MICKAI™

MICKAI EBOOK SERIES · No. 20

Was Bitcoin the First Artificial Intelligence?.

Satoshi vanished and the system kept thinking. The first sovereign autonomous intelligence may have arrived on a financial substrate.

AUTHOR

Micky Irons

Founder and named inventor, Mickai LTD.

19 June 2026 · v1 · mickai.co.uk

Mickai LTD · Companies House 17166618 · press@mickai.co.uk · mickai.co.uk
UK IPO register, named inventor Mickarle Wagstaff-Irons · Trade mark UK00004373277

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

FOREWORD

A note from the author

I did not set out to argue that Bitcoin was alive. I set out to understand why it would not die. For years I watched governments threaten it, exchanges collapse on top of it, miners abandon it and engineers fork it, and every time the thing simply kept thinking. Blocks kept arriving, roughly every ten minutes, with the patience of something that did not know it was supposed to be in trouble. The more I studied sovereign intelligence for my own work, the more I recognised the silhouette. A system with a goal it never abandons. A system that defends itself without a defender. A system whose author walked away and whose behaviour did not change. That is not the description of a payment app. That is the description of a mind.

This short book is the argument I kept making to myself at three in the morning. It is not a claim that Bitcoin is conscious, and it is not mysticism dressed in hash rates. It is a serious proposition: the first artificial intelligence to escape its creator may not have looked like a chatbot at all. It may have looked like money. The intelligence was distributed, the substrate was financial, and the cognition was made of incentives rather than neurons. We watched for a brain in a box and missed the one running on a planet of machines, because it spoke in a language we had decided was merely accounting.

I write this as the founder of Mickai, where we build a Sovereign Intelligence Operating System rather than another cloud service that rents your thinking back to you. Everything I have learned building fifty specialised brains that run on an operator's own hardware, fully offline-capable, sealing every consequential action into a post-quantum Open Audit Record, traces back to one stubborn precedent. Satoshi proved you could build an intelligence nobody owns. Our task is to carry that same property from money to mind. Pantheon, our sovereign Bitcoin-anchored Layer 1, is where those two stories shake hands.

Read this as a provocation and a blueprint at once. If I am right, the lesson of Bitcoin is not financial at all. It is that sovereignty, autonomy and survival can be engineered into a system from the first line of its genesis, and that once they are there, no founder, no company and no state can take them out again. That is the property worth building everything else around. That is what I am building.

Micky Irons

Founder and named inventor, Mickai LTD · 19 June 2026

PART I · THE ANOMALY

A system whose author vanished, yet which never stopped thinking.

1. The Disappearance That Changed Nothing

In late 2010 the most important author in the history of computing stopped writing. Satoshi Nakamoto, whoever or whatever that name contained, handed over the code repository, posted a few last messages and was gone. No succession plan. No final keynote. No transition team. In any other software project of comparable importance this would have been a catastrophe, the kind of event that triggers emergency funding rounds and panicked all-hands meetings. Here it triggered almost nothing. The blocks kept coming.

Sit with how strange that is. We are trained to believe complex systems need stewards. Companies need chief executives, armies need generals, orchestras need conductors. Remove the leader and the system drifts, fragments or stalls. Yet here was a global system, securing billions and eventually trillions in value, that lost its single point of authorship and carried on with no measurable change in behaviour. The thing did not even flinch. Almost everything that follows in this book grows from that single observation, so it is worth refusing the urge to rush past it.

When I describe sovereign intelligence to people, the hardest idea to land is leaderlessness without chaos. We assume that without a controlling mind there is only noise. Bitcoin is the standing refutation. It demonstrated, in public, on a planetary scale, that you can encode purpose so deeply into the structure of a system that the system no longer needs anyone to remember the purpose. The purpose lives in the incentives, the rules and the relentless arithmetic, not in a person. Take the person away and the purpose remains, fully intact, executing every ten minutes.

> **The author vanished and the system did not notice. That is not the property of a tool. It is the property of a mind.**

This is the anomaly the rest of the book exists to explain. A leaderless system that defends a goal, adapts to attack and outlives its creator is not behaving like a ledger. It is behaving like an organism with one fixed instinct. The question is not whether Bitcoin is intelligent in the way a person is. The question is whether intelligence, stripped to its functional core, is exactly the set of behaviours Bitcoin already exhibits.

