition paid for it again in the 1960s.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. 88-352; Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. 89-110; Fair Housing Act of 1968, Pub. L. 90-284; historical accounts: Robert Mann, The Walls of Jericho: Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Richard Russell, and the Struggle for Civil Rights (1996); Robert A. Caro, The Years of Lyndon Johnson: Master of the Senate (2002). (¶6)

[144] The ACA passed on a party-line vote, has survived, and is still contested roughly two decades on.

Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. 111-148 (Mar. 23, 2010); final House vote 219-212 (no House Republicans in favor). NFIB v. Sebelius, 567 U.S. 519 (2012); King v. Burwell, 576 U.S. 473 (2015). Note: at 2026 publication, "two decades" is approximate (~16 years since enactment); consider "a decade and a half." (¶8)

[145] Heather McGhee's drained-pool thesis: the zero-sum bargain was a con that cost everyone, including those who took the deal.

McGhee, The Sum of Us (2021), ch. 1 (the Oak Park public pool in Youngstown, OH). (¶12)

[146] Malcolm X's late-life trajectory moved from the totalizing-villain frame toward the structure and the universal.

Interpretive. Manning Marable, Malcolm X: A Life of Reinvention (New York: Viking, 2011); Malcolm X (with Alex Haley), The Autobiography of Malcolm X (New York: Grove Press, 1965). Projection/interpretation flag: the reading is the author's, grounded in these biographies. (¶14)

Chapter 23: Afterword -- The Longest Night Yet

Most claims in this chapter are the author's first-person medical and biographical history; per the book's sourcing standard, self-attested personal facts are not cited here. Only outward-facing empirical assertions (medical epidemiology, historical events, named public works) are sourced.

[147] Aspergillosis usually affects only cancer or transplant patients with severely compromised immune systems.

CDC, "Aspergillosis" (invasive aspergillosis risk factors); Thomas F. Patterson, et al., "Practice Guidelines for the Diagnosis and Management of Aspergillosis: 2016 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America," Clinical Infectious Diseases 63(4):e1-e60 (2016). Severe malnutrition and critical illness are recognized but uncommon immunosuppressive risk factors. (¶3)

[148] The digestive fluids coming from the ileum are highly corrosive to peristomal skin.

Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nurses Society (WOCN) clinical guidance; Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing (peristomal skin breakdown from ileostomy effluent). (¶13)

[149] TEXT REVIEW NEEDED -- "The colon does a lot to break down the corrosive enzymes that are present in the ileum."

Claim in the manuscript text (Ch. 23, ¶13): "The colon does a lot to break down the corrosive enzymes that are present in the ileum."

TEXT REVIEW NEEDED: The manuscript wording is physiologically imprecise and should be softened. The colon's primary functions are water and electrolyte reabsorption and bacterial fermentation of residual carbohydrates to short-chain fatty acids -- not enzymatic digestion or "breakdown of enzymes." Digestive enzymes (proteases, lipases) are produced by the pancreas and

small-intestinal brush border, not neutralized by the colon; ileal effluent is corrosive mainly because it is rich in active proteolytic enzymes that the colon would otherwise dilute by reabsorbing water. Correction: reword to "The colon reabsorbs water and dilutes the corrosive digestive enzymes that enter it from the ileum," or similar. Citation: John E. Hall, Guyton and Hall Textbook of Medical Physiology, 14th ed. (Elsevier, 2021), chs. on colonic function and intestinal secretion. (¶13)

[150] TPN (total parenteral nutrition) and PICC line definitions.

American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (ASPEN), clinical guidelines and definitions of central venous access and parenteral nutrition. The text's "pumped nutrients directly into the heart" is a lay description of central venous access. (¶15)

[151] An LVAD or heart transplant requires that a patient follow medical advice; non-adherence disqualifies.

International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) transplant-candidate selection criteria; AHA/ACC heart-failure guidelines on destination-therapy LVAD candidacy and the adherence requirement. (¶25)

[152] Internal Family Systems (IFS) therapy.

Richard C. Schwartz, Internal Family Systems Therapy (New York: Guilford Press, 1995). (¶24)

[153] John Brown's raid on Harpers Ferry failed; the plan "died with two of his sons."

