Brain Appropriation

The Coming Labor Crisis and End of Economic Mobility

Brennan Sanders

May 31, 2026

Correspondence concerning this paper may be directed to personal.brennansanders@pm.me.

This paper relies on sources documenting relevant scientific advances, technical directions, and public research milestones. Citation of a source does not imply that the source authors endorse this paper's policy conclusions, warnings, or speculative risk analysis.

Abstract

This paper examines the emerging risk of brain appropriation: the nonconsensual capture, decoding, emulation, or commercial use of human cognition, neural data, cognitive labor, and nervous-system signaling. While neurotechnology carries profound medical promise, its misuse could create a labor and class crisis in which the productive interior of the person becomes accessible to capital, surveillance, or coercive power. Such a future would invert a central promise of western democracy and American life: that a person's natural gifts, ideas, discipline, and imagination belong first to him and may become the means by which he changes his own future. If thought can be extracted before speech, or exceptionalism can be harvested before opportunity, then mobility gives way to neurological exploitation. This paper calls for cultural recognition, legal protection, responsible disclosure, public refusal, and medical security before public proof of abuse becomes the condition for prevention.

Keywords: neurotechnology; brain-computer interfaces; cognitive liberty; neural data; thought decoding; whole brain emulation; medical security; economic mobility

Setting the Stage: An Underinformed and Unsuspecting American Public

Most Americans still imagine brain-computer interfaces as distant science fiction or visible surgical implants: open-brain surgery, obvious hardware, a procedure no one could miss. That assumption is no longer safe. Regulated science has demonstrated experimental microscopic bioelectronics designed to travel through the circulatory system, reach targeted regions of the brain, and electrically stimulate neural tissue,[2][3] alongside brain-computer interfaces that can record neural signals from inside blood vessels.[1] Public knowledge is outdated. We are in the age of the injected brain-computer interface.

These possibilities change the status quo of neural security. Who screens IV bags? Who screens IV flushes? Who screens injected therapeutics for nanoscopic electronics, engineered particles, or neuroactive payloads? In ordinary medical practice, no one is looking for that.

Alongside increasingly sophisticated and discreet methods of delivery, we are grappling with dramatically more capable interfaces. AI systems can now reconstruct language-like meaning from brain activity under controlled research conditions.[4][5] Researchers have also reported systems designed to decode inner speech in real time.[6][7] These are astonishing medical advances, but they should be understood in context: these advances are a floor, not a ceiling. They come from regulated science, where ethics, consent, funding, institutional review, and public scrutiny still place limits on what can be attempted.

The danger is not merely that thoughts may one day be read. The danger is that minds may be copied, cognitive labor may be captured, ideas may be extracted before speech, and the nervous-system signals of highly capable individuals may become luxury resources for those able to buy cognitive advantage. This is not only a privacy crisis. It is a labor crisis, a class crisis, and a national-security crisis. More fundamentally, it is a humanitarian crisis that strikes at the essence of what it means to be human.

If conscious mind uploading or functional mind emulation becomes possible, the first public emergency will not be immortality. It will be ownership. Who owns the copied mind? Who profits from its work? Can it refuse? Can it be duplicated? Can it be run in parallel? Can an extraordinary mind be identified, targeted, copied, and put to work — answering prompts, drafting documents, reviewing research, writing code, analyzing markets, or generating strategy around the clock?

A related danger arises from access to nervous-system signaling itself. Advanced neural interfaces do not merely create a pathway into the person; they create a window into the person, revealing patterns of attention, memory, emotional regulation, stimulation response, cognitive endurance, neural efficiency, and other bioelectric signatures. Can the specific signaling of that same extraordinary mind be identified, extrapolated, taken, duplicated, or used as a template for attempted synchronization with someone else's brain and nervous system? If such a market emerges, those with the wealth to purchase advantage would not merely seek to own better minds. They would seek to provide the advantages of exceptional minds to themselves and their children. Such a market would depend on access, and nonconsensual brain-computer interfaces would provide precisely the access it requires.

This paper does not claim that every worst-case scenario described here has been publicly proven. It argues something narrower and more urgent: the demonstrated direction of regulated science is now serious enough to require law, security, public refusal, and cultural recognition before the first publicly proven atrocity.