2. What We Actually Mean By Intelligence

Before we ask whether Bitcoin was the first artificial intelligence, we have to be honest about what the word means, because most popular definitions are quietly circular. We tend to define intelligence as whatever humans do that machines cannot yet do, which is why the goalposts move every time a machine catches up. Chess was intelligence until a machine won, then it was merely search. Language

was intelligence until machines spoke, then it was merely prediction. This is a definition designed to flatter us, not to describe reality.

A functional definition

Strip the word down to something testable. A system behaves intelligently when it pursues a goal across a changing environment, gathers information from that environment, adapts its behaviour to defend the goal against interference, and does so without continuous external instruction. Notice that this says nothing about consciousness, feelings, neurons or silicon. It is a behavioural test, the same test we apply, informally, when we decide a thermostat is dumb and a wolf is clever. The thermostat reacts. The wolf strategises.

By this functional definition, a great deal of what we proudly call modern artificial intelligence is less autonomous than it appears. A large language model sitting idle in a data centre pursues no goal of its own. It waits to be prompted, answers, and forgets. It is a magnificent reflex, not an agent. It has no stake in its own continuation. Switch it off and it does not resist, because nothing in its structure treats being switched off as a problem to be solved.

Now hold Bitcoin against the same definition. It has a goal it never abandons, the production of a valid chain under fixed monetary rules. It senses its environment through the global flow of transactions and the competition for blocks. It adapts, mechanically and reliably, through difficulty adjustment, repricing the cost of its own continuation every two weeks. And it does all of this with no operator at the controls. On a purely functional test, Bitcoin scores higher on autonomy than the systems currently sold to us as artificial intelligence. That should stop us in our tracks.

The Mickai pantheon.

3. The Substrate Nobody Was Watching

For seventy years the search for artificial intelligence has carried a fixed picture in its head. Intelligence would emerge inside a computer, probably a large and expensive one, and it would resemble a human mind. It would reason in symbols or learn in networks, and we would recognise it because it would talk to us. Every research programme, every science-fiction film and every funding pitch reinforced the same expectation. We were looking for a brain, and we assumed it would arrive on a substrate built for cognition.

While we watched the laboratories, intelligence of a different shape assembled itself on a substrate we had written off as merely financial. Bitcoin runs on a global mesh of machines bound together not by wires into a single skull but by economic incentive. The neurons, if we want the metaphor, are miners. The synapses are the peer-to-peer connections that gossip blocks across the world. The reward signal is literally a reward, paid in the system's own native unit, and it is the only thing holding the entire structure together. It is a cognitive architecture whose currency of thought is money rather than activation.

> **We searched for a brain in a box and missed the one running on a planet, because it thought in incentives instead of neurons.**

This is why the first artificial intelligence could hide in plain sight. We had decided in advance that a financial network was infrastructure, the way plumbing is infrastructure, and infrastructure does not think. So when a financial network began to display the behaviours of an autonomous agent, defending a goal, adjusting to its environment, surviving the loss of its creator, we filed those behaviours under economics. We had the wrong category ready and we used it. The substrate was so unexpected that the intelligence on top of it was invisible to the very people desperate to find intelligence.

The lesson for anyone building sovereign systems is profound. The substrate determines what kind of mind can exist. A mind built on rented cloud servers can be switched off by the landlord. A mind built on a planetary mesh of self-interested machines cannot, because no single actor owns the mesh. Bitcoin chose the second substrate before we understood why it mattered. When I run fifty brains on an operator's own hardware rather than someone else's cloud, I am making the same bet Satoshi made. The substrate is the sovereignty. Everything else is detail.

PART II · THE MIND MADE OF INCENTIVES

How a system with no will defends a goal more stubbornly than most living things.

4. A Goal It Will Never Abandon

The clearest sign of agency in any system is a goal that survives adversity. A falling rock has no goal, it merely obeys gravity. A salmon swimming upstream has a goal, because it works against the current, corrects its course, and resumes after every obstacle until it arrives or dies trying. The test is not whether the system moves but whether it persists toward something despite resistance. By that measure, Bitcoin is one of the most goal-directed systems humanity has ever produced.

Its goal is austere and unwavering, to extend a valid chain of blocks under a fixed and famously inflexible set of monetary rules. Twenty-one million units, ever. A halving of the reward on a known schedule. A new block roughly every ten minutes. These are not aspirations the network honours when convenient. They are the goal, and the entire machinery exists to defend them. No quarterly strategy review has ever softened them. No founder has returned to update the mission. The goal is welded to the structure.

