

Artificial Intelligence, Abundance and the Next Form of Human Organization

*Abundant intelligence, entrepreneurship, prosperity
and post-state coordination.*

Luiz Antonio Busnello · August 2026 · ~24 min read

-
- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1 Intelligence becomes abundant | 2 Who turns capability into progress |
| 3 From bureaucracy to distributed coordination | 4 Building the future |
-

1 Intelligence becomes abundant

Intelligence becomes abundant · 1

The first revolution that can amplify every individual

Previous revolutions multiplied strength, energy and speed. Artificial intelligence is beginning to multiply understanding, creativity and the capacity to decide.

The Industrial Revolution increased output by replacing physical strength, artisanal labor and manual steps with machines. Agricultural mechanization displaced workers from the countryside; industrial automation eliminated repetitive functions; and computerization reshaped offices and services. These transformations raised living standards, but they also produced disruptions that frequently eliminated jobs before creating new alternatives.

Artificial intelligence will also automate tasks and eliminate positions. To deny this would weaken the argument. The difference is that its principal capability is not limited to substitution. AI can amplify the capacity of those who remain

in the process: a physician can analyze more evidence; a teacher can follow more students; a researcher can test more hypotheses; and an entrepreneur can access competencies that were once available only to large organizations.

In the formulation of Daron Acemoglu and Pascual Restrepo, automation produces a displacement effect when it replaces labor in certain tasks, but productivity gains, the creation of new tasks and the expansion of demand can generate countervailing forces. Technology alone does not determine the outcome. It depends on how firms, markets and people reorganize work around it.

For this reason, AI should not be treated merely as a cost-reduction machine. It is an infrastructure of capability. It can be used to remove people from the productive system or to raise the level of each person's contribution. The first option is simpler and more immediate; the second demands vision, investment, new products and a willingness to expand markets.

Intelligence becomes abundant · 2

Productivity, work and the creation of new markets

The future of work will not be decided solely by the number of tasks that are automated, but by the speed with which society converts productivity gains into new companies, new products and new demand.

In many organizations, an enormous share of time is consumed by rework, unproductive meetings, the search for information, documentation, reconciliations, parallel controls and systems that do not talk to one another. Automating these activities can free human capacity for customer service, product creation, relationships, research, sales and the solving of problems that were previously not economically viable.

Productivity does not necessarily mean producing the same output with fewer people. It can mean producing far more, with better quality, for more consumers and in markets that did not previously exist. How many decisions

that once went unmade because of their high cost now become viable thanks to a significant reduction in the costs involved? When the cost of developing and delivering a solution falls, demands that were once small or barely profitable also begin to be served.

Even so, jobs will not be preserved automatically. Some companies will use AI merely to cut their teams. The response to automation cannot be to freeze every existing function. It must consist in making the creation of the new so cheap that the formation of companies, activities and markets outpaces the destruction of the old.

AI itself reduces the cost of entrepreneurship. A single person or a small team will be able to research markets, write code, build a brand, produce content, organize finances, serve customers and operate globally with the support of specialized agents. This shortens the distance between an idea and its first implementation and makes it possible to run a volume of business experiments unthinkable in earlier generations.

The future of work will therefore be inseparable from the future of entrepreneurship. An economy dominated by a few companies may turn efficiency into unemployment and concentration. An economy with millions of new builders may turn efficiency into new offerings, into the meeting of needs that were previously ignored and into new forms of work.

Intelligence becomes abundant · 3

The universal tutor and the democratization of expertise

For the first time, anyone driven by curiosity can have permanent access to personalized explanations, intellectual dialogue and support to make progress in virtually any field.

A recurring criticism holds that artificial intelligence will make people lazier and more intellectually dependent. The risk exists for those who use it merely

to copy answers, avoid effort and simulate knowledge. But this is neither the only way to use it nor the most transformative.

AI can function as a tutor available twenty-four hours a day. It can adapt its language to the student's level, present the same concept in different ways, formulate exercises, point out gaps, test comprehension and conduct a Socratic conversation. Benjamin Bloom demonstrated, in the well-known two-sigma problem, the enormous difference that individualized teaching can produce. AI offers the possibility of bringing part of that benefit to a far greater scale.