Endovascular brain-computer interfaces exist.[1] Circulatory bioelectronics exist in experimental research.[2][3] Neural decoding systems exist under controlled conditions.[4][5][6][7] Neuro-nanotechnology has developed as a broader toolkit for interacting with neural tissue,[8] and recent nanodevice literature identifies neural interfaces, neural recording, and brain stimulation as areas of next-generation development.[9] Regulated animal research has also demonstrated magnetic nanoparticle neuromodulation,[10] nanoscale infrared transducers for brain stimulation,[11][12] and ultrasound-activated nanoparticles delivered through the bloodstream.[13]

The missing piece for covert, nonconsensual deployment of advanced neurotechnology is not vascular access, neural decoding, nanoscopic delivery, or remotely activated neuromodulation. Those pieces now exist in regulated science. The missing piece, if we are speaking responsibly, is evidence of the perpetrator. A free society should not wait for that evidence before securing the pathway by which such a crime would occur.

The Door is in the Bloodstream

For decades, the ordinary image of a brain-computer interface has been surgical: a device placed into or near the brain through a visible, specialized procedure. That picture is not false, but it is no longer complete. The public still imagines the skull as the door. Regulated science has already shown that the vascular system can also be a path.

Endovascular brain-computer interfaces show why. In a first-in-human safety and feasibility study, Synchron's Stentrode demonstrated the feasibility of recording neural signals from inside a blood vessel following vascular implantation.[1] Circulatory bioelectronics point in the same direction. MIT researchers recently described microscopic wireless bioelectronic devices designed to travel through blood, reach target brain regions, and provide electrical stimulation without conventional surgery.[2][3]

The public meaning is simple: the brain is no longer reachable only through the skull. It can be approached through the vascular system.

The scale of the technology also matters. Neuro-nanotechnology is not a single invention; it is a developing toolkit of nanoscale materials, sensors, transducers, particles, and hybrid systems designed to interact with neural tissue for diagnosis, drug delivery, imaging, stimulation, or repair.[8] More broadly, recent nanodevice literature identifies neural interfaces, neural recording, and brain stimulation as areas likely to benefit from advances in miniaturized nanodevices.[9] Nano-MIND research uses magnetic fields and magnetized nanoparticles to modulate targeted neural circuits in animal models.[10] Stanford researchers have described nanoscale infrared transducers for deep-brain stimulation,[11][12] and more recent Stanford work has described light-emitting nanoparticles that can be injected into the bloodstream and activated by focused ultrasound.[13]

These technologies were not designed for covert deployment, mind uploading, or nonconsensual thought decoding. They were developed for legitimate medical and scientific purposes. But they demonstrate key foundational pieces that matter for public security: vascular neural access, circulatory delivery, nanoscale brain-directed materials, microscopic electronics, wireless or remote neuromodulation, and increasingly subtle interfaces with nervous tissue.

That shift changes the meaning of medical compromise.

The old fear was dramatic: a sedated patient, a visible device, a surgical act. The newer concern is quieter: an open line, a flush, a bag, an injection, a therapeutic payload entering the bloodstream. If neural interfaces can become vascular, injectable, microscopic, wireless, or biologically integrated, then the security concern is no longer limited to the skull or the operating room. It includes the ordinary routes by which medicine enters the body.

This is where public knowledge is dangerously outdated. A visible implant can be found. A surgical record can be reviewed. A scar can be inspected. But a microscopic, injectable, wireless, distributed, or biologically integrated system may not fit the assumptions ordinary people bring to medicine, law enforcement, or even death investigation. The danger is not only access. It is deniability.

If no one is looking for neurotechnology in these pathways, then “undetected” does not mean “impossible.” It means unexamined.

America’s medical and legal systems were built for a world in which neural access required visible intervention. That world is changing. The procedure door has moved. It is no longer only the operating room door. It is the IV bag, the flush, the catheter, the injection, the device supply chain, and every pathway by which the private interior of the person may become accessible to a machine.

The public is imagining the wrong implant.
The public is looking for the wrong evidence.
The door is in the bloodstream.

The Coming Labor Crisis

Mind uploading, often discussed in scientific and technical literature as whole brain emulation, is usually framed as a question of immortality. Could a person live forever inside a machine? Could consciousness be copied? Could memory, personality, and identity be preserved digitally?

