What Is a Crypto-Body? Rethinking the Role of the Blockchain Ledger

Mun How Mong Shuyang Shi Chase Wang

1 Introducing the idea of a Crypto-Body

Cryptocurrencies are often portrayed as volatile, lightly regulated, or tools for illicit activity. This view overlooks a deeper innovation: the Crypto-Body, a self-sustaining digital ledger system that is essentially a programmable and consensus-governed architecture for recording and automating diverse data and functions. Beyond serving as a store of value or payment rail, a Crypto-Body operates as a programmable institutional substrate whose rules are guaranteed by cryptographic verification. It validates data and transactions, allocates value and credit, enables exchange of verifiable digital assets, and coordinates these activities via energy and computation across individuals, firms, governments, and organizations; all while preserving anonymity and user privacy through pseudonymous identifiers and selective disclosure (e.g., zero-knowledge proofs), and still permitting auditability and legal compliance where required.

This article suggests five key criteria for a blockchain to qualify as a "Crypto-Body":

i. Adoption Threshold: The network must attract a critical mass of users, validators, and on-chain activity to sustain itself economically. There needs to be enough demand for validation, and enough participants to satisfy that demand. The system cannot function as a self-sustaining entity without sufficient transactional and validator engagement.

ii. Fiat Infrastructure Threshold: The Crypto-Body has also reached sufficient adoption for a robust "fiat infrastructure" to exist, enabling rapid two-way conversion between Crypto-Body tokens and fiat currency. This infrastructure includes participation by banks, stablecoin issuers, crypto exchanges and, where applicable, regulatory authorization for derivative products (e.g., ETFs and futures) referencing the Crypto-Body.

iii. Composability: It provides a general-purpose smart contract environment so that multiple functions and applications can interoperate on the same ledger. In practice, this means developers can compose complex services (finance, identity, governance, etc.) on this singular platform. Improved composability also serves to reinforce the adoption threshold.

iv. Deterministic Logic: Outcomes are enforced by transparent code (smart contracts) rather than by opaque institutional processes. The rules are public and automatic without the need for a discretionary decision by a central authority for the system to function.

v. Sustainable Incentives: The ledger has a built-in token mechanism that provides an economic incentive for its own security and sustainable usage. For example, proof-of-stake blockchains reward validators through staking yields and may even incorporate fee-burning mechanisms to reduce the number of tokens in circulation (thus increasing the value of remaining tokens). These features provide economic returns to participants and help secure the long-term viability of the network.

In short, a Crypto-Body is a broadly adopted, composable smart-contract platform operating on a public ledger, with robust fiat conversion infrastructure and durable incentive mechanisms that secure and sustain the network.

2 What Can a Crypto-Body Actually Do?

A programmable ledger unlocks an array of applications beyond the possibilities of fiat currency or static ledgers. Some domains already explored include:

- Financial Contracts (DeFi): Decentralized finance protocols enable lending, borrowing, trading, and asset management without traditional intermediaries. For example, automated market makers and liquidity pools allow users to swap assets algorithmically. Billions of dollars now flow through such contracts on-chain, showcasing how a Crypto-Body can assume the role of banks and exchanges.

- Digital Identity and Credentials: Projects are leveraging blockchains for identity, from zero-knowledge ID systems that prove who you are without revealing sensitive data, to non-transferable tokens (sometimes called "soulbound" tokens) that serve as digital certificates or reputational badges. Systems like Ethereum Name Service (ENS) map easy names to wallet addresses,[1] and initiatives like Worldcoin aim to provide unique personhood attestations on-ledger.[2]

- Registries for Ownership and IP: Blockchains can act as tamper-proof registries for assets. Non-fungible tokens (NFTs) demonstrate this for digital art and collectibles. Similar logic is being applied to supply chains (e.g. VeChain tracking goods provenance)[3] and intellectual property rights. Even governments are testing blockchain-based land registries and certificate issuance.

- Governance via Token Voting (DAOs): A Crypto-Body can serve as a governance platform. Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs) use tokens to represent voting power, letting stakeholders make decisions transparently on-chain. For instance, the Optimism Collective has pioneered on-chain governance for funding public goods, where token holders vote on proposals in a digital "assembly."[4]

- IoT Integration: Smart contracts can respond to real-world data feeds (via oracles) and even control devices. Projects like Chainlink and IOTA have explored connecting Internet-of-Things sensors and actuators to blockchain logic, envisioning smart locks that open only when an on-chain condition is met, or insurance that pays out automatically based on weather data.