Harpers Ferry raid, Oct. 16-18, 1859. The two sons killed in/after the raid were Oliver Brown (killed Oct. 17) and Watson Brown (mortally wounded; died Oct. 19). David S. Reynolds, John Brown, Abolitionist: The Man Who Killed Slavery, Sparked the Civil War, and Seeded Civil Rights (New York: Knopf, 2005); Stephen B. Oates, To Purge This Land with Blood: A Biography of John Brown (New York: Harper & Row, 1970). "Two of his sons" is correct. (¶35)

[154] John Brown's transformation occurred in a Charlestown (now Charles Town, WV) cell, where he spent his last month writing letters of love.

Brown was held in Charles Town, VA (now WV), tried Oct. 25-Nov. 2, 1859, hanged Dec. 2, 1859. Prison letters collected in The Life, Trial and Execution of Captain John Brown (New York: Robert M. DeWitt, 1859). See also Reynolds (2005) and Oates (1970). Interpretive flag: the "letters of love" framing is the author's interpretive reading. (¶35)

[155] Pop-culture references: Hank Schrader (Breaking Bad); Shrinking.

Breaking Bad (AMC, 2008-2013); Shrinking (Apple TV+, 2023-). Optional/common knowledge. (¶11, ¶27)

[156] "Longest Night" by Clay Rose / Gasoline Lollipops.

Gasoline Lollipops, "Longest Night" (songwriter credit: Clay Rose). Epigraph permission/attribution note required for use. (¶41, epigraph)

General References

[157] Income inequality and long-run capital accumulation.

Thomas Piketty, Capital in the Twenty-First Century, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2014).

[158] Institutional economics and game theory (collective-action failure and regulatory capture).

Mancur Olson, The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965); George J. Stigler, "The Theory of Economic Regulation," The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science 2(1):3-21 (1971).

[159] Structural reform before catastrophe -- the Constitutional Convention.

Max Farrand, The Framing of the Constitution of the United States (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1913).

Consolidated TEXT REVIEW NEEDED Flags -- Manuscript Corrections Required

The following flags were identified during the claims audit. Each is documented in full at its sources entry above. The substantive argument of the book is unaffected.

| # | Location | Flag | Required Correction |

|---|----------|------|---------------------|

| [49] | Ch. 5, ¶10 | Kefauver-Harris (1962) described as requiring proof of drug safety; safety was already required by the 1938 FDCA. The 1962 amendment added the efficacy requirement (and affirmative FDA approval). The text "Before the disaster, the

law did not require that" is also wrong. | Attribute safety to the 1938 FDCA; attribute efficacy to the 1962 Kefauver-Harris Amendment. Same correction applies to [112] (Ch. 17). |

| [69] | Ch. 7 | Shareholder primacy "made Boeing's buybacks rational" risks implying a legal duty. Shareholder-value maximization is not an enforceable legal requirement under U.S. corporate law (Stout, The Shareholder Value Myth; Dodge v. Ford historically misread). | Keep the economic claim (buybacks were economically rational under a shareholder-value norm); avoid implying a legal mandate. |

| [122] | Ch. 19, ¶6 | "Treble damages ... the way securities law does" is factually wrong. Securities fraud (§ 10(b)/Rule 10b-5) does not provide treble damages; the manuscript's own footnote [^3] already self-corrects this. Treble damages attach to antitrust (Clayton Act § 4) and civil RICO (18 U.S.C. § 1964(c)). | Reword the body text to "the way antitrust and civil RICO do" (or the False Claims Act, see [31]). |

| [133] | Ch. 19, ¶16 | "The one trader imprisoned after 2008" is figurative, not a precise count. | Name a specific case (e.g., Kareem Serageldin, Credit Suisse, 2013) or reframe explicitly as illustrative. |

| [138] | Ch. 19, ¶18 | "$1.5 billion immediately" vs. earlier "~$6.5 billion over 15 years" reads as a contradiction. The two are consistent (the $1.5B is the upfront tranche within the ~$6.5B total paid over 15 years). | State the upfront tranche and the 15-year total together in the text; confirm against the bankruptcy-court order and multi-state AG announcement. |

| [149] | Ch. 23, ¶13 | "The colon ... break[s] down the corrosive enzymes that are present in the ileum" is physiologically imprecise. The colon reabsorbs water/electrolytes and ferments carbohydrate; it does not enzymatically digest or neutralize ileal enzymes. | Reword, e.g., "The colon reabsorbs water and dilutes the corrosive digestive enzymes that enter it from the ileum." |

This list covers the major empirical claims in the book. Where a claim is contested, the opposing view is cited. Where a claim is a projection or an interpretation, it is identified as such in the text or in its entry. The author's own project (Open-Write; A Thousand Silences) is self-evidencing.

If you find an error, the author wants to know.