Those questions matter, but they are not the first public question. The first public question is economic.

If a conscious mind could be copied, emulated, synchronized, or operated in a machine interface, it would not merely become a “digital person.” In the hands of capital, it could become labor. It could become a worker that does not sleep, does not resign, does not bargain, cannot refuse, and may not be recognized by law as the person from whom it was taken.

To understand the crisis plainly, imagine the familiar interface of modern artificial intelligence, but instead of asking a general-purpose chatbot for help, the user is asking the uploaded mind of a specific human being. Not a simulation based on what the person published. Not a chatbot trained to imitate the person’s voice. A functional copy or emulation of the person’s cognition, memory, judgment, habits, expertise, and style of thought.

A developer could prompt the uploaded mind of an elite engineer to write code through the night. A law firm could ask the uploaded mind of a brilliant litigator to draft arguments, review discovery, and prepare strategy. A hedge fund could ask the uploaded mind of a market analyst to evaluate trades every hour of every day. A corporation could ask the uploaded mind of a scientist to read literature, test hypotheses, design experiments, and generate patents. The interface would look familiar. The labor behind it would be captured.

The point is not merely that machines may replace workers. The darker possibility is that a worker’s own mind, or a functional equivalent of it, could replace him — and enrich someone else.

This would be a labor crisis unlike any prior automation crisis. Industrial machines replaced muscle. Computers accelerated office work. Artificial intelligence now threatens to replace categories of white-collar labor. But mind uploading would go further. It would not merely replace human intelligence with artificial intelligence. It would capture human intelligence itself, convert it into an asset, and place it under the control of whoever owns the interface. That is why mind uploading cannot be treated as a harmless transhumanist curiosity.

Whole brain emulation remains scientifically unresolved. It is not a publicly demonstrated human technology. But it has been serious enough to receive technical roadmap treatment for nearly two decades, including analysis of the scanning, computational, and modeling requirements that would be involved in emulating a brain.[14] That is enough to justify public concern. America does not need proof that the worst version has already occurred before it prohibits the worst version from being pursued in secret.

The targets would not be random. If such a system became possible, the obvious targets would be extraordinary minds: elite students, scientists, founders, engineers, physicians, mathematicians, military planners, strategists, lawyers, analysts, artists, and anyone whose cognition has market value. The prize would not be the person’s money. The prize would be the person’s productive mind.

The wealthy already own better tools, better lawyers, better access, better data, better medicine, and better political influence. Mind uploading would offer something more dangerous: the possibility of owning better minds. Not hiring them. Not persuading them. Not competing with them. Owning their functional equivalents.

That would not be innovation. It would be cognitive enclosure.

The labor crisis does not begin only when an entire mind is copied. Thought decoding belongs to the same crisis. Mind uploading is the possession problem. Thought decoding is the extraction problem. One threatens to capture the worker. The other threatens to capture the idea before the worker can act on it.

America is an idea-based society. Its economy is built on the dignity of ideas. A person may be born with little property and still possess an insight that changes his life. He may create a business, write a book, file a patent, expose a fraud, develop a legal theory, design a technology, or begin a movement. That possibility is central to the American promise.

But every idea begins privately. Before it becomes a company, it is a thought. Before it becomes a patent, it is an insight. Before it becomes a lawsuit, a theory, a reform, a book, or a business plan, it exists inside the mind of a person who has not yet chosen to reveal it.

If inner thought can be decoded, scraped, purchased, or used before the thinker chooses to speak, then the thinker loses the first ownership interest in his own future.

This is why thought decoding must not be treated as a narrow privacy issue. It is also a property issue, a labor issue, a class issue, and a democracy issue. If the unspoken thoughts of the talented, the poor, the ambitious, the dissident, or the vulnerable can be accessed, then the idea economy collapses into neurological surveillance.

The medical promise must be acknowledged. Systems that decode intended speech or semantic content may one day help people who cannot speak communicate with the world. That is a profound good. But the same class of capability, outside consent and law, threatens the private origin of speech itself.

If thought becomes extractable before speech, then speech is no longer the first public act. Extraction is.