Knowledge that once required years of training, close contact with specialists or long professional experience becomes more accessible. This does not eliminate the need for deep study, practice and validation. Information is not wisdom, and a plausible answer may be wrong. But the initial barriers fall in extraordinary fashion.

A person can study mathematics in the early hours of the morning, learn to program on the way to work, ask for a critique of a business plan or explore a scientific field the instant curiosity arises. They can ask again without embarrassment and advance at their own pace.

The education suited to this new environment should not prohibit the tool. It should teach how to use it critically: to formulate better questions, verify sources, compare perspectives, acknowledge uncertainty and distinguish a reproduced conclusion from an understanding that has been built.

AI can be a crutch for those who do not want to think. For those who wish to learn, it can be the greatest intellectual accelerator ever created.

Human agency as the new scarcity

When intelligence and knowledge become widely available, will, judgment, courage and the capacity to act come to matter even more.

For centuries, advanced knowledge was scarce because it was concentrated in a few institutions, books, laboratories and specialists. Artificial intelligence is beginning to reduce that scarcity. But it does not eliminate another limitation: the human decision whether or not to use that capability.

Two people may access the same system. One will ask for answers in order to avoid effort. The other will use it to investigate, learn, produce, test hypotheses and build. The difference will lie not only in the intelligence available, but in agency: the capacity to choose objectives, take responsibility and act consistently to achieve them.

The new economy will continue to value technical knowledge, but it will also amplify the worth of qualities that are hard to automate: good judgment, taste, curiosity, courage, the ability to frame problems, empathy, leadership, ethics and persistence in the face of uncertainty.

This may widen the differences between people. AI democratizes access to potential capability, not to results. Those who possess discipline and initiative will be able to advance far more quickly. Those who remain passive may use the same tool only to deepen their own passivity. For this reason, the education of the future cannot limit itself to teaching content or commands. It must develop agency.

To develop agency means creating environments in which young people choose problems, take on projects, build something real, receive feedback, make mistakes, correct them and finish what they started. It means teaching that knowledge acquires value when it guides decision and execution.

When intelligence becomes abundant, human agency becomes the most valuable resource.

Intelligence becomes abundant · 5

From efficiency to abundance

Not everyone will need to become superproductive in order to live better. Collective productivity can lower the price of essentials and widen access.

Living standards depend not only on how much each person earns. They also depend on what that income can buy. A person may not double their productivity and yet live far better if education, health, food, energy, transport, financial services and access to knowledge become cheaper and more effective.

Artificial intelligence reduces costs embedded in virtually every activity: searching for and organizing information, customer service, analysis, documentation, translation, supervision, personalization, error prevention and coordination. These frictions consume time and capital without directly increasing the value delivered to the user.

In knowledge-based services, the cost of serving one additional person can fall drastically once the system has been built. An explanation, a translation, an initial piece of guidance or a preliminary analysis can reach millions of people without requiring a proportional growth of the structure.

But efficiency does not automatically translate into lower prices. A company protected from competition can capture the entire gain as margin. Technology creates the possibility of reducing costs; competition and the entry of new entrepreneurs press for part of that benefit to reach the consumer.

The economic sequence is decisive: AI reduces costs; entrepreneurship converts capability into offerings; competition presses prices down and improves quality; and the increase in supply raises purchasing power and

living standards. Without competition, technological abundance can end in economic concentration.

Even those who do not enter the highest-value activities will be able to benefit from aggregate prosperity. In a much wealthier society, supporting those who fall behind becomes relatively less costly and can function as a bridge to autonomy and reintegration, rather than as the permanent administration of scarcity.

2 Who turns capability into progress

Who turns capability into progress · 6

The entrepreneur as an agent of realization

Progress begins with ideas, but it only changes reality when vision and execution meet.

Alan Turing, Claude Shannon, John von Neumann and Norbert Wiener expanded our understanding of computation, information, systems and intelligence. Hayek revealed the limits of centralized knowledge; Herbert Simon described bounded rationality; and Elinor Ostrom demonstrated that communities can create rules and cooperate without depending exclusively on a central authority.

These ideas changed the horizon of the possible, but no historical transformation is the work of a single mind. Scientists, engineers, investors, workers and organizations convert knowledge into practical capability. The entrepreneur occupies a special position because they connect these elements and take on the responsibility of making them work together.