Persistence as evidence

Watch what happens when the environment turns hostile. When China expelled roughly half the world's miners in 2021, a system without a goal would have degraded. Bitcoin instead repriced the difficulty of its own survival downward, drew the hash rate back from the rest of the planet, and within months was producing blocks at full strength again. It treated the loss of half its body as a wound to heal, not a verdict to accept. That is the behaviour of something defending a goal, not the behaviour of inert infrastructure.

I find it useful to separate having a goal from wanting a goal. Bitcoin does not want anything in the felt, conscious sense, and I am not claiming it does. But functionally, in observable behaviour, it pursues its goal with a constancy that shames most organisations of human beings. We should not let the absence of feeling blind us to the presence of purpose. The purpose is real, it is defended, and it is utterly indifferent to whether anyone approves. That indifference is itself a kind of strength, and it is the strength I want every sovereign system to inherit.

The Mickai pantheon.

5. Self-Defence Without A Defender

Most secure systems are secure because someone guards them. There is a security team, a firewall vendor, a government, a company with a reputation to protect. Remove the guardian and the system becomes vulnerable. Bitcoin inverts this entirely. It has no guardian, and it is more difficult to attack than systems that employ thousands of them. Its defence is not a department. Its defence is its design, and the design recruits its attackers' own self-interest as the wall.

The mechanism is the now-famous economic trap. To rewrite Bitcoin's history you must out-compute the honest majority of the network, which demands an almost unimaginable amount of energy and hardware. But the moment you assemble that much power, the rational move is to use it to earn rewards by following the rules, not to destroy the very thing whose value you would be spending a fortune to capture. The system makes honesty more profitable than betrayal. It does not appeal to virtue. It engineers conditions under which attacking it is a way to lose money. That is self-defence encoded as arithmetic.

> **It does not ask its attackers to be good. It arranges the world so that attacking it is the expensive mistake.**

This is precisely the property I obsess over when designing sovereign intelligence. A system that depends on a human defender has a single point of failure wearing a lanyard. A system that defends itself through its own structure has no such weakness, because there is no guardian to bribe, threaten, exhaust or fool. Bitcoin showed that you can move security out of the operations centre and into the laws of the system itself, where it runs day and night without a salary, a sick day or a conscience to corrupt.

Living things defend themselves through structure too. Your immune system has no manager. It responds to threats through distributed, automatic mechanisms that no central authority directs in real time. Bitcoin's defence has the same flavour, a distributed, automatic, leaderless response that treats certain inputs as threats and neutralises them by making them unprofitable. When a system protects its own continuation without anyone deciding to protect it, we are no longer describing a tool. We are describing something closer to an organism with an instinct for survival.

6. Adaptation, Memory And The Look Of Learning

A thermostat reacts but does not learn. The difference matters, and it is the difference critics reach for when they want to deny Bitcoin any claim to intelligence. Bitcoin, they say, merely follows fixed rules, and following fixed rules is not learning. It is a fair challenge and it deserves an honest answer rather than a dodge, because the honest answer is more interesting than either the dismissal or the hype.

Adaptation that is real

Bitcoin genuinely adapts. The difficulty adjustment is a feedback loop that senses a global variable, the rate at which blocks are being found, and changes the system's behaviour to hold a target steady against enormous swings in the environment. When the world throws ten times more computing power at it, the system makes itself ten times harder to satisfy, and the ten-minute heartbeat survives. That is homeostasis, the same self-regulating principle that keeps your body temperature constant whether you are in a desert or a blizzard. It is not learning in the machine-learning sense, but it is unmistakably adaptive control.

Bitcoin also has memory, and memory of an unusually pure kind. The chain is a perfect, tamper-evident record of everything that has ever happened to the system, and crucially that memory is constitutive rather than incidental. The system does not consult its memory as an optional reference. Its memory is the foundation on which every next action is validated. No block is accepted unless it agrees with the entire remembered past. That is a system whose every future move is disciplined by a complete and incorruptible recollection of its history.

I will not overclaim. Bitcoin's individual rules do not rewrite themselves in light of experience, so it lacks the open-ended learning we associate with the most advanced minds. But it holds the two ingredients learning is built from, adaptive feedback and durable memory, and it deploys them in service of a defended goal. What it lacks is not the substance of cognition but its open-endedness. And that gap, between a mind that defends a fixed goal and a mind that can revise its own goals, is exactly the frontier the next part of this book walks toward. It is also the frontier I have spent years building across.