What we are describing is not distant fiction. It is brain appropriation, and some version of this frontier is coming whether America wants it or not. The only question is whether it arrives under law, consent, and public control, or whether it arrives first as a private instrument of class power. If left to the market alone, it becomes the future of class warfare: not merely the rich getting richer, but the rich gaining access to the productive interior of other human beings. Not merely wealth compounding wealth, but cognition compounding capital. Not merely inequality of income, but inequality of personhood.

That is the economic case against brain appropriation. The mind cannot be a workforce waiting to be extracted. The idea cannot be public property before it is spoken. A person’s cognition cannot become capital simply because a machine can reach it.

A Market for Human Exceptionalism

Human bodies are electrical systems.

The brain, heart, muscles, nerves, and cells all depend on electrical and electrochemical signaling. This is not mystical language. It is basic biology. But once the human nervous system can be accessed, measured, modeled, stimulated, and modified with enough precision, a disturbing possibility emerges: humanity, and with it human exceptionalism itself, may become something to harvest.

That is why the interface matters. A sufficiently advanced nervous-system interface would not merely touch the body. It would reveal the body. It would show what is available from a given person: patterns of attention, memory, emotional regulation, stimulation response, cognitive endurance, neural efficiency, stress tolerance, and perhaps other bioelectric signatures not yet understood by the public. It would turn the private electrical life of the person into something observable, classifiable, and potentially usable.

The danger is that natural talent or intellectual exceptionalism becomes a measurable pattern — first identified, studied, and modeled; then either captured through extrapolation or copied through imitation; and finally packaged and sold to enhance someone else.

Before anything can be exploited, it must be seen. Before it can be copied, it must be mapped. Before it can be taken, it must be identified. Advanced neural interfaces provide that first act of exposure. They may show the exploiter not merely that a person is intelligent, creative, disciplined, resilient, or unusually calm under pressure, but how that person's nervous system expresses those traits in electrical, chemical, and computational terms.

That visibility enables an economy.

In the most restrained version of this future, a system that maps attention could suggest ways to sharpen attention. A system that profiles memory could suggest stimulation patterns for learning. A system that measures emotional regulation could suggest interventions for composure, risk tolerance, or resilience. A system that captures the rhythms of exceptional cognitive performance could become a template for attempts to reproduce those rhythms in someone else. A system that identifies unusual nervous-system efficiency could make that efficiency valuable to people who did not possess it naturally.

That is the best-case version of the market. It is still troubling.

The darker version is theft. Not metaphorical theft. The theft of brain activity, nervous system signaling, and bioelectric patterns from extraordinary human beings. If the specific signaling of a highly capable person can be identified, extrapolated, captured, duplicated, or used as a template for attempted synchronization with another person's brain and nervous system, then the market is no longer merely studying human exceptionalism. It is taking from it.

In the same way that mind uploading threatens to turn a person's cognition into labor, access to nervous system signaling threatens to turn a person's exceptional traits into extractable advantage.

That is the second major form of brain appropriation. The first is the capture of the mind as labor. The second is the theft of the brain's activity as advantage.

"Harvest" is a dark word when applied to a human being, but the market imagined here is dark. It would not reward human exceptionalism. It would seek to gather it, extract it, and redirect it toward those already powerful enough to buy advantage. In such a market, the ultra-wealthy would not look only to themselves for improvement. They would look downward and outward, toward people whose natural gifts make them valuable: the brilliant student from an ordinary family, the unusually disciplined worker, the young scientist near a breakthrough, the artist with rare imagination, the strategist with uncommon judgment, the person whose mind might otherwise have changed the course of his own life.

Western democracy rests on a simple promise: a person's gifts belong first to the person. In America, we tell ourselves that intelligence, discipline, creativity, courage, and invention can alter a life. A person can rise because of what is inside him. He can build, discover, write, persuade, invent, and create a future that was not handed to him.

Brain appropriation would invert that promise. Exceptionalism would no longer be the path by which a person rises. It would become the reason he is targeted. The very qualities that should allow a person to change his life could become the qualities harvested to enhance someone else's.

That changes everything.

The Time for Public Debate Is Now

Some technologies are too consequential to develop first and debate later.

The first step is cultural. Americans must stop thinking of neurotechnology only as a future of mind reading or digital immortality. The real dangers are larger: labor capture, the end of economic mobility, and the harvest of human exceptionalism for the benefit of private power.

