ChatGPT

# Zen Capital: Bitcoin as Zen Capital

## Executive summary

"Zen capital" can be defined as **capital held and deployed in ways that reduce suffering and compulsive attachment, honor impermanence, cultivate mindfulness, favor simplicity, recognize interdependence, and align with ethical livelihood**—with the key twist that the "quality" of capital is evaluated not only by return and risk, but also by how it *shapes attention, incentives, and behavior* over time. This framing draws from Zen-adjacent Buddhist principles such as **non-attachment (non-clinging)**, **impermanence**, **mindfulness**, **simplicity**, **interdependence (dependent origination)**, and **right livelihood**. [1]

Bitcoin's core design—originating with Satoshi Nakamoto [2] 's 2008 proposal—can be read as an attempt to engineer **credible, rules-based monetary scarcity** and **peer-to-peer transfer without reliance on a central issuer**, implemented as a public transaction log secured by proof-of-work and economic incentives. [3]

Through a Zen-capital lens, Bitcoin shows **strong alignment** with (a) **simplicity and legibility** at the protocol-rule level (transparent constants like the satoshi unit and MAX_MONEY sanity bounds, and publicly auditable rules), and (b) **interdependence** (its security and usefulness emerge from many independent actors—nodes, miners, developers, users—rather than a singular authority). [4]

At the same time, there are **material conflicts** with Zen principles in common real-world usage: price **volatility and speculation** can intensify clinging; the **permanent ledger** can clash with "impermanence" when interpreted as letting go; proof-of-work's **energy externalities** raise right-livelihood questions; and mining's industrial structure can create centralization pressures that complicate naïve "decentralization" narratives. [5]

"Bitcoin as Zen capital" therefore becomes less a claim about Bitcoin being inherently "Zen," and more a claim about **how to hold, size, secure, and relate to it**: a Zen-capital approach emphasizes **process discipline (mindfulness), non-identification with outcomes (non-attachment), robust risk limits (impermanence awareness), minimal complexity, and ethical reflection on externalities and community impact**. [6]

## Defining Zen capital

Zen is a Buddhist tradition emphasizing practice and lived insight rather than purely conceptual doctrine; modern summaries commonly associate Zen-adjacent practice with training attention, reducing reactivity, and loosening fixation on self and outcomes. In parallel, classical Buddhist sources emphasize that suffering is sustained by patterns of craving and clinging, and that skillful conduct and mental training can reduce this suffering. [7]

To make “Zen capital” analytically useful (instead of a poetic label), it helps to treat Zen principles as **constraints and diagnostics** for capital/asset behavior:

## Zen principles synthesized into asset-relevant dimensions

**Non-attachment (non-clinging).** In Buddhist framing, clinging (upādāna) functions as “fuel” that keeps reactive cycles going; liberation is described as coming from the cessation of grasping. [8] In finance, non-attachment translates into *not fusing identity with holdings*, avoiding compulsive checking and revenge-trading, and resisting leverage-driven “must-win” dynamics.

**Impermanence.** Impermanence (anicca) is a core Buddhist mark of existence: conditioned phenomena change and do not provide stable footing for permanent satisfaction. [9] Mapped to capital, impermanence becomes a demand for *explicit recognition that prices, regimes, correlations, liquidity, and legal treatment change*, requiring robustness rather than prophecy.

**Mindfulness.** Mindfulness practice centers on trained, present-moment awareness and reduced automaticity. [10] As a capital dimension, mindfulness implies decision processes that are deliberate, documented, rule-based where possible, and less driven by noise and social contagion.

**Simplicity.** Zen-influenced aesthetics often valorize simplicity and restraint; Japanese aesthetics connected to wabi-sabi and sabi explicitly highlight simplicity/tranquility and the beauty of impermanence and imperfection. [11] For assets, simplicity points to transparent rules, minimal dependency chains, and fewer hidden tail risks.

**Interdependence.** Dependent origination (paṭicca-samuppāda / pratītyasamutpāda) describes how phenomena arise conditionally rather than independently. [12] In capital terms, this is a reminder to analyze *the full stack*: issuers, settlement rails, custody layers, regulation, counterparties, energy inputs, and social coordination.