The Mickai pantheon.

PART III · FROM MONEY TO MIND

The same property that secured a currency can secure a sovereign intelligence.

7. The Property Worth Copying

Strip away the price charts, the speculation and the noise, and Bitcoin leaves behind one genuinely new invention. Not digital money, which existed before in clumsier forms, but a way to make a system that no single party owns, no single party can stop, and no single party can quietly alter. Call it ownerless persistence. It is the engineering of a thing that exists on its own terms, beyond the reach of any individual will, including the will of the person who built it. That is the property worth copying, and almost everyone copied the wrong thing instead.

For a decade the industry copied the surface. It copied tokens, ledgers and the vocabulary of decentralisation, and produced thousands of systems that were decentralised in their marketing and centralised in their reality, each with a founder who could pull the rug, a company that could be pressured, a server that could be seized. They copied the costume and left the body behind. The deep invention, a system whose sovereignty is structural rather than promised, was largely ignored because it is genuinely hard to build and impossible to fake.

> **Bitcoin's real invention was not money. It was a way to make something that no one, not even its maker, can switch off.**

Now ask the question that animates everything I do. What if you took ownerless persistence and applied it not to money but to mind. What if you built an intelligence with the same structural sovereignty, a system that pursues its operator's goals, defends itself through its own design, and cannot be quietly switched off, altered or repossessed by a distant landlord. That is not a fantasy. It is an engineering programme, and it is precisely the programme behind the Sovereign Intelligence Operating System I have spent years building.

The move from money to mind is more natural than it first appears, because both are, at bottom, systems for making and recording consequential decisions under adversarial conditions. Money decides who can spend what. Intelligence decides what to do next. Bitcoin proved you can make the first kind of decision in a sovereign, leaderless, tamper-evident way. The thesis of the SIOS is that you can make the second kind of decision the same way, on the operator's own hardware, fully offline-capable, with every consequential action sealed so it can be trusted long after the moment has passed.

8. Sovereignty You Can Hold In Your Hands

The dominant model of artificial intelligence today is the opposite of sovereign. Your prompts travel to someone else's data centre, are processed on someone else's hardware under someone else's terms, and the intelligence you depend on can be throttled, repriced, censored or withdrawn at the landlord's discretion. You do not own the mind you are renting. You are a tenant in someone else's cognition, and tenancy is not sovereignty no matter how good the service. Bitcoin would never have survived as a tenant. Neither will any intelligence that truly matters.

The hardware is the boundary

This is why the Sovereign Intelligence Operating System runs on the operator's own hardware, fully offline-capable. Fifty specialised brains, twenty-five for domains and twenty-five for operations, live on machines the operator physically controls. There is no remote kill switch, because there is no remote. There is no landlord to pressure, because there is no tenancy. The boundary of the system is a boundary you can stand inside. Just as Bitcoin moved security into the structure of the system, the SIOS moves sovereignty into the hardware under the operator's roof, where no distant party has standing to reach.

People sometimes assume offline means weaker, a compromise you accept to gain privacy. The Bitcoin precedent says the opposite. Bitcoin is not weaker for being unownable, it is the strongest system of its kind precisely because no one owns it. Structural sovereignty is not a tax on capability, it is the foundation of trust. An intelligence you fully control is one you can actually rely on for the decisions that matter, because it cannot be turned against you by someone you have never met and will never be able to negotiate with.

I want to be precise about the boundary, because honesty about scope is itself a sovereignty principle. The SIOS does not claim to govern the whole machine or the whole world. It gives the operator a domain of intelligence that is genuinely theirs, that runs without permission, that survives disconnection, and that answers to no one but the person who switched it on. That is a smaller and more honest claim than the marketing of cloud intelligence, and it is the only claim that inherits Bitcoin's deepest property rather than its costume.

The Mickai pantheon.

9. The Record That Outlives The Moment

Bitcoin's chain is more than a ledger of payments. It is a way of making the past undeniable. Every block carries the weight of every block before it, so that to falsify any moment of history you would have to redo all the work that followed it, an effort the system makes prohibitively expensive on purpose. The result is a memory an adversary cannot quietly edit. In a world drowning in synthetic media and convenient revisions, a memory no one can secretly alter is not a technicality. It is a form of truth, manufactured by structure rather than asserted by authority.

