

Reflections on Currency, Power, and Inequality

Darshan P.

1749236923

Do we even need to have answers to questions like:

“Should a currency solve wealth inequality?”

Because most people would argue – a currency only needs to be a medium of exchange: portable, divisible, limited, and non-forgable. But that’s just the surface.

What happens when the same currency begins to decide the lives and futures of millions for the generations to come?

Isn’t that when we need to go beyond technical definitions and start asking deeper questions – like *how should it be distributed?* Shouldn’t we define a currency not just by how it works, but by what kind of society it creates?

Because if we don’t, we end up with systems shaped by the Cantillon Effect – where those closest to money creation benefit first, and the rest just chase after leftovers. And when such currencies are backed by “temporarily halted gold” or “trust in the state,” that trust gets exploited – again – by a small group of elites. Isn’t that just another kind of Ponzi, slow and systemic?

And if that’s true, then I’m sorry – but **Bitcoin doesn’t solve this problem either.**

Yes, Bitcoin removes the need for a central monetary authority—or at least it appears to. In practice you still need KYC to use an exchange, and that KYC makes transactions traceable. That is acceptable, because you are moving from a centralized on-ramp to a decentralized realm of transactions. The real challenge is that Bitcoin has become a speculative asset.

Yes, the supply is capped, and the white paper notes that no “central authority” issues the coins, comparing miners’ computation to gold mining. Certainly, Bitcoin—or any other cryptocurrency—is not issued by a central bank. But isn’t that similar to a “paper” currency issued by a small group of people in my town? On-chain data show that ownership is

concentrated in a few groups. They do not even have the liquidity to sell in the open market, because the average person owns almost none. Many of these coins sit in investment-firm or custodian wallets. To me, that sounds like they are fooling their own clients: if the traditional financial system collapses, how will they liquidate?

Let's be honest—since the very beginning, the top 1% have held nearly 90% of the total supply. Bitcoin never really addressed who gets access or how value is shared. Yes, you can fork the Bitcoin code and run your own network, but such a chain is likely to be attacked by networks with far greater hash power, at least in its early stages. Worse, if everyone starts forking the code, Bitcoin risks losing its standing as a currency or store of value.

And so we arrive at the real, uncomfortable question:

We're all born on this planet. So why don't we all deserve equal opportunities and equal access to the resources and systems that shape our lives?

That's where the real purpose of questioning starts – not just to complain about broken systems, but to imagine and create a new one. One that doesn't just solve *technical* problems, but also tackles *social distribution* and *power imbalance*.

But, before we even go there – I'm stuck with two questions that won't leave me:

1. Do we even need to build such a system?

Because honestly, people can be easily manipulated. The psychology of group masses has already been exploited and can be perfected even more. Maybe giving everyone equal opportunity is a dangerous illusion. As per Edward Bernays, in fact I believe there was a big community of people who worked as PR and successfully managed to orchestrate Bitcoin, although it wasn't even close to solving the “currency” challenges but indeed a revolution. However, it fails to achieve what is often publicly “orchestrated or PR,” which indeed proves one way or another it is possible to exploit masses by a very few individuals thanks to the “education system which fails to make people question deeply,” and through history I failed to find if people were smart enough to question anything at all – they love to follow only. And if that is going to happen, eventually what is the point of all this?

2. But if we say “yes, we do need change,” then what are we even trying to build?

What's the goal? What are we chasing? And more importantly – *at what cost?* What kind of world do we want to create, and are we even ready for it? Aren't rats born to run and struggle their whole life while the cat feasts alone?

So, what conclusion are we even trying to draw from all these questions? I'm fond of asking philosophical, first-principles questions, but I also want a substantial conclusion.

From my limited perspective, whether you call it capitalism, communism, socialism, or even a lobby-serving democracy, one thing never disappears: the “greed factor.”

A small group of individuals will always try to consolidate power. Picture this: I start mining Bitcoin and convince you it is “digital gold.” Because I hold most of the coins, I can now trade them for whatever I need to survive—farmland, houses, even water.

People often say, “The richest on the planet don't pay taxes.” That's partly because they don't actually hold much cash. The real issue is the politicians who *do* hold large cash positions. Why do they keep so much? Greed—to own. You can never underestimate or ignore that motive.

We may never reach true equality, even after revolutions like the French Revolution or civil wars. Whether it's the bourgeoisie or the proletariat, power tends to flow from the many to the few.

So, what should we do? “Adapt”.

Adapt is more than passive survival—it is a tit-for-tat strategy. To wield it effectively, you must first grasp how power really operates. I've dived into Ludwig von Mises' *Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth* (https://cdn.mises.org/economic_calculation_in_the_socialist_commonwealth.pdf) and W. Paul Cockshott and Allin Cottrell's *Towards a New Socialism* (https://web.archive.org/web/20141117115309/http://ricardo.ecn.wfu.edu/~cottrell/socialism_book/new_socialism.pdf). Both outline bold alternatives to capitalist norms—but theory rarely survives contact with entrenched interests.

In 2000, President Clinton signed legislation granting China permanent normal trade relations, a prerequisite for China's WTO accession in 2001. Proponents argued this would expand U.S. exports and strengthen global trade, but industry lobbying and geopolitical considerations played a major role. U.S. firms expected market access, while critics noted stark differences in labor standards and state support for Chinese enterprises. This case shows that theoretical economic models often encounter practical pressures—political interests, lobbying, and regulatory disparities can shift outcomes. When I say *adapt*, I mean: anticipate these dynamics and design systems accordingly.