A brilliant idea can remain in a laboratory for decades. A technology can exist without ever reaching scale. The entrepreneur sees a possibility, mobilizes capital and talent, confronts uncertainty, organizes execution and turns the vision into a product, a service or a company. This is a civilizational function: to link knowledge and reality, invention and scale, possibility and access.

Steve Jobs integrated technologies into experiences that became part of everyday life. Jeff Bezos treated the internet as infrastructure for rebuilding commerce, logistics and computing. Elon Musk applied first-principles

thinking to electric vehicles, reusable rockets, satellites and brain-machine interfaces. They are not infallible figures, nor did they build their projects alone. They are examples of the combination of vision, ambition, capital and execution.

Deirdre McCloskey draws attention to the role of the social dignity granted to merchants, inventors and innovators. Joel Mokyr shows how a culture open to progress and to useful knowledge can sustain cycles of innovation. Societies advance not merely because they possess resources, but because they value those who experiment and build.

When this process works, it produces more than profit: it generates jobs, income, skills, suppliers, competition, taxes and technologies that others will be able to use. Profit, in an environment open to competition, is a feedback mechanism. It signals that people have voluntarily chosen a solution and makes it possible to reinvest, grow and take on new risks.

The world is not moved only by those who imagine. It is moved by those who imagine, take risks and realize.

Who turns capability into progress · 7

From the traditional company to the AI-augmented organization

By reducing transaction and coordination costs, AI may lower the minimum size required to build global companies.

Ronald Coase explained that firms exist, in part, because negotiating each task separately in the market entails costs. Finding suppliers, drafting contracts, supervising deliveries and coordinating people requires time and information. When coordinating within the firm is cheaper, the organization grows.

Artificial intelligence reduces both internal costs and market costs. Agents can research, negotiate, compare options, document processes, monitor results and integrate systems. This allows small teams to run operations that previously required entire departments.

The result may be a new form of company: a few human beings define the direction, the culture, the relationships and the high-impact decisions, supported by hundreds or thousands of digital agents that carry out research, development, marketing, finance, customer service and operations.

This shift need not produce only smaller companies. It may produce a far greater number of companies. The capital required to test a hypothesis falls; the speed of iteration rises; niches that were once unviable begin to be served economically; and teams can be born global.

Yochai Benkler showed, in his study of free software, that production can occur outside the traditional dichotomy between market and corporate hierarchy. With more powerful coordination tools, temporary organizations, networks of specialists and productive communities may become even more relevant.

The boundary between employee, entrepreneur, independent professional and participant in a productive community may become less rigid. Work may organize itself around projects and reputations, with structures that arise to solve a problem and dissolve when they cease to be useful.

Who turns capability into progress · 8

Competition: how efficiency becomes distributed prosperity

Falling costs benefit the majority only when new entrants can come into the market, challenge established firms and compete for consumers.

A society may possess extraordinary technology and yet distribute few benefits if its markets are closed, concentrated or protected. Cost reduction is only a

technical possibility. Competition is the mechanism that turns that possibility into lower prices, higher quality and wider access.

Established firms have incentives to protect their positions, acquire competitors, influence rules and raise the cost of entry. Rules presented as protection can become barriers that only large organizations are able to meet. The result is less experimentation and weaker pressure to pass on the gains of efficiency.

William Baumol distinguished productive entrepreneurship, which creates innovation and value, from unproductive or destructive activities, such as the pursuit of privileges and the capture of rents. Entrepreneurial energy exists in every society; what changes is the activity in which it is most rewarded. When navigating bureaucracy is worth more than serving customers, talent is diverted from creation to influence.

The logic appropriate to abundance is not to pick winners, but to remove obstacles to entry, preserve freedom of contract and prevent any agent from turning a temporary advantage into a permanent barrier to competition. The creative destruction described by Schumpeter and formalized by Aghion and Howitt depends on the possibility of the new replacing the old.

This process is uncomfortable because companies, careers and technologies lose value. Protecting every existing structure would interrupt the mechanism that creates future prosperity. Protection should focus on people during the transition, not on preventing inefficient organizations from being replaced.

Without competition, efficiency can turn into margin and concentration. With competition, it turns into lower prices, innovation and access.

From bits to atoms: health, food, energy and physical production

Digital abundance will be only the beginning. The material rise in living standards will depend on the combination of intelligence, machines, biology, materials and energy.