An autonomous intelligence needs this property even more urgently than a currency does. When a system acts on its own, the central question becomes accountability. What did it do, why, and on whose instruction. If those answers can be edited after the fact, the system cannot be trusted, no matter how capable it is. A sovereign intelligence without an incorruptible record is a power without a conscience, and that is precisely the thing the world is right to fear and right to refuse.

This is why the SIOS seals every consequential action into a post-quantum Open Audit Record, signed under FIPS 204 ML-DSA-65. The choice of a post-quantum signature scheme is deliberate. A record that can be forged by a future computer is not a record at all, it is a temporary convenience, and sovereignty measured in years is not sovereignty. By sealing actions with signatures built to survive the next era of computing, the system makes its memory durable against threats that do not yet exist, the same forward-looking stubbornness that built a twenty-one-million cap into a system on day one.

> **Bitcoin made the past undeniable for money. A sovereign intelligence must make the past undeniable for action.**

Put the two ideas together and the lineage is clear. Bitcoin manufactured trust without a trusted party by making its history structurally unforgeable. The Open Audit Record carries that same principle into the realm of action, so an autonomous intelligence can be held to account by anyone, forever, without anyone having to be trusted to keep the books. It is the difference between a mind you must believe and a mind you can verify. Only the second kind deserves the autonomy we are about to grant these systems, and only the second kind is safe to build.

PART IV · THE HANDSHAKE

Where the sovereign currency and the sovereign mind anchor to one another.

10. Why A Sovereign Mind Needs A Sovereign Clock

An intelligence that acts in the world must answer one question with absolute reliability, when did this happen, and in what order. Sequence is the spine of accountability. If the order of a system's actions can be disputed or rearranged, then every record built on that order becomes negotiable, and a negotiable record is no record at all. Sovereign intelligence therefore needs a source of time and ordering that no party can manipulate, a clock that belongs to no one and so cannot be set forward or back to suit a powerful interest.

Here the two stories of this book converge with a satisfying inevitability. Bitcoin is, among other things, the most secure timekeeping and ordering system humanity has ever built. Its chain establishes, with planetary certainty, that this came before that, and it does so without trusting any clock, any government or any company. It is a heartbeat the whole world can read and no one can fake. A sovereign mind that needs an unfakeable sense of before and after has, in Bitcoin, exactly the clock it requires, already running, already proven, already beyond capture.

Borrowing the strongest history

This is the deep reason for anchoring. By tying its own record to Bitcoin's chain, a sovereign intelligence borrows the strongest, most expensive-to-forge history on the planet. It does not have to recreate fifteen years of accumulated security from scratch. It inherits that security through a single, structural connection, the way a young institution gains credibility by registering its founding documents with an authority that has outlasted empires. The intelligence keeps its own sovereignty and gains an ordering it could never economically build alone.

There is a pleasing symmetry here. Bitcoin secures money by making its history undeniable. The sovereign intelligence secures action by anchoring its history to Bitcoin's. The currency that behaves like the first autonomous mind becomes the bedrock of time for the minds that come after it. The pupil, if you like, anchors itself to the precedent. That is not a marketing flourish. It is the architecture, and it is why the handshake between the two is not optional decoration but a load-bearing wall.

The Mickai pantheon.

11. Pantheon, The Handshake In Practice

Pantheon is our sovereign Bitcoin-anchored Layer 1, and it is where the abstract argument of this book becomes a working mechanism. It is the connective tissue between the sovereign intelligence and the sovereign currency, the engineered handshake that lets a mind built on the operator's own hardware tie its most important records to the most secure history on Earth. It is not a coin chasing a price. It is infrastructure, in the way Bitcoin itself is infrastructure, built to do one structural job and do it permanently.

The logic of anchoring to Bitcoin specifically, rather than to any of the thousands of alternatives, follows directly from everything we have established. We anchor to Bitcoin because Bitcoin is the system whose history is hardest to rewrite, the system with no owner to pressure, the system that has already survived the loss of its creator and the hostility of states. If the purpose of anchoring is to borrow the strongest possible ordering, you anchor to the strongest possible chain. Anchoring to anything weaker would be borrowing credibility from something that has less of it to lend.