Real-world examples also hint at how Crypto-Bodies could undergird public infrastructure. Estonia's e-Residency program, often lauded for its digital government, anchors some of its security on blockchain-like distributed logs for data integrity.[5] In finance, the Monetary Authority of Singapore and others have trialed cross-border payment networks on Ethereum-based platforms.[6] However, the remainder of this article focuses on the monetary and banking functions that a Crypto-Body can either complement or replace. Finance is the foundation for all other applications because a decentralized Crypto-Body can only be self-sustaining if it offers the right economic incentives, both for developers to build services on the ledger and for validators to contribute computing power for securing it.[7]

3 What is Wrong with Paper Money?

It is worth revisiting the challenges of traditional finance ("TradFi") in order to appreciate the Crypto-Body alternative. It is widely accepted that today's financial system rests on three pillars: sovereign currency, commercial banks, and central banks. In broad strokes:

- Sovereign Currency: National governments issue fiat money (like the US dollar), which is not backed by commodities but by public trust; legal tender laws mandate its acceptance for economic transactions.

[1] `https://ens.domains/`
[2] `https://world.org/world-id`
[3] `https://support.vechain.org/support/solutions/articles/103000089941-how-can-i-use-vechain-to-track-goods-across-my-supply-c`
[4] `https://gov.optimism.io/t/about-the-optimism-collective/6118`
[5] `https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/apr/21/e-stonia-country-using-technology-to-rebrand-itself-as-the-anti-russia`
[6] `https://consensys.io/blockchain-use-cases/finance/project-ubin`
[7] Catalini, C. and Gans, J. S., 2020. *Some simple economics of the blockchain.* Communications of the ACM, 63(7), 80–90.

- Commercial Banks: Private banks create most of the money supply by lending out deposits (the fractional reserve model). They act as custodians of public deposits and as intermediaries allocating credit in the economy.
- Central Banks: Entities like the Federal Reserve or European Central Bank manage currency and bank liquidity. They set monetary policy (e.g. interest rates, quantitative easing) and act as lenders of last resort to prevent financial crises.

This system has accomplished much but is also prone to well-documented problems:

- Inflation and Currency Risk: History is littered with currencies that lost value due to over-issuance or loss of confidence. In extreme cases, fiat regimes implode in hyperinflation; for example, Zimbabwe's dollar inflation hit an estimated 79.6 billion percent per month in late 2008.[8] Such episodes show how fragile trust in a centrally-managed currency can be if central bank discipline fails. Even in mild cases, many economies such as Argentina and Turkey suffer chronically high inflation that erode savings.
- Bank Runs and Bailouts: Banks engage in maturity transformation: they borrow short and lend long which makes them fragile by design. The bank fails if too many depositors demand their money back at once, a dynamic formalized by Diamond and Dybvig way back in 1983.[9] Government deposit insurance and central bank backstops exist to prevent panics, but these are imperfect as seen in the Great Financial Crisis of 2008 where bank failures can cascade without swift intervention.
- Adverse Selection and Moral Hazard in Lending: Because banks lend other people's money, they do not always price risk with sufficient discipline. The subprime mortgage boom of the 2000s illustrates this vividly: lenders extended credit too freely, underestimating default risk. As Ashcraft and Schuermann (2008)[10] show, mortgage insurers charged premiums that failed to scale meaningfully with borrower risk, effectively encouraging adverse selection where safer borrowers ended up subsidizing riskier ones. When housing prices plateaued, defaults surged and the underlying fragility of these poorly priced loans became evident, culminating in institutional failures like Lehman Brothers.
- Opacity: The traditional system often operates opaquely; a bank's true financial health can be hard for outsiders to gauge due to complex balance sheets or off-book exposures; indeed, research shows that banks are "inherently more opaque" than other firms.[11] Central banks, for their part, conduct a lot of deliberations behind closed doors. This opacity can undermine accountability and trust where depositors and investors must essentially trust institutional managers to do the right thing because they cannot easily verify the facts themselves.

In summary, our current fiat-based system relies heavily on trust in institutions: trust that governments will not debase the currency, that banks will not gamble away deposits, and that regulators will act in time to prevent collapse. When that trust falters, the consequences range from bank runs to currency crashes.

