

EVAN

*A New Economic Operating System*

## THE POSSIBILITIES

by **Jeff Evans**

Montgomery, Alabama · 2026

1.334.245.3917 | [jeff@buildevan.com](mailto:jeff@buildevan.com) | [buildevan.com](http://buildevan.com)

## PREAMBLE

### The Shared Conviction

Put the right people in a room and ask whether the current trajectory is sustainable. They say no. Ask whether something structural needs to change. They say yes. These are not radicals or pessimists. They are among the most successful people in the world — people who understand how systems work, who have built things that matter, and who are watching the same horizon with the same quiet concern.

The trajectory they're watching is not complicated. Machines and AI are displacing workers — not in one industry, not in one country, not in one skill category, but horizontally, simultaneously, across every sector of the global economy at once. This has never happened before. Every previous technology disruption replaced one kind of work and created adjacent opportunities for the people it displaced. Steam replaced muscle. Software replaced clerical work. Each time, new industries absorbed the displacement over time, and the economy moved forward. This time is different. AI doesn't replace one category of work and leave the others intact. The truck driver and the radiologist and the paralegal and the software engineer are not facing the same problem at different speeds. They are facing the same problem at the same time. There is no adjacent industry to retrain into when the displacement is horizontal across every sector at once.

The productivity gains are extraordinary. The question of who captures them is the most important economic question of the next twenty years — and it is being answered right now, by default, in the architecture of the systems being built.

***The problem is not the diagnosis. The diagnosis is already shared. The problem is that no one has yet put a concrete mechanism on the table that is equal to the scale of what's coming.***

This paper is about that mechanism.

## MOVEMENT ONE

### Two Futures

There are only two ways this ends. Not two ideologies, not two political platforms — two futures, each one a direct consequence of decisions being made right now. It is worth looking at both of them clearly, without sentiment, before discussing which one is still available to us.

#### ***The first future.***

It is 2038. The transition is largely complete. AI manages most cognitive work. Robotics has absorbed most physical labor. The economy is producing wealth at a scale that would have seemed implausible a decade earlier — Elon Musk's ten-times economy arrived roughly on schedule, perhaps faster. The numbers are staggering. The aggregate is extraordinary.

But aggregate wealth and distributed wealth are different things. In this future, the ownership of the machines that generate the wealth was never broadly distributed — because the infrastructure to distribute it was never built. The gains flowed to the people who owned the assets when the transition accelerated. That was a small group. It was always going to be a small group without deliberate intervention, because asset ownership at the start of the transition was already concentrated, and nothing in the architecture of the transition was designed to change that.

The majority of people in this future are not starving. UBI exists in various forms across most developed nations. The check arrives. The lights stay on. But the check is not ownership. It is a stipend — enough to survive outside the productive economy, not enough to participate in it. And the thing that a stipend cannot replace is not just income. It is purpose. Identity. The sense that the system is working for you, not merely tolerating you.

A stipend has one more structural flaw that the policy debate almost never names: it has no end-game. Universal Basic Income, in every form it has been proposed, is a permanent obligation. The check goes out this month and next month and in thirty years, because nothing in the design creates the conditions under which it is no longer needed. The family receiving it in year one is just as dependent in year twenty. There is no sustainability horizon. There is no mechanism by which the transfer becomes unnecessary, no graduation point, no moment at which the government's role ends because the family's ownership has begun. The liability is permanent by design — because the instrument was never meant to build anything. It was meant to maintain.

Evan is designed around the opposite logic. Every participant has a sustainability horizon — the specific point at which the income from their portfolio exceeds their monthly living expenses and they are self-sufficient through ownership rather than transfer. That crossing point is the goal the system is

engineered to reach. If a government chose to accelerate it — subsidizing early portfolio contributions for lower-income participants the way it might fund infrastructure — it would be making a finite investment with a defined end state. Help a family build a sustainable portfolio and the income continues without another dollar of public support. The government's role ends. The family's income does not.

A stipend maintains dependency indefinitely. A portfolio eliminates it permanently. These are not two versions of the same idea. They are opposite architectures with opposite destinations.