**Right livelihood.** Right livelihood is part of the Noble Eightfold Path; it evaluates whether one’s means of earning and economic conduct reduce harm and support ethical living. [13] For assets, this becomes an ethical test: *Does the asset’s production, usage, and incentive structure systematically cause harm, exploitation, fraud, or coercion—or can it be used in ways that support constructive livelihoods?*

## A working definition of Zen capital

**Zen capital** is **capital whose ownership and use are structured to (a) reduce clinging and reactivity in the holder, (b) remain robust under impermanence, (c) increase mindful clarity, (d) minimize unnecessary complexity, (e) reflect interdependence explicitly, and (f) align acquisition and deployment with right livelihood**. [14]

This definition is intentionally *dual*: it evaluates both (1) the **instrument** (its rule set, custody model, externalities) and (2) the **practitioner** (behavioral patterning of the investor). [15]

# Bitcoin through the Zen-capital lens

Bitcoin is best summarized as a **public, append-only transaction ledger** replicated across many nodes, with transaction ordering and history secured by **proof-of-work** and a longest-chain ("most cumulative work") rule, plus economic incentives for miners and verifiability for anyone running software that enforces consensus rules. [16]

## Technical, economic, governance, and social features that matter for Zen capital

**Scarcity and monetary policy (issuance legibility).** At the consensus layer, Bitcoin defines a base unit (COIN = 100,000,000 satoshis) and a MAX_MONEY constant (21,000,000 * COIN) used as a consensus-critical sanity bound, explicitly noting this is not identical to the realized supply path but is still consensus-critical. [17] The consensus parameters define a subsidy-halving interval (nSubsidyHalvingInterval = 210,000 blocks), anchoring the rule-based decline in new issuance. [18] The fourth halving occurred at block 840,000 (April 19, 2024), reducing the block subsidy from 6.25 to 3.125 BTC; blockchain explorers and financial analysis documented this event and its mechanics. [19]

**Decentralization and governance (coordination without a single ruler).** Bitcoin's governance is largely **off-chain**: code changes require social coordination among contributors, node operators, and the broader ecosystem; consensus rules are enforced by nodes, and activation mechanisms (e.g., soft forks) are coordination problems rather than corporate directives. [20] The open-source repository documentation tracks which BIPs are implemented and when. [21]

**Immutability (history as a costed commitment).** Immutability is not metaphysical; it is an economic-security property: rewriting history requires redoing proof-of-work and overtaking the chain's accumulated work, so "51% attack" discussions focus on the feasibility of sustaining majority hash power. [22]

**Mining and energy (externalities and incentives).** Proof-of-work consumes energy by design; Bitcoin's electricity use is tracked by academic initiatives, and government energy agencies describe how PoW mining demand interacts with power systems and policy concerns. [23]

**Volatility (psychological and financial stress test).** Major research-oriented financial institutions emphasize that Bitcoin has historically exhibited high volatility and non-trivial drawdowns, making it behaviorally and financially demanding compared to many traditional assets. [24]

**Network effects (value-from-adoption dynamics).** Academic and practitioner research has modeled Bitcoin's valuation partly via network-effect dynamics (e.g., Metcalfe's-law-style relationships between network size proxies and value), reinforcing the idea that adoption and usage can matter as much as "intrinsic" cash flows (which Bitcoin lacks). [25]

**Social meaning (narratives, identity, and community).** The genesis block in Bitcoin Core's chain parameters explicitly embeds a newspaper headline about bank bailouts ("The Times 03/Jan/2009 Chancellor on brink of second bailout for banks"), often interpreted as a critique of contemporary monetary/banking conditions and as narrative fuel for Bitcoin's cultural identity. [26]

## Alignment and conflict with each Zen principle

Below, “alignment” means the feature can plausibly *support* Zen-capital practice; “conflict” means it can predictably *intensify* the opposite (clinging, delusion, harm), or generate ethical incoherence.