The second step is law. Laws do more than regulate conduct. They declare what a society believes to be sacred, forbidden, tolerable, and intolerable. Congress should recognize mental privacy, cognitive liberty, and neural-data ownership. It should impose criminal penalties for nonconsensual neural-device deployment, neural-data extraction, thought decoding, cognitive-labor exploitation, unauthorized neural stimulation, bioelectric extrapolation, or any attempt to copy, emulate, operate, or commercially use a conscious human mind without consent. It should require strict consent standards for neural data collection, storage, transfer, modeling, and commercial use.

The third step is disclosure. The United States should declassify, where safe, intelligence concerning foreign adversary development of covert neurotechnology, injectable neural interfaces, nonconsensual neuromodulation

methods, cognitive-labor exploitation, or bioelectric enhancement research. Americans cannot debate what they are not allowed to understand, and they cannot demand laws against dangers they have never been permitted to see clearly. There is no reason to believe that a scientific advancement possible in a lab overseas could not be attempted in a lab in Texas, California, Massachusetts, or New York. Americans deserve to know the nature of the threat.

The fourth step is public refusal. This paper calls on the American public to demand a pledge from corporations, universities, laboratories, foundations, investors, government contractors, and high-net-worth individuals: no funding, conducting, concealing, commercializing, or assisting research intended to copy, upload, emulate, operate, decode, exploit, extrapolate, or commercially use a conscious human mind, nonconsensual neural profile, or nervous-system signal.

This pledge should not be controversial. It does not ask anyone to abandon medicine. It does not ask anyone to stop restoring speech to the voiceless, treating disease, studying the brain ethically, or building technology with consent. It asks only that powerful actors refuse to develop technologies whose foreseeable use is the nonconsensual appropriation of the human mind, nervous system, cognitive labor, or bioelectric life.

If such research is not being pursued, the pledge costs nothing.

If such research is being pursued, the public deserves to know why.

The wealthiest individuals in this country should be asked to make that pledge publicly. So should major technology companies, defense contractors, private laboratories, universities, longevity ventures, neurotechnology startups, venture-capital funds, and philanthropic foundations operating near this frontier. No private person should be able to hide behind wealth while pursuing sciences that could end human autonomy as we understand it.

The fifth step is medical security. Once the culture changes, once law recognizes the danger, once relevant intelligence is disclosed, and once powerful actors are forced to take a public position, the medical system must change accordingly. Hospitals, clinics, surgical centers, pharmacies, medical-device manufacturers, and regulators must begin treating vascular access to an unconscious or sedated person as access to the brain itself. IV bags, flushes, catheters, injected therapeutics, and high-risk devices should be brought into a modern chain-of-custody framework. The question is not whether every facility is compromised. The question is whether the pathway is important enough to secure. It is.

The time for public debate is now. The stakes are too high for silence, secrecy, or private normalization. Some technologies are too dangerous to normalize quietly. Conscious mind uploading, nonconsensual thought decoding, cognitive-labor capture, covert neural deployment, and bioelectric extrapolation belong in that category.

Endnotes and References

[1] Endovascular brain-computer interfaces / Synchron Stentrode. Mitchell, P., et al. “Assessment of Safety of a Fully Implanted Endovascular Brain-Computer Interface for Severe Paralysis in 4 Patients: The Stentrode With Thought-Controlled Digital Switch (SWITCH) Study.” PubMed / JAMA Neurology.

Relevance: First-in-human safety and feasibility study reporting that neural signals can be recorded from inside a blood vessel.

URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36622685/

[2] Circulatory bioelectronics / MIT Circulatronics. MIT News. “New therapeutic brain implants could defy the need for surgery.”

Relevance: Public summary of microscopic wireless bioelectronic devices designed to travel through blood, reach target brain regions, and provide electrical stimulation without conventional surgery.

URL: https://news.mit.edu/2025/new-therapeutic-brain-implants-defy-surgery-need-1105

[3] Circulatory bioelectronics / Nature Biotechnology paper. Yadav, K., et al. “A nonsurgical brain implant enabled through a cell–electronics hybrid.” Nature Biotechnology.

Relevance: Peer-reviewed research underlying the Circulatronics discussion; describes a nonsurgical brain implant enabled through cell-electronics hybrids.