4 How Crypto-Bodies can Reimagine Finance

Therefore, Crypto-Bodies offer an alternate vision: trust in transparent code and math over trust in fallible human institutions. Blockchain-ledger systems like Bitcoin and Ethereum directly tackle some of the above pain points by design:

- Algorithmic Monetary Policy: Crypto networks replace central bankers with code. Bitcoin does it bluntly: a hard cap of 21 million coins, doled out on a fixed halving schedule. Ethereum, characteristically more flexible, rewrote its monetary logic entirely. In 2021, it began burning a portion of

[8] Hanke, S. H., & Kwok, A. K. F. (2009). On the Measurement of Zimbabwe's Hyperinflation. *Cato Journal*, 29(2), 353–364.

[9] Diamond, D.W. and Dybvig, P.H., 1983. Bank runs, deposit insurance, and liquidity. *Journal of political economy*, 91(3), pp.401–419.

[10] Ashcraft, A.B. and Schuermann, T., 2008. Understanding the securitization of subprime mortgage credit. *Foundations and Trends in Finance*, 2(3), pp.191–309.

[11] Morgan, D.P., 2002. Rating banks: Risk and uncertainty in an opaque industry. *American Economic Review*, 92(4), pp.874–888.

every transaction fee. Then in 2022, it abandoned energy-intensive mining in favor of proof-of-stake by rewarding users who lock up tokens to secure the network. The result is that issuance dropped and supply becomes elastic in the opposite direction compared to traditional monetary policy; in other words, increased usage makes ETH tokens more scarce because more ETH is destroyed than created when network activity rises.

This is a radical break from conventional monetary thinking. Modern policy, grounded in Keynesian economics, all but assumes that a growing economy must be accompanied by a growing monetary supply. In other words, inflation is not a flaw but a sign of healthy economic growth. Ethereum turns that logic on its head because its "monetary policy" is transparent, non-discretionary, and self-adjusting, a kind of algorithmic Federal Reserve that tightens when demand surges and eases when it slows. No committee, no surprise announcements, no politics, just code.

- Yield by Protocol Design (and not financial engineering): In traditional finance, earning interest usually means trusting someone else with your money, like putting it in a bank (and hoping the bank does not fail) or buying corporate bonds (and betting the company will not go bust). Crypto-Bodies like Ethereum offer a different model where yields are gained simply by helping to keep the network running. On Ethereum, this happens through staking, which means locking up your tokens so the system can use them to validate transactions. In return, you earn rewards, typically around 3–5% per year, paid directly by the network itself in the form of additional tokens. Some have called this crypto's version of a "risk-free rate," because you are not lending tokens to anyone but just being paid for helping to keep the system honest. As of mid-2025, Ethereum's staking return has held steady around 3–4% (current averages about 3.06–3.58%),similar to what might be received from a creditworthy government bond. Unlike high-yield financial products that rely on hidden risk or complex borrowing, this return is built into the code. The protocol pays you directly without needing a bank, or middleman.

- Open Access and Self-Custody: Anyone with an internet connection can use blockchain-based financial services without need for a bank account, credit check, or permission from an authority. With a simple wallet app, people can send money, earn interest, or borrow funds through decentralized platforms like Aave. This is not just theory: thousands of users around the world do it every day on networks like Ethereum. Unlike traditional banks, these platforms do not hold your money for you; you hold it yourself which means your funds are not at risk if a company goes under. Also, because everything is tracked publicly on the blockchain, there are no hidden lending or surprise shortfalls. In this system, bank runs are not really possible because what you see is what exists.

- No Central Choke Points: In decentralized systems, control is not held by any one group and is spread across thousands of participants called validators. That means there is no single company or institution whose failure could crash the whole network. If a few validators break the rules, they lose money, and the system keeps running. Also unlike traditional platforms, there is no central authority, no government or corporation, that can easily shut things down or block transactions across the board. While individual accounts can still be restricted by apps, the core infrastructure is designed to resist broad censorship. This kind of shared control makes the system more robust, though it also means that updates and changes depend on open, often messy community decision-making.

All that said, Crypto-Bodies are not panaceas and face their own challenges and trade-offs:

- Volatility: Crypto assets used as currencies (like BTC or ETH) have exhibited far greater price volatility than fiat currencies or even equities. For example, an ECB analysis noted crypto-asset volatility "continues to dwarf" that of stock and bond markets [12] which makes using them as a stable unit of account difficult. Stablecoins (tokens pegged to fiat) partly solve this but introduce their own trust issues by relying on off-chain stores of value.