**Non-attachment** - Alignment: Bitcoin’s rules are externally legible and not discretionary in the way many human-governed monetary systems are; this can reduce the “authority attachment” some people experience toward institutions and can re-center agency toward verification and personal responsibility. [27] - Conflict: High volatility, meme-driven social reinforcement, and reflexive narratives can make Bitcoin a powerful object of “clinging”—price-checking, tribal identity, and leveraged risk-taking. [28]

**Impermanence** - Alignment: Bitcoin’s market behavior is an uncompromising teacher of impermanence: regimes shift, correlations change, drawdowns happen, and no price level is guaranteed. This reality forces anyone trying to “use Bitcoin well” to operationalize impermanence through time horizon, position sizing, liquidity planning, and scenario humility. [29] - Conflict (or paradox): Bitcoin’s “immutability” can be emotionally misread as permanence in a way that fosters rigid narratives (“the future is guaranteed”), even though the protocol’s *history* is hard to change while the *social and market environment* around it is radically changeable. [30]

**Mindfulness** - Alignment: Bitcoin is unusually verifiable: rules and supply bounds (COIN, MAX_MONEY) are explicit, and transactions/blocks can be audited by running software that checks them. This can support a “don’t trust, verify” orientation that resembles mindful inquiry: observe → verify → act deliberately. [31] - Conflict: 24/7 trading, social-media velocity, and the salience of price can push users into compulsive attention loops—closer to addiction mechanics than mindfulness. [32]

**Simplicity** - Alignment: At the consensus level, Bitcoin’s transparent constants and conservative scripting limits are designed for broad verifiability and predictable validation. [4] - Conflict: The lived Bitcoin ecosystem can become complex: custody choices, key management, tax reporting, scams, L2s, wrappers, and financial products add layers that can undermine simplicity unless intentionally constrained. [33]

**Interdependence** - Alignment: Bitcoin’s security and liveness arise from interdependence: miners supply work, nodes validate rules, developers propose changes, users create fees and demand, and no single actor “is Bitcoin.” [34] - Conflict: Real-world mining can concentrate into pools and geographies, and supply chains (ASIC manufacturing, energy sourcing) create dependency clusters that complicate simplistic decentralization narratives. [35]

**Right livelihood** - Alignment: Bitcoin can expand access to value transfer without requiring permissioned accounts, potentially supporting livelihoods where traditional rails are exclusionary or fragile—an argument sometimes made in financial inclusion discourse. [36] - Conflict: Proof-of-work energy use is a direct ethical pressure point; additionally, Bitcoin’s history includes use in illicit markets, and regulators and researchers discuss these risks. A Zen-capital approach cannot ignore harm externalities simply because the protocol is “neutral.” [37]

### Principle-to-feature mapping diagram

```
flowchart LR
  subgraph Zen_Principles[Zen principles]
    NA[Non-attachment]
    IM[Impermanence]
    MF[Mindfulness]
    SI[Simplicity]
    ID[Interdependence]
    RL[Right livelihood]
  end

  subgraph Bitcoin_Features[Bitcoin features]
    SC[Rules-based scarcity\n(halving, capped bounds)]
    DV[Decentralized verification\n(nodes enforce rules)]
    PW[Proof-of-work security\n(cost to rewrite history)]
    VO[Market volatility\n(drawdowns, regime shifts)]
    NE[Network effects\n(value-from-adoption)]
    EN[Energy & externalities\n(mining footprint)]
    GS[Governance-by-consensus\n(BIPs, social coordination)]
  end

  NA --> SC
  NA --> VO
  IM --> VO
  IM --> PW
  MF --> DV
  MF --> GS
  SI --> SC
  SI --> DV
  ID --> NE
  ID --> GS
  RL --> EN
  RL --> DV
```

This mapping summarizes relationships documented across primary protocol sources and analyses of mining, governance, and valuation. [38]

## Case studies and thought experiments

These are presented as **structured scenarios** (some grounded in documented protocol capabilities), designed to show when Bitcoin functions more like “Zen capital” versus “attachment capital.”

## A mindful accumulation strategy

**Scenario:** An individual commits to a fixed, small allocation to Bitcoin over multiple years, implemented via periodic purchases, with a written policy statement and predefined rebalancing bands. The "Zen" element is not the asset; it is the *practice*: the investor treats purchases as a ritual of non-reactivity rather than a prediction exercise.