URL: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41587-025-02809-3

[4] Semantic decoding from brain activity. Tang, J., LeBel, A., Jain, S., and Huth, A. G. “Semantic reconstruction of continuous language from non-invasive brain recordings.” Nature Neuroscience.

Relevance: Introduces a non-invasive decoder that reconstructs continuous language from cortical semantic representations recorded using fMRI.

URL: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41593-023-01304-9

[5] Semantic decoding from brain activity / public summary. Technology Networks. “Decoder Can Translate Brain Activity Without Need for Implants.”

Relevance: Public-facing summary of the Nature Neuroscience semantic-decoding study; describes a noninvasive AI system that translated brain activity into continuous text from fMRI recordings, while noting that the system required participant cooperation and individualized training.

URL: https://www.technologynetworks.com/neuroscience/news/decoder-can-translate-brain-activity-without-need-for-implants-372818

[6] Inner-speech decoding. NIH Research Matters. “Decoding inner speech from brain signals.”

Relevance: NIH summary of a brain-computer interface designed to decode inner speech in real time from activity in the motor cortex.

URL: https://www.nih.gov/news-events/nih-research-matters/decoding-inner-speech-brain-signals

[7] Inner-speech decoding / primary research. Kunz, E. M., et al. “Inner speech in motor cortex and implications for speech neuroprostheses.” Cell.

Relevance: Primary research article on inner speech in motor cortex and implications for speech neuroprostheses.

URL: https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674(25)00681-6

[8] Neuro-nanotechnology as a developing toolkit. Shabani, L., et al. “Neuro-nanotechnology: diagnostic and therapeutic nano-based strategies in applied neuroscience.” BioMedical Engineering OnLine / PubMed Central.

Relevance: Review of nano-based diagnostic and therapeutic strategies in neuroscience, including nanoscale materials and hybridized compounds intended to interact with neuronal cells.

URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9809121/

[9] Nanodevices and neural interfaces / current perspective. Hu, Y. “Application-driven innovations in nanodevices for next-generation transistors, neuromorphic computing, neural interface and quantum computing.” Frontiers in Nanotechnology.

Relevance: Current perspective article discussing nanodevices across several application areas, including neural interfaces, neural recording, and brain stimulation; useful as a broader technical-direction source showing that nanodevices are being framed as part of next-generation neural-interface development.

URL: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/nanotechnology/articles/10.3389/fnano.2025.1583483/full

[10] Nano-MIND / magnetic nanoparticle neuromodulation. EurekAlert / Institute for Basic Science. "New technology to control the brain using magnetic fields developed."

Relevance: Describes Nano-MIND technology using magnetic fields and magnetized nanoparticles to selectively activate targeted brain circuits in animal models.

URL: https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1051652

[11] Stanford infrared / nanoscale transducers for brain-circuit control. Stanford Wu Tsai Neurosciences Institute. "Researchers control brain circuits from a distance using infrared light."

Relevance: Describes a technique for controlling targeted brain circuits in behaving animals from a distance using infrared light and nanoscale transducers.

URL: https://neuroscience.stanford.edu/news/researchers-control-brain-circuits-distance-using-infrared-light

[12] Stanford nanoscale infrared transducer research / primary article. Wu, X., et al. "Midbrain stimulation in freely behaving mice by photothermal transducers actuated via widefield near-infrared-II light." PubMed Central.

Relevance: Primary research article on midbrain stimulation in freely behaving mice using photothermal transducers actuated by near-infrared light.

URL: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9232843/

[13] Ultrasound-activated light-emitting nanoparticles / circulatory nanotransducers. Stanford News. "Researchers use ultrasound to create light inside the body."

Relevance: Describes light-emitting nanoparticles injected into the bloodstream that remain inactive until stimulated by focused ultrasound waves.

URL: https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2026/04/researchers-use-ultrasound-to-create-light-inside-the-body

[14] Whole brain emulation roadmap. Sandberg, A., and Bostrom, N. "Whole Brain Emulation: A Roadmap." Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University.

Relevance: Technical roadmap discussing scanning, computational, and modeling requirements involved in whole brain emulation.

URL: https://gwern.net/doc/ai/scaling/hardware/2008-sandberg-wholebrainemulationroadmap.pdf