- Irreversibility and Bugs: "Code is law" can be brutally unforgiving because if a smart contract has a flaw, funds can be stolen or frozen and it is often permanent. There is no central authority to reverse

[12]Hermans, L., Ianiro, A., Kochanska, U., Törmälehto, V.M., van der Kraaij, A. and Simón, J.M.V., 2022. Decrypting financial stability risks in crypto-asset markets. *Financial Stability Review*, 1.

a fraudulent or mistaken transaction. High-profile incidents include the 2017 Parity wallet bug, where an error in Ethereum multi-signature wallet code permanently locked over $150 million USD dollars (equivalent to 500k ETH) in ETH with no recourse.[13] Finality cuts both ways because it prevents arbitrary reversals (good for rule of law), but also means user errors or hacks can be catastrophic.

- Governance and Upgrades: Decentralised networks still need human coordination to upgrade protocols or make policy choices which can lead to disputes and forks. A famous example was the DAO hack (2016): after a major Ethereum smart contract was hacked, the community split on how to respond, resulting in a hard fork (those who disagreed continued as Ethereum Classic).[14] More routinely, getting token-holders to participate in governance votes is hard as many governance tokens see only single-digit percentage turnout, and voting power often concentrates in the hands of a few large holders.[15] Thus, while Crypto-Bodies remove formal hierarchy, they face de-facto oligarchy or voter apathy issues.

- Usability and Security for Users: Self-custody, while eliminating trust in intermediaries, places a big burden on individuals. Managing private keys securely is difficult because lost keys mean lost assets forever (an estimated 20% of all Bitcoin is lost from forgotten keys or similar mishaps).[16] The user experience of interacting with wallets and DeFi apps is improving but still complex and intimidating for newcomers. In short, the on-boarding problem remains: Crypto-Bodies currently attract primarily the tech-savvy or those with strong ideological motivation.

These growing pains are not fatal flaws so much as hurdles to be overcome with better engineering, education, and perhaps selective regulation. Keep in mind that early financial systems in the 17th–19th centuries also suffered frequent crashes and scandals before modern reforms took place.[17] Crypto-Bodies are likely to be in an analogous formative stage, learning, improving, and becoming more robust over time.

5 Ethereum, Solana, and Bitcoin: Who Fits the Definition?

Not all blockchains are created equal. Using the "Crypto-Body" lens, we can evaluate leading networks on key features[18]:

Feature	Ethereum (post-merge, proof-of-stake)	Solana (proof-of-stake)	Bitcoin (proof-of-work)
Ledger Activity	Extensive: ˜1.5 million transactions per day, plus rich DeFi/NFT activity. High on-chain "GDP."	Rising: Very high TPS capacity; tens of millions of daily transactions (though many are consensus messages). Usage growing with DeFi and NFTs, but still below Ethereum in value settled.	Basic: ˜0.4 million transactions/day, mostly simple transfers. Limited expressivity keeps activity narrower (mostly payments).
Composability	High: Turing-complete smart contracts; thousands of dApps (DeFi, gaming, NFTs) interlinked on one ledger. Layer-2 extensions further increase composability.	Moderate: Supports smart contracts (e.g. Rust-based programs). Growing app ecosystem, but more siloed (some interoperability, but smaller scale).	None: Script language is intentionally not Turing-complete. Bitcoin cannot natively support complex dApps; it is focused on one function (currency).

[13] Choy, W.L. and Teng, P., 2017. When smart contracts are outsmarted: The parity wallet 'Freeze' and software liability in the internet of value. *National Law Review*, 7(356).

[14] Siegel, D., 2016. Understanding the DAO attack. *Coindesk*. Retrieved July, 14, p.2020.

[15] Wang, Q., Yu, G., Sai, Y., Sun, C., Nguyen, L.D., Xu, S. and Chen, S., 2022. An empirical study on snapshot DAOs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.15993*.

[16] Kirstein, U., Grossman, S., Mirkin, M., Wilcox, J., Eyal, I. and Sagiv, M., 2021. Phoenix: A formally verified regenerating vault. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01240*.

[17] Reinhart, C.M. and Rogoff, K.S., 2009. *This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly*. Princeton University Press.

[18] All three crypto-currencies fulfill the Fiat Infrastructure Threshold criterion.