**Mechanics that support Zen-capital practice:**
Because Bitcoin's issuance is mechanically constrained by consensus parameters and its unit system is explicit (COIN, MAX_MONEY), the investor can anchor expectations in *rules* rather than stories. [39]

**Stress test ("impermanence drill"):**
The investor pre-commits that if a drawdown exceeds a threshold, they do *nothing* for a fixed cooling-off period (e.g., 30 days), and only then reassess. This is a behavioral interpretation of impermanence: accept turbulence rather than feed it. [32]

## A personal-finance "volatility firewall"

**Scenario:** A household treats Bitcoin as a high-volatility, non-cash-flow asset and builds a "firewall" between daily life and market noise: - Living expenses and an emergency buffer remain in fiat bank money (understanding that most broad money is created via bank lending and is influenced by monetary policy). [40] - Bitcoin is treated as long-horizon capital, kept off exchanges, with access friction that reduces impulsive selling.

**Zen-capital interpretation:**
This explicitly acknowledges interdependence: fiat depends on the banking system and policy; Bitcoin depends on network security and market liquidity. The point is not ideological purity, but *clear seeing* of dependencies and consequently appropriate sizing and liquidity design. [41]

## A community treasury with transparent rules

**Scenario:** A small community organization (e.g., a mutual-aid fund) receives donations in Bitcoin and uses a multi-signature policy to prevent unilateral misuse. The treasury can only move funds if "m-of-n" signers approve, implemented using standard multisig and common P2SH patterns.

**Protocol grounding:**
Bitcoin's developer documentation describes multisig scripts (m-of-n) and the widespread use of P2SH multisig. [42]

**Zen-capital interpretation:**
This structure operationalizes interdependence and right livelihood: decision authority is distributed, and the group can formalize ethical spending constraints. The risk is that transparency becomes moral vanity or factional warfare; mindfulness still matters.

## Comparative analysis across assets

A Zen-capital comparison is not a performance contest; it asks, “Which assets *invite* which mental states and dependency structures?”

### Comparison table

| Asset class | Non-attachment | Impermanence | Mindfulness | Simplicity | Interdependence | Right-livelihood tensions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bitcoin | High temptation to identify; also supports self-responsibility via verification | Very high volatility teaches impermanence | Verifiable rules, but 24/7 noise | Simple core rules; complex ecosystem | Emergent from many actors | Energy footprint, potential misuse |
| Gold | Can become identity asset; less memetic than crypto | Lower volatility than Bitcoin historically (often) | Tangible but custody opaque | Physically simple; custody/ logistics | Mining supply chain & geopolitics | Mining impacts; extraction ethics |
| Fiat bank money | Attachment via “safety illusion” possible | Inflation/ regime shifts create slow impermanence | Low transparency for many users | Very convenient | Deep dependency on banks/policy | Debasement/ inclusion issues vary |
| Equities | Attachment via ego/ status and narratives | Regime-dependent; business cycles | Disclosure can help, but complexity high | Corporate/ market complexity | Firm + economy + regulation | Sector ethics, externalities vary |
| Asset-backed stablecoins | Convenience invites “cash-like” clinging | Parity depends on issuer/ reserves | Requires trust in issuer and legal structure | Operationally simple; structurally complex | Issuer + banking + regulation | Reserve quality, governance, censorship |
| ETH | Narrative-driven attachment common | Volatile; protocol evolves | Complex; requires abstraction | More complex than Bitcoin | Strong dependency web (validators, apps) | PoS reduces energy; other risks remain |

Key factual anchors: equities are ownership securities, granting proportional claims and often voting rights; this underpins why equities are deeply interdependent with corporate governance and the broader economy. [43] Stablecoins represent private tokenized money as issuer liabilities redeemable at par (in the sovereign unit of account) but can depart from singleness-of-money dynamics depending on structure. [44] Ethereum's consensus transitioned to proof-of-stake with the Merge (September 15, 2022), materially changing its energy profile and governance constraints relative to proof-of-work systems. [45] Gold supply is largely above-ground and historically accumulated, with estimates of total mined gold and annual supply tracked by the World Gold Council. [46]

## Practical implications for investors

A Zen-capital approach is best treated as **risk management plus mental training**. It does not eliminate uncertainty; it changes how uncertainty is held.