AI already reduces the cost of informational tasks, but much of life remains subject to the cost of atoms: housing, energy, food, transport, infrastructure, medicines and in-person care. The most profound social transformation will occur when cheap intelligence crosses that frontier.

In medicine, models can organize the scientific literature, identify patterns, assist diagnoses, contribute to the development of molecules and personalize treatments. AI does not replace clinical validation, medical judgment or human responsibility. It multiplies the number of hypotheses that can be explored and shortens the time between a question and an experiment.

In agriculture, sensors, robotics, climate forecasting, genetics and intelligent logistics can raise productivity while using less water, land, fertilizer and energy. Producing more is only part of the problem; forecasting demand, reducing losses and coordinating distribution also generate abundance.

In construction and manufacturing, robots, new materials, advanced printing and AI-generated designs can reduce costs and timelines. In energy, gains in generation, storage and efficiency feed everything else: cheaper computing, more efficient transport and automated production at greater scale.

The convergence is multiplicative. AI accelerates science; science produces better materials and energy sources; energy expands computing and robotics; and robotics carries intelligence into the physical world. The result may be far greater than the isolated sum of these technologies.

Digital abundance will probably arrive before physical abundance. But when cheap intelligence, abundant energy and autonomous machines begin to act

together, the cost of essential goods may fall structurally. It is at that moment that even those who are not at the frontier of individual productivity will feel the transformation in everyday life.

3 From bureaucracy to distributed coordination

From bureaucracy to distributed coordination · 10

The visible and invisible cost of the State

The decisive critique lies not only in the waste we are able to measure, but also in the companies, the solutions and the choices that never come into existence.

The thesis defended in this essay is radical: the State does not create the wealth it distributes. It collects, regulates, controls and spends resources previously produced by individuals and organizations. Before it can finance any policy, someone must work, invest, innovate, sell and generate the income that will be taxed.

Even when the State delivers a public work or an apparently useful service, the correct comparison is not between the state delivery and the absence of any delivery. It is between that delivery and all the alternatives that could have been created with the capital, the time and the intelligence taken from society. This counterfactual is invisible.

We see the infrastructure that is built. We do not see the companies that were never born, the investments that never occurred, the products that were never developed, the time consumed by compliance with obligations or the talent shifted from production to bureaucracy.

Public choice theory, developed by James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, rejects the idea that political agents abandon their interests and incentives upon entering government. William Niskanen showed how bureaucracies can seek to expand their budgets and power. Mancur Olson explained how

organized groups obtain concentrated benefits whose costs are distributed across the whole of society.

These mechanisms help explain why programs rarely disappear, agencies preserve their functions and rules accumulate in layers. In the market, an organization that fails to deliver value loses customers and capital. In bureaucracy, a poor result can justify more budget, new rules and additional structures.

The larger and more regulatory the State becomes, the more resources it absorbs from productive activity. Small entrepreneurs are especially harmed, since they lack the legal and administrative teams capable of handling the complexity. Regulation can thus protect established firms and turn political power into an economic barrier.

From bureaucracy to distributed coordination • 11

Why a central AGI does not solve the planning problem

A more intelligent machine does not eliminate dispersed knowledge, individual preferences or the danger of the concentration of power.

It would be a mistake to conclude that, if the human State is inefficient, a central AGI could finally plan society correctly. This would merely replace a limited bureaucracy with a potentially far more powerful sovereign.

Hayek showed that the problem of planning is not merely a lack of computational capacity. Much of the relevant knowledge is local, tacit, changeable and embedded in the choices of individuals. Preferences do not form a static database; they arise, change and are discovered in the course of action itself.

An AGI can process more information and simulate consequences, but it should not be granted the authority to define a single welfare function and compel everyone to follow it. Aggregate efficiency does not substitute for freedom, the diversity of ends or the right to disagree.

The most promising contribution of AGI is the opposite of centralization. It can make individuals, companies and communities capable of negotiating, assessing risks, creating contracts, resolving conflicts and coordinating projects directly. Instead of one intelligence deciding on behalf of the collective, millions of intelligences could help individuals, companies and communities cooperate.

Markets and decentralized choices do not exist because human beings are omniscient. They exist because they allow parallel experimentation, feedback and correction. AI can make these mechanisms faster and better informed without replacing them with a single plan.