Deterministic Logic	High: Protocol changes go through transparent EIPs; smart contracts enforce rules autonomously. Ethereum's consensus and state transitions are algorithmic and well-specified.	Moderate: Solana's core is deterministic, but the network has a history of coordinated restarts during failures. Reliance on a smaller validator set and core developer decisions means somewhat more centralized control in practice.	High (limited scope): Bitcoin's rules are hard-coded (21M cap, block time etc.) and its governance is conservative. Determinism in protocol is high, but Bitcoin's scope of automation is minimal (no internal automation beyond coin transfers).
Incentive Structure	Robust: ETH staking yield (currently ˜3–4%) plus fee burns make holding ETH financially attractive. Validators have long-term rewards aligned with network growth. Token economics designed for sustainability (low inflation, even deflationary at times).	Workable: SOL staking yields are higher (˜8%+) but come with higher inflation (new tokens). Solana's token supply growth is greater, and its outages have at times shaken confidence. No fee burn mechanism; has to balance rewarding validators with not diluting value too much.	Sparse: Bitcoin miners earn block rewards, but ordinary BTC holders get no yield. There is no native staking or reward for holding BTC aside from speculative price appreciation. As mining rewards diminish (halvings), Bitcoin's security model long-term relies on fees and continued high price, leaving this an open question.

Bitcoin remains the gold standard for secure, immutable record of value transfers; it is ultra-reliable at what it does, but it purposely does very little. There is no integrated way to deploy new financial contracts or applications on Bitcoin's base layer. That inflexibility is a trade-off that maximizes security/simplicity at the cost of innovation.

Solana represents almost the opposite end: highly flexible and fast, with a design optimized for throughput (parallel processing, short block times). It powers NFT markets and DeFi apps with impressive speeds. However, Solana's push for performance has sometimes come at the expense of resilience. It has experienced multiple network-wide outages where the blockchain halted. Moreover, its validator community is more centralized (due to high hardware requirements and smaller size), which raises questions about long-term decentralization.

Ethereum by contrast has, over time, balanced decentralization with functionality. With hundreds of thousands of validators securing the chain after the switch to proof-of-stake, Ethereum is considered sufficiently decentralized to avoid any single point of failure. It is fully programmable: from automated market maker exchanges to games where items are NFTs, an enormous variety of functions run on Ethereum's ledger. Crucially, Ethereum's economic design post-2022 aims for sustainability: token issuance is low and often offset by fee burns (making ETH scarcer when usage is high), and users who stake ETH earn returns without needing any off-chain intermediaries. No other blockchain of Ethereum's scale has this combination of composability, decentralization, and self-sustaining incentives. It is fair to say that Ethereum is the closest real-world instantiation of a "Crypto-Body" as defined. It behaves like a decentralized financial institution, one where the ledger itself is the platform for an entire economy's worth of activity.

6 Crypto Legislation and the Emergence of ETH as a Financial Instrument

Recent developments in U.S. law and policy are accelerating the mainstreaming of Crypto-Bodies, especially Ethereum. Three pieces of proposed or passed legislation in 2023–2025 are particularly noteworthy:

1. The Digital Asset Market CLARITY Act (2025): This House bill (H.R. 3633, informally the CLARITY Act) provides a comprehensive framework to finally classify digital assets in U.S. law. In essence, it draws a clear line between digital commodities and digital securities:

- Jurisdictional Clarity: The Act gives the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) exclusive oversight of "digital commodities," while the SEC retains jurisdiction over "digital assets offered as part of an investment contract" (i.e. securities). This is a monumental clarification because for years, tokens like ETH were in a gray area, but CLARITY formally leans toward treating sufficiently decentralized tokens as commodities. The bill also includes a process for networks to earn a "Certification of Decentralization", after which their tokens are presumptively commodities, not securities. Ethereum, with its thousands of independent validators and open-source development, is a prime candidate for such classification.
- Regulatory Framework: The Act outlines registration and disclosure standards for digital commodity platforms and intermediaries. It mandates that exchanges dealing in crypto commodities register as Digital Commodity Exchanges with the CFTC and comply with consumer protection and market integrity rules. It also enshrines that anti-money-laundering (AML) laws still apply to crypto businesses just as for banks. This means the onus is on crypto institutions to implement compliance, but it also reassures traditional institutions that the crypto market will have comparable safeguards.
- Impact on Ethereum: By likely cementing Ether's status as a commodity (as opposed to a regulated security), the Act removes a major overhang. Regulatory ambiguity has been a big risk factor deterring institutional investors. With legislation signaling that "ETH is a commodity", we can expect more products and participation. Indeed, the Act's progress already correlates with increasing talk of ETH spot ETFs following SEC approval in MAY 2024 and even inclusion of ETH in retirement portfolios, as it would be regulated akin to gold or oil (commodities) rather than stocks.