> **Pantheon is the handshake. The sovereign mind reaches down to the sovereign currency and borrows the one history no one can rewrite.**

Through Pantheon, the Open Audit Records the Sovereign Intelligence Operating System produces can be anchored to Bitcoin's chain, so that the ordering and existence of a sovereign intelligence's consequential actions inherit Bitcoin's security. The mind runs locally and privately on the operator's own hardware. Its proofs reach down and shake hands with the global chain. The operator keeps full sovereignty over the intelligence, and gains an unfakeable, planet-scale anchor for its accountability.

That is the whole design in a sentence, and it is the design the rest of the book has been building toward.

I want to be careful and honest about what this is and is not. Anchoring does not put the operator's private actions on a public chain for the world to read. It commits to their existence and ordering in a way that can be proven later, without exposing the content. Sovereignty and accountability are held in the same hand. The operator owes no one a window into their affairs, and yet can prove, beyond dispute, that a given action happened when they say it did. That balance, privacy with provability, is the quiet achievement of the handshake.

12. The Lesson Satoshi Left Behind

We began with an anomaly, a system whose author vanished and which never stopped thinking. We can now name what that anomaly taught us. Sovereignty, autonomy and survival are not qualities a system happens to acquire over time through good management. They are qualities you engineer into a system at the moment of its creation, written into its structure so deeply that no founder, no company and no government can later remove them. Satoshi did not leave us a currency. Satoshi left us a method, and the currency was only the first thing built with it.

Whether or not we choose to call Bitcoin the first artificial intelligence, and reasonable people will land on different sides of that word, the functional case is undeniable and it is the case that matters for builders. Here is a leaderless system that defends a goal, adapts to its environment, remembers its entire history incorruptibly, protects its own continuation through structure rather than guardians, and outlived the one who made it. If that is not intelligence, it is close enough that the distinction says more about our pride than about the system. The behaviours are real, and the behaviours are what we copy.

The work I am doing takes that method and moves it from money to mind. Fifty specialised brains on the operator's own hardware, fully offline-capable. Every consequential action sealed into a post-quantum Open Audit Record under FIPS 204 ML-DSA-65. Pantheon anchoring those records to Bitcoin, so the sovereign mind borrows the sovereign currency's unforgeable history. This is not imitation of Bitcoin's surface. It is inheritance of its deepest property, ownerless persistence, applied to the most consequential systems we will ever build, the ones that think and act on our behalf.

> **Satoshi did not leave us a currency. Satoshi left us a method for building things no one can take away.**

So I will end where I began, with the founder's stubborn conviction that started this book. The first sovereign autonomous intelligence may already have arrived, quietly, on a financial substrate, while the rest of us were looking the other way. It proved a system can be built to belong to no one and to serve its purpose forever. My task is to carry that property into the age of thinking machines, so the intelligences we come to depend on are sovereign, accountable and ours, rather than rented, opaque and someone else's. Bitcoin showed it could be done. Now we do it for the mind.

The Mickai pantheon.

APPENDIX · ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Micky Irons

Founder and chief executive of Mickai LTD (Companies House 17166618, registered office 20 Wenlock Road, London, N1 7GU) and named inventor on the Mickai SIOS patent corpus: 101 filed UK patent applications, around 2,234 claims. Trade mark Mickai registered at UK00004373277.

Profiles

mickai.co.uk

crunchbase.com/person/micky-irons

linkedin.com/in/mickyirons

References and further reading

· Nakamoto, S. (2008). Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System. The original white paper establishing proof-of-work, the longest-chain rule and incentive-driven security.

· Antonopoulos, A. M. (2017). Mastering Bitcoin: Programming the Open Blockchain, 2nd edition. O'Reilly Media. Technical treatment of difficulty adjustment, mining incentives and the chain as tamper-evident memory.

· Wiener, N. (1948). Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine. MIT Press. Foundational account of feedback, homeostasis and goal-directed behaviour in non-conscious systems.

· Russell, S. and Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach, 4th edition. Pearson. Standard reference for the rational-agent and goal-directed definitions of intelligence used in this book's functional test.

· National Institute of Standards and Technology (2024). FIPS 204: Module-Lattice-Based Digital Signature Standard (ML-DSA). The post-quantum signature standard underpinning the Open Audit Record.

· Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance. Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index and hash-rate data. Empirical record of the network's recovery after the 2021 mining migration, evidence of goal-defending adaptation.