AGI should not centralize society with more intelligence. It should allow society to decentralize with less friction.

From bureaucracy to distributed coordination · 12

The State disaggregated function by function

The transcending of the State becomes more convincing when imagined as the gradual replacement of services, rather than as the instantaneous disappearance of every form of organization.

The State arose as a historical response to high costs of information, trust and coordination. Functions such as registering identities and property, resolving disputes, financing infrastructure, providing protection and organizing large populations required centralized structures. Technology can alter the cost of these functions.

Verifiable identity, reputation, certification, payments, insurance, arbitration, education, assistance and infrastructure can be organized by multiple providers and protocols. Artificial intelligence can compare contracts, detect fraud, evaluate performance and help people choose among alternatives.

Elinor Ostrom documented forms of community governance that do not fit the dichotomy between State and market. David Friedman explored the possibility of providing legal services, arbitration and protection on a competitive basis. Ronald Coase showed that institutional form depends on transaction costs. When those costs change, the boundary between hierarchy, market and cooperation shifts as well.

The possible trajectory would be: monopoly, parallel experimentation, competition, choice and obsolescence. A state function loses centrality when alternative solutions offer more trust, lower cost and better adaptation. The process repeats itself, function by function.

In this scenario, the State would not disappear because a revolution destroyed its seat of power or because an AGI decreed its end. It would be hollowed out as people ceased to need it. The structure would remain for some time, but it would lose usefulness, resources and legitimacy.

This is a future and almost utopian vision. Today, many functions still lack mature substitutes. The value of the hypothesis lies not in pretending that the transition would be simple, but in abandoning the premise that the state monopoly constitutes a permanent condition of civilization.

The State will not be transcended as a single structure. It may be disaggregated and replaced, function by function, until it becomes irrelevant.

From bureaucracy to distributed coordination · 13

Freedom, the right of exit and preventing the algorithmic sovereign

A technically superior coordination may be incompatible with freedom. The architecture must prevent any center, human or artificial, from becoming incontestable.

A post-state network cannot rest on a single model, a single company, a single protocol or a single set of values. Intelligent systems can reproduce biases, suffer manipulation or capture and be used to predict and control behavior on an unprecedented scale.

The defense against this risk is structural: a plurality of agents, auditable code and rules, interoperability, privacy, competition, the possibility of appeal and the right of exit. A decision must be open to challenge; a community must be able to adopt another system; and a protocol must be able to be replaced or forked.

The most radical thesis is not to swap rulers for machines. It is to build an architecture in which no person, organization or intelligence can monopolize coordination. This requires that technical power be distributed and that individuals preserve spaces of autonomy not subject to collective optimization.

The right of exit is especially important. Freedom does not consist merely in taking part in the choice of a ruler or an algorithm. It consists in being able to leave a relationship, choose another provider, join another community and refuse a system without losing one's own standing as a person.

The collective intelligence of the future can incorporate different scientific, economic, philosophical and moral perspectives. Its components must disagree, audit one another and reveal their assumptions. The quality of coordination will arise less from a claim to perfection than from the permanent capacity for correction.

Coordination without command requires plurality, contestation and the right of exit.

Protection and social transition without a state monopoly

A society without a State need not be a society without solidarity. Abundance can finance a protection that is closer, plural and subject to accountability.

Technological progress will be uneven. Some people will adapt quickly; others will lose their jobs, face limitations or simply not wish to compete at the frontier of productivity. A vision of freedom cannot ignore vulnerability, illness, childhood, old age or economic transitions.

The difference lies in not confusing solidarity with a state monopoly. Foundations, endowments, insurance, mutual-aid societies, community networks, educational scholarships and mechanisms of collective financing can offer protection without depending on a single, distant bureaucracy.

In an economy with much greater production and lower costs, ensuring dignified conditions becomes relatively cheaper. Protection can be designed as a bridge to autonomy, education and reintegration, rather than as a permanent relationship of dependence administered by structures interested in their own expansion.

During the transition, while the State still exists, support policies should focus on people, not on the artificial preservation of jobs, companies or sectors. Their function would be to enable the shift toward more productive activities, not to freeze the previous economy.

On the post-state horizon, the diversity of mechanisms allows for tailored solutions. Organizations that fail can lose resources and trust; donors and participants can move elsewhere; and results can be compared. Solidarity ceases to be a justification for concentration and becomes a field of social innovation.