If large groups of people are left out of economic participation, history is consistent about what happens next. It happened after the Industrial Revolution concentrated gains in the hands of factory owners. It happened in the 1930s when the last great technological and financial disruption left enough people economically purposeless long enough. It does not require a majority to be destitute. It requires enough people to feel permanently excluded from an economy they can see generating wealth all around them. At that point, the social trust that makes civilization function — the shared conviction that the system is legitimate, that playing by the rules is worth it — breaks. What follows is not orderly. It is not negotiated. It does not respect the portfolios of the people who won.

The wealth in this future turns out not to be durable. The few who hold it discover what every ruling class in history has eventually discovered: that prosperity built on exclusion requires more and more energy to defend, until it doesn't.

That distinction — between a transfer that maintains dependency and an architecture that ends it — is exactly what separates the two futures worth considering.

### ***The second future.***

It is also 2038. The same machines exist. The same AI. The same extraordinary productive capacity. The transition happened at roughly the same speed. The difference is not the technology. It is one decision that was made early enough to matter: the ownership infrastructure was built before the transition completed.

Not a government program. Not a redistribution scheme. Not a tax on the winners and a check to the losers. A platform — open, competitive, governed by principles embedded in its architecture rather than in agreements that could be renegotiated — that made it possible for any person, anywhere, with any amount of capital, to own a piece of the machines reshaping the world.

The factory worker who saw the robot coming didn't fight it. He bought into it — a few dollars a month into microshares of the warehouse robotics fleet his employer was deploying. The income from those shares grew as the fleet grew. By the time his job was gone, the assets that replaced him were paying him. Not enough to replicate his salary at first. Enough to matter. Enough to compound. Enough to give him a stake in the economy that replaced his labor rather than a check from the economy that discarded it.

---

***You do not burn down what you own. You do not cheer for the disruption of systems your family's future depends on.***

That story, multiplied by hundreds of millions of people across every sector and every country, changed the political calculus of the transition entirely. People with ownership positions in the productive economy do not vote to burn it down. They do not radicalize around leaders who promise to take from the other side, because the other side is also their business partner. The geopolitical map looks different when a farmer in Kenya, a logistics worker in Vietnam, and a retired teacher in Ohio all hold microshares in the same global infrastructure assets.

The second future is not a utopia. There is still inequality. There is still failure and fraud and disappointment alongside the success. The transition is still hard. But the direction is stable. The system did not take from Peter to pay Paul, it gave Paul a seat at the table. The mechanism is legitimate. The social contract held — not because anyone was generous enough to give it away, but because the right infrastructure was built at the right time and made inclusion the default rather than the exception.

### ***A third future?***

There is a third future worth considering.

In this one, the displacement doesn't come — or doesn't come as severely as the first two futures assume. The ten-times economy arrives on schedule, but people adapt faster than expected. The displaced logistics worker uses AI to start a small business and brings four former colleagues with him. New industries emerge. The labor market adjusts. The optimists are vindicated.

But even in this third future, there are still people at the edges — people who can press their face against the glass and watch the ten-times economy without ever being invited inside. Not because the system failed. Because the on-ramp was never built wide enough.

Now ask the harder question: if this third future — the best-case future — chose to build Evan anyway, chose to make ownership the default rather than the exception, what would that world look like? Not just better. Categorically different. A world where prosperity is not a spectator sport.

Evan is not only a response to displacement. It is the infrastructure that completes capitalism's promise — in any future, under any conditions.

## **MOVEMENT TWO**

### **The Mechanism**

---

***The architecture of a dream — turning a dream into a goal, and a goal into reality.***

The difference between those two futures is not technological. Every component required to build the ownership infrastructure already exists. Fractional ownership of productive assets has worked for sixty years in real estate. Diversified asset bundles have been standard investment products for thirty years. Distributed ledger technology, AI validation systems, conversational interfaces — all deployed at scale today.

What has never existed is the integration. A single open platform, governed by immutable principles, on which any productive asset — a robotaxi fleet, a warehouse robot, an agricultural module, an energy microgrid, a small business — can be packaged into microshares and made accessible to any participant at any scale, from a few dollars a month to a few million.