2. The Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins Act (GENIUS Act, 2025): Passed by the House in July 2025 (Senate in June, House in July, signed in July) and signed into law, the GENIUS Act is America's first federal law focused on stablecoins (cryptocurrencies pegged to assets like the dollar). Its provisions aim to encourage innovation in digital payments while protecting consumers and the financial system:

    - Stablecoin Issuer Regulations: The Act creates a two-tier licensing model for stablecoin issuers. Small issuers (<$10 billion) outstanding can operate under state regimes (with federal standards), whereas large issuers must obtain a federal license. In practice, this means companies like Circle (issuer of USDC) or Tether will face bank-like scrutiny and oversight, addressing concerns that an unregulated stablecoin could blow up and harm consumers.
    - Full Reserve and Transparency: Critically, GENIUS requires that all payment stablecoins be 100% backed by high-quality, liquid assets (think short-term Treasuries, bank deposits, etc.) and it mandates monthly reserve disclosures to the public. Under the new law, a stablecoin must essentially operate like a narrow bank. Users should be able to trust that a $1 stablecoin really has $1 backing it, verified by reports. In blockchain terms, this aligns with the ethos of on-chain transparency: you could imagine in the future real-time attestations of reserves, potentially even written to a public ledger.
    - Consumer Protections (AML/KYC): The Act subjects issuers to Bank Secrecy Act obligations, meaning they must perform KYC (know-your-customer checks), monitor transactions for illicit activity, and be able to freeze or blacklist funds when legally required. While this may raise eyebrows in crypto circles that value censorship-resistance, it's a concession to law enforcement. It essentially integrates stablecoins into the regulated financial perimeter.
    - Why it matters for Ethereum: The majority of stablecoins (USD-backed ones in particular) run on Ethereum and related networks. By legalizing and structuring the stablecoin industry, the GENIUS Act paves the way for much larger institutional use of stablecoins on open ledgers. We could soon see, for instance, a truly regulated US Dollar stablecoin that banks and fintechs feel comfortable integrating, because it is as supervised as money market funds. This would cement Ethereum's role as a global settlement layer for digital dollars. Moreover, with transparency and reserve quality mandated, stablecoins on Ethereum start to look like superior forms of money,

potentially as safe as bank deposits, but more programmable. Put another way, the law is pushing the crypto-dollar model rather than a Fed-issued digital dollar (CBDC).

3. The CBDC Anti-Surveillance State Act (2024): This bill, passed by the House in 2024, prohibits the Federal Reserve from issuing a retail central bank digital currency (CBDC) without Congress's approval.[19] It was born from concerns that a U.S. CBDC could enable government surveillance of private transactions, akin to how China's digital yuan is allegedly used to monitor citizens. The act's supporters explicitly argue any digital dollar must be "open, permissionless, and private", otherwise it is "a CCP-style surveillance tool". In effect, U.S. lawmakers are signaling a preference for market-driven stablecoins over a Fed-controlled digital currency.

   The relevance to Crypto-Bodies is significant: if the United States foregoes a government-run programmable dollar, the field is wide open for Ethereum and other public networks to fill that role. We can expect growth in USD stablecoins (on Ethereum) and perhaps even adoption of privacy-preserving technologies (like zero-knowledge proofs) to meet the demand for digital cash that is not a surveillance instrument. By banning a Fed CBDC, Congress is indirectly endorsing the crypto approach for now by leveraging open networks and private innovation to modernize payments, rather than a top-down system. This stance may encourage more investment into blockchain-based payment infrastructure, knowing that it would not be immediately outcompeted by a federal alternative. Indeed, stablecoin usage and DeFi dollar markets might surge if people believe the "digital dollar" would be an array of well-regulated stablecoins on networks like Ethereum, rather than a token issued by the Fed.