### Risk management

Because Bitcoin is volatile and can produce sharp drawdowns, a Zen-capital posture begins with *survivability*: sizing so that volatility does not force the investor into panic selling or identity crisis. [47]

Risk guardrails that fit the Zen-capital frame:

- **No leverage as a default.** Leverage increases fragility and can turn impermanence into ruin; U.S. regulators warn that leveraged trading can amplify losses in virtual currency markets. [48]
- **Pre-committed rebalancing or non-action windows.** Rebalancing and rule-based controls are classic risk tools in portfolio management; modern portfolio theory formalizes risk reduction via diversification (variance/covariance). [49]
- **Position limits and liquidation rules with humility.** Risk-management frameworks describe position limits and stop-loss concepts; but Zen-capital practice should recognize that "control" tools can become compulsive rituals if used without reflection. [50]

### Portfolio construction

If a portfolio is built as a system, Bitcoin is typically better treated as a **high-volatility satellite** rather than a core cash surrogate (unless the investor has a very specific thesis and risk capacity). That framing is consistent with mean-variance thinking: assets with very different volatility and correlation profiles demand careful sizing. [51]

A Zen-capital "construction rule" can be stated simply: **allocate only what you can hold through impermanence without psychological distortion**, and assume your future self will be less rational in stress than your present self believes. [52]

### Ethical considerations

Right livelihood implies that *how* gains are pursued matters. For Bitcoin, ethical reflection repeatedly converges on: - **Mining externalities and energy sourcing** (what is the marginal energy, and who bears costs). [53] - **Security and harm reduction** (scams, fraud, exploitative leverage products). [54] -

**Governance integrity** (resisting misinformation about protocol guarantees; recognizing that social coordination is part of reality). [34]

### Behavioral guidance for Zen-capital investors

Zen-capital investing is "behavior-first." A concrete translation of mindfulness into investing process:

- **Implement "attention budgets."** Decide when and how often prices are checked, and treat breaking the rule as a signal of attachment, not a market signal. [55]
- **Write a one-page policy statement.** Define the purpose of the Bitcoin allocation (e.g., asymmetric upside, hedge thesis, learning), acceptable drawdown, and reasons to exit. This is mindfulness made operational.
- **Use "verification rituals."** Periodically verify assumptions using primary sources (consensus rules, BIPs, reputable research) rather than social feeds. [56]

## Limitations, critiques, and further reading

### Limitations and counterarguments

**Category error risk.** Zen is a soteriological practice aimed at liberation from suffering; "Zen capital" can become a consumerist appropriation that mistakes aesthetic calm for ethical clarity. [57]

**Non-attachment paradox.** Calling any asset "Zen" can itself become attachment—status-signaling, purity narratives, or tribal identity—which Zen practice explicitly warns against as forms of clinging. [58]

**Immutability vs impermanence tension.** A permanently recorded financial history can conflict with values like forgiveness, forgetting, and contextual change—especially if "immutability" is treated as moral superiority rather than a specific security tradeoff. [59]

**Energy and right livelihood debates remain unresolved.** Even if mining can stabilize grids or use stranded energy in some contexts, the ethical burden of proof is non-trivial; right livelihood demands honest accounting, not slogans. [60]

**Governance is social, not purely technical.** Bitcoin's credibility depends on a large, resilient social system continuing to coordinate on a rule set; this is interdependence in action, but it also means "code is law" is not the whole story. [20]

**Comparison critique.** A Zen-capital lens can unfairly penalize assets for complexity that is actually productive (e.g., equities funding real-world enterprise). Since stocks are ownership claims on productive firms, dismissing them as "un-Zen" can ignore right-livelihood pathways like funding beneficial innovation. [61]

### Prioritized sources for further reading

1. Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System [62] (primary design document). [63]
2. Bitcoin Core consensus constants and chain parameters (COIN, MAX_MONEY, halving interval; genesis block message). [64]

3. Bitcoin Developer Guide (blocks/chain, transactions, scripts, multisig/P2SH). [65]
4. BIPs on standard multisig and P2SH: **BIP 11** and **BIP 16**. [66]
5. Rainer Böhme et al., "Bitcoin: Economics, Technology, and Governance" (high-quality synthesis). [67]
6. Cambridge Bitcoin Electricity Consumption Index and mining mapping (energy and mining structure). [68]
7. Bank for International Settlements [69] Bulletin 73 on stablecoins vs tokenised deposits (singleness of money; issuer-liability framing). [70]
8. Bank of England [71] on money creation in modern economies (fiat/bank money mechanics). [40]
9. Ethereum Foundation [72] documentation on proof-of-stake and the Merge (comparative consensus design). [45]
10. Zen and Buddhist foundations: Stanford Encyclopedia entries on Zen and ethics, plus primary Zen writings such as Shōbōgenzō [73] for deeper practice-context (to prevent "Zen capital" from becoming mere branding). [74]