That platform is Evan.

Evan is not a charity and it is not a government program. It is a market — open, competitive, and anti-capture — designed on a simple premise: the income-producing assets of the global economy should be ownable by anyone willing to participate, at whatever scale they can manage, without requiring prior wealth, credentials, or connections to get started.

The mechanics are straightforward. An asset is packaged as an RFE — a REIT for Everything. Microshares are issued. Participants buy in for whatever they can afford. The asset generates income. The income is distributed proportionally, after reserves for maintenance, replacement, and platform operations are set aside. Participants reinvest by default, compounding their ownership over time. The assets work whether they do or not.

At global scale — and Evan is designed for global scale from the first day — the mathematics of small become extraordinary. Billions of people contributing even a few dollars a month into productive asset ownership generates an ownership base that changes the structure of the economy. Not through redistribution. Through participation.

Evan is not only a platform for owning existing assets. It is an incubator for new ones. Any participant with an idea — for a product, a service, a piece of infrastructure, a business that doesn't exist yet — can bring that idea to Evan and have it developed, stress-tested, validated, and funded without surrendering ownership to the people with the capital to back it. The entrepreneur who could never get a meeting with a venture capitalist now has access to a global pool of microshare investors and an AI system that stress-tests her idea against thousands of economic scenarios before a dollar is committed. The ideas that are dying unhatched today because the people who have them don't have the connections or the capital to act on them — those ideas enter the economy. At scale, that is not a ten-times economy. It is something considerably larger than that.

## **MOVEMENT THREE**

---

## The Moment

Every major technological transition in modern history has ended in redistribution. The only variable is whether that redistribution was designed or forced.

The Industrial Revolution was eventually followed by labor laws, unions, progressive taxation, and the social safety net — not because the factory owners volunteered them, but because the alternative was worse. The 1930s produced the New Deal, and in countries where nothing like it emerged, it produced something considerably darker. In each case, the voluntary version — the designed redistribution — was available earlier than it arrived. The window was open. It closed. What came after was more expensive, more painful, and less elegant than what could have been built when the window was still open.

***The window is open right now. The transition is underway but not complete. The social trust is strained but not broken.***

The political will to build something new still exists alongside the capital and the capability to build it. The people who understand the trajectory most clearly — who have built the technologies accelerating it, who have studied the historical patterns it echoes, who have spent careers thinking about how systems fail and what makes them durable — those people are in a position to act that no subsequent generation will have.

That window is measured in years. Not decades.

The question this paper is asking is not whether Evan is a good idea. The architecture is documented. The stress tests are published. The mechanics work at any scale. The question is whether the people who understand what is coming are willing to act on that understanding while the designed version is still available. No one can predict when displacement will be massive enough to cause social unrest. But Evan is a good idea even if displacement never happens. It provides the on-ramp that capitalism needs for everyone to be able to participate. It removes the argument for socialism and communism. We are already seeing AI enable one- and two-person businesses generating wealth that once required organizations of hundreds. That is not a trend. It is a preview. Evan is the infrastructure that ensures that preview becomes available to everyone — not as a promise, but as the on-ramp that capitalism always needed and never built.

Evan does not need a government. It does not need a revolution. It needs a small number of people who see the problem clearly, believe the mechanism is sound, and are willing to commit the capability and the resources to build it before the window closes.

The full architecture — the mechanics, the governance, and the honest accounting of every scenario in which it could fail — is in two companion papers at [buildevan.com](http://buildevan.com). They are written for people who will not be satisfied with a vision document alone. If this argument held, they are worth your time.

If the argument doesn't hold, you will know exactly where it breaks and why — and that conversation is equally worth having.

*Evan is not waiting for the right moment. The moment is here. It is waiting for the right people.*

## **Jeff Evans**

Montgomery, Alabama · 2026

1.334.245.3917 | [jeff@buildevan.com](mailto:jeff@buildevan.com) | [buildevan.com](http://buildevan.com)