7 Implications for ETH as an Asset

Ethereum's native token, ETH, stands to gain a new narrative in this evolving regulatory landscape. It is transforming from just a "speculative cryptocurrency" into a bona-fide financial instrument with characteristics of multiple asset classes:

- With the introduction of spot ETH ETFs (the SEC allowed the first spot Ether ETFs to begin trading in July 2024), institutional investors can now get exposure to ETH through familiar vehicles. This is analogous to gold ETFs in the 2000s, a key bridge from niche to mainstream allocation.
- ETH now provides a yield (from staking) that is on par with dividend stocks or bonds. Around 3–5% in annual rewards, with relatively low variance, makes it somewhat akin to a floating-rate bond. In fact, analysts have started calling staked ETH "the new risk-free rate" in crypto. Unlike a government bond, ETH's "interest" is paid in ETH and comes from network activity fees and inflation. However, from an investor's perspective, a spot ETH ETF that auto-stakes its holdings could resemble a high-yielding bond that also has equity-like upside if the asset appreciates in value.
- The legislative clarity (from Acts like CLARITY and GENIUS) further derisks ETH in the eyes of institutions. Regulatory risk was a big part of why, for example, pension funds or insurance companies stayed away. As ETH is treated more like a commodity and as stablecoin use on Ethereum gets official approval, ETH starts to slot into portfolios as a long-term holding, a sort of digital oil that powers a whole economy of transactions, with fee revenue (burns and tips) analogous to dividends.

One could argue ETH is becoming a multi-faceted asset: a commodity (fuel for using the network), a capital asset (producing yield for stakers, like interest), and even quasi-equity (since owning ETH gives one a share of the collective transaction fees and upside from network growth). This "triple point asset" nature was theoretical in 2019, but by 2025 it is visibly playing out. For example, the burn mechanism (EIP-1559) has at times made ETH deflationary when network usage surges, directly tying economic activity to token scarcity (much like how stock buybacks increase equity value).

In sum, legislation is nudging Ethereum and similar Crypto-Bodies into the mainstream financial fold on terms that highlight their strengths. Ethereum can be viewed not just as a volatile tech experiment, but

[19] `https://emmer.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/emmer-reintroduces-cbdc-anti-surveillance-state-act`

as a new form of financial infrastructure that the law is increasingly recognizing and accommodating. ETH the asset, in this light, starts to look like a 21st-century amalgam of a reserve commodity (oil/gold), a yield-bearing instrument (bond), and a tech equity (upside from adoption). Its value is backed by the economic activity on its ledger (fees from millions of transactions, services running on it) and by the cryptographic guarantees of its code.

8 Conclusion: The Ledger Is the Institution

In the twentieth century, trust and coordination in society were mediated by paper contracts, corporate hierarchies, and government agencies. In the twenty-first, we are seeing the rise of ledgers, validators, and code as an alternative mode of coordination. Crypto-Bodies like Ethereum show that it is possible to have an institutional framework without traditional institutions, a public ledger that functions as courthouse, bank, and marketplace all at once.

This is a profound shift. A Crypto-Body is not just a coin or a payment system. It is a new species of institution: one that is programmable (rules can be adjusted via code updates and smart contracts), auditable (everything is transparent on-chain by default), and decentralized (no single party can monopolize control). Such an entity can hold and transfer value, enforce agreements, and even adjudicate (through code) without relying on conventional legal enforcement.

Ethereum, at present, is the most complete specimen of this phenomenon. It issues currency, manages savings (via staking), allocates capital (through DAO treasury votes and DeFi lending), keeps records (property as tokens), and more, all on a ledger accessible worldwide. It is as if the functions of a central bank, a stock exchange, a notary public, and a clearinghouse were bundled into one open protocol.

The implications are only beginning to unfold. As regulations solidify and technology matures, we may witness ledgers becoming primary vehicles of policy (imagine welfare distribution via smart contracts), or even the law itself being coded (dispute resolutions by algorithms). The Crypto-Body concept urges us to rethink what a "financial institution" or "market institution" can be when jurisdiction is global and trust is algorithmic.

To conclude on a forward-looking note: if one asks "who regulates a Crypto-Body?", the answer might ultimately be the holders and the code: a form of self-governance that is neither anarchy nor traditional state control, but something in between. We are effectively watching the birth of autonomous economic organisms, and much like the early internet, they will evolve, face setbacks, and challenge existing paradigms. The ledger-as-institution is here to stay; the open question is how it will coexist or compete with the institutions of yesterday.