---


[1] Anicca | Impermanence, Suffering, Transience
https://www.britannica.com/topic/anicca?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[2] [3] [16] [27] [38] [63] [69] Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System
https://bitcoin.org/en/bitcoin-paper?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[4] [17] [31] [39] [56] [64] bitcoin/src/consensus/amount.h at master · bitcoin/bitcoin · GitHub
https://github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin/blob/master/src/consensus/amount.h

[5] [24] [28] [29] [32] [47] Zen Capital Investments
https://www.cbinsights.com/company/zen-capital/financials?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[6] [50] Measuring and Managing Market Risk
https://www.cfainstitute.org/insights/professional-learning/refresher-readings/2026/measuring-managing-market-risk?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[7] [13] [14] [57] Right livelihood (samma ajivo)
https://www.accesstoinsight.org/ptf/dhamma/sacca/sacca4/samma-ajivo/index.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[8] [58] Upādāna
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Up%C4%81d%C4%81na?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[9] Abhidharma - Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/abhidharma/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[10] Japanese Zen Buddhist Philosophy
https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/japanese-zen/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[11] Sabi | Japanese aesthetics
https://www.britannica.com/art/sabi?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[12] Paticca-samuppada | Buddhist Doctrine of Dependent ...
https://www.britannica.com/topic/paticca-samuppada?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[15] [52] [55] Investment Behavior Is a Design Problem, Not an ...
https://blogs.cfainstitute.org/investor/2026/03/11/investment-behavior-is-a-design-problem-not-an-information-problem/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

18 26 bitcoin/src/kernel/chainparams.cpp at master · bitcoin/bitcoin · GitHub
https://github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin/blob/master/src/kernel/chainparams.cpp

19 Blockchain.com Explorer | BCH | ETH
https://www.blockchain.com/explorer/blocks/btc/840000?utm_source=chatgpt.com

20 34 36 67 71 Bitcoin: Economics, Technology, and Governance
https://courses.cs.duke.edu/spring20/compsci342/netid/readings/jep.29.2.213.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

21 bitcoin/doc/bips.md at master
https://github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin/blob/master/doc/bips.md?utm_source=chatgpt.com

22 30 59 65 72 Block Chain - Bitcoin.org
https://developer.bitcoin.org/devguide/block_chain.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

23 37 53 68 CBECI: Methodology
https://ccaf.io/cbnsi/cbeci/methodology?utm_source=chatgpt.com

25 Metcalfe's Law as a Model for Bitcoin's Value
https://caia.org/sites/default/files/metcalfeslaw_websiteupload_7-5-18.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

33 Bitcoin Core integration/staging tree
https://github.com/bitcoin/bitcoin?utm_source=chatgpt.com

35 Bitcoin Mining Map
https://ccaf.io/cbeci/mining_map?utm_source=chatgpt.com

40 41 Money creation in the modern economy
https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/quarterly-bulletin/2014/q1/money-creation-in-the-modern-economy?utm_source=chatgpt.com

42 Transactions - Bitcoin.org
https://developer.bitcoin.org/devguide/transactions.html?highlight=signature&utm_source=chatgpt.com

43 61 62 Stocks - FAQs
https://www.investor.gov/introduction-investing/investing-basics/investment-products/stocks?utm_source=chatgpt.com

44 70 Stablecoins versus tokenised deposits: implications for the ...
https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull73.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

45 The Merge
https://ethereum.org/roadmap/merge/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

46 73 How Much Gold Has Been Mined?
https://www.gold.org/goldhub/data/how-much-gold?utm_source=chatgpt.com

48 54 Understand the Risks of Virtual Currency Trading
https://www.cftc.gov/LearnAndProtect/AdvisoriesAndArticles/understand_risks_of_virtual_currency.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

49 51 PORTFOLIO SELECTION* - Markowitz - 1952 - The Journal of Finance
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1952.tb01525.x?utm_source=chatgpt.com

60 Bitcoin attacks: A comprehensive study
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1084804525001948?utm_source=chatgpt.com

66 BIP 11: M-of-N Standard Transactions
https://bips.dev/11/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

74 ethics: in Indian Buddhism

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-indian-buddhism/?utm_source=chatgpt.com