The VBF Fund, described below, is a small example of this logic: perennial private capital, focused governance and direct support for institutions and young people, without the need to build an extensive operational structure.

4 Building the future

Building the future · 15

Forming millions of builders

Education should not prepare young people merely to fill jobs. It should enable them to create companies, technologies, projects and institutions that do not yet exist.

To say that we need more people like Elon Musk or Steve Jobs does not mean reproducing their personalities, their leadership styles or their trajectories. It means multiplying qualities such as curiosity, first-principles thinking, ambition, tolerance for risk, the ability to bring people together and the discipline to execute.

The goal is not to discover a few geniuses destined to become celebrities. It is to build an environment in which millions of ordinary people can accomplish exceptional things. A builder can be a founder, a scientist, an engineer, a designer, an investor, an operator, a teacher or the leader of a small organization that solves a real problem.

AI makes this ambition more plausible because it offers every young person an additional layer of capability. It allows them to study, program, design, research, produce prototypes, test hypotheses, simulate markets and converse with specialized assistants. What once required a team and a great deal of capital can begin with a single person and a well-formulated idea.

But the tool does not provide direction. Education must develop the judgment needed to choose relevant problems, the ethics to understand consequences,

the courage to act and the humility to correct mistakes. It must unite technology, economics, science, communication and practical experience.

Real projects are essential. Young people need to experience the difference between an interesting idea and a solution that works; between writing a plan and convincing someone to use it; between starting and finishing. Execution teaches constraints, responsibility and cooperation in a way that no lecture can replace.

A society that forms millions of builders creates a distributed mechanism for solving problems. Not everyone will found global companies, but the greater the number of people with agency, the greater the probability that new solutions, jobs, markets and scientific advances will emerge.

We do not merely want to prepare young people for the future. We want to form millions of people capable of creating it.

Building the future · 16

The VBF Fund as intergenerational infrastructure

Perennial capital, aligned institutions and direct scholarships can form a cycle in which each generation widens the opportunities of the next.

The Verre Busnello Fernandes Fund for Technology Education and Opportunities, the VBF Fund, is born as the practical translation of the ideas in this essay. Its role will not be to operate a large educational structure, but to direct perennial capital to Brazilian organizations that are already building the education of the future.

The first front will be to support foundations and institutions aligned with an education grounded in technology, artificial intelligence, applied science, entrepreneurship, intellectual autonomy and execution. Perennial capital will

allow these organizations to plan over generational horizons, preserve quality and expand their reach without depending solely on short fundraising cycles.

The second front will be to grant scholarships directly to young people with talent, ambition and the capacity to deliver who, because of financial limitations, would not otherwise have access to institutions such as Inteli, the Link School of Business and other colleges with models oriented toward technology, innovation and entrepreneurship.

A scholarship represents more than the payment of tuition. It represents access to a repertoire of knowledge, teachers, peers, mentors, projects, networks and opportunities. A young person needs to see possibilities in order to pursue them, and needs to enter the environments in which the new economy is being created.

The model gains strength when it ceases to be a one-way relationship between donor and beneficiary. Scholarship recipients can become mentors, founders, investors and future supporters. The companies created by participants can generate jobs, finance new projects and give knowledge back to the ecosystem.

The desired cycle is continuous: perennial capital finances education; education forms builders; builders create companies and projects; those initiatives generate wealth and impact; and part of that value returns as mentorship, financing and new educational opportunities. The endowment is perennial, but the impact must also become self-replicating.

The VBF Fund should maintain a lean structure, clear governance and metrics tied to real results: young people educated, projects completed, companies created, jobs generated, scientific advances, economic mobility and the contribution of former scholarship recipients to the generations that follow.

Conclusion: from scarcity to autonomy

The deepest promise of artificial intelligence is not to produce a society without people, but a society in which far more people have the capacity to learn, create and choose.

The debate about artificial intelligence usually begins with fear: how many jobs will disappear, which skills will lose value, which powers will be concentrated and how existing institutions will manage to control the change. These risks are real, but they do not exhaust the question.

The more ambitious question is what we will do with all the intelligence and all the productivity that will be created. We will be able to use them to reduce the cost of essentials, widen access to medicine and education, produce more food, accelerate science and allow small teams to build solutions of global reach.

Artificial intelligence turns knowledge into a far more abundant resource. Education turns that intelligence into human capability. Entrepreneurship turns capability into products, companies and progress. Competition turns progress into lower prices, higher quality and distributed prosperity.

Not everyone will become superproductive. They do not need to. If production and supply grow, if costs fall and if competition prevents a few agents from capturing the benefits, the majority will be able to live better. For those who face hardship, abundance will make possible mechanisms of transition and protection that are more effective and less costly.

The same reduction of costs can reach social coordination. AGI does not need to govern humanity. It can allow individuals and communities to cooperate without depending on a permanent center of power. If state functions are replaced, one by one, by superior solutions, the State may disappear not through rupture, but through irrelevance.

This future will not be created automatically by technology. It will depend on people with will, judgment, courage and the capacity to execute. That is why

education stands at the center of this vision, and it is also why the VBF Fund must invest in the forming of millions of builders.

Perhaps the greatest advances of the coming decades will not be answers to questions we already know how to ask, but possibilities we cannot yet imagine. The future will be built by those who have the freedom to think, the capacity to learn and the courage to turn vision into reality.

References

- ACEMOGLU, Daron; JOHNSON, Simon. Power and Progress: Our Thousand-Year Struggle Over Technology and Prosperity. New York: PublicAffairs, 2023.
- ACEMOGLU, Daron; RESTREPO, Pascual. Artificial Intelligence, Automation and Work. NBER Working Paper No. 24196, 2018.
- AGHION, Philippe; HOWITT, Peter. A Model of Growth through Creative Destruction. *Econometrica*, v. 60, n. 2, p. 323-351, 1992.
- BAUMOL, William J. Entrepreneurship: Productive, Unproductive, and Destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*, v. 98, n. 5, p. 893-921, 1990.
- BENKLER, Yochai. Coase's Penguin, or, Linux and The Nature of the Firm. *Yale Law Journal*, v. 112, p. 369-446, 2002.
- BLOOM, Benjamin S. The 2 Sigma Problem: The Search for Methods of Group Instruction as Effective as One-to-One Tutoring. *Educational Researcher*, v. 13, n. 6, p. 4-16, 1984.
- BRYNJOLFSSON, Erik; McAfee, Andrew. The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies. New York: W. W. Norton, 2014.
- BRYNJOLFSSON, Erik; ROCK, Daniel; SYVERSON, Chad. Artificial Intelligence and the Modern Productivity Paradox. NBER Working Paper No. 24001, 2017.
- BUCHANAN, James M.; TULLOCK, Gordon. The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- COASE, Ronald H. The Nature of the Firm. *Economica*, v. 4, n. 16, p. 386-405, 1937.
- DIAMANDIS, Peter H.; KOTLER, Steven. Abundance: The Future Is Better Than You Think. New York: Free Press, 2012.
- FRIEDMAN, David D. The Machinery of Freedom: Guide to a Radical Capitalism. 2. ed. La Salle: Open Court, 1989. Obra publicada originalmente em 1973.
- HAYEK, Friedrich A. The Use of Knowledge in Society. *American Economic Review*, v. 35, n. 4, p. 519-530, 1945.

- KURZWEIL, Ray. *The Singularity Is Nearer: When We Merge with AI*. New York: Viking, 2024.
- McCLOSKEY, Deirdre Nansen. *Bourgeois Dignity: Why Economics Can't Explain the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- MOKYR, Joel. *A Culture of Growth: The Origins of the Modern Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.
- NISKANEN, William A. *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.
- NORTH, Douglass C. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- OLSON, Mancur. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- OSTROM, Elinor. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- PINKER, Steven. *Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*. New York: Viking, 2018.
- SCHUMPETER, Joseph A. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.
- SHANNON, Claude E. *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*. *Bell System Technical Journal*, v. 27, 1948.
- SIMON, Herbert A. *The Sciences of the Artificial*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1969.
- TURING, Alan M. *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*. *Mind*, v. 59, n. 236, p. 433-460, 1950.
- WIENER, Norbert. *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1948.
- WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION. *Regulatory Considerations on Artificial Intelligence for Health*. Geneva: WHO, 2023.
- FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS. *The State of Food and Agriculture 2022: Leveraging Automation in Agriculture for Transforming Agrifood Systems*. Rome: FAO, 2022.