

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Crypto-Anarchy and Stateless Economies: Legal Implications of Decentralized Political Systems

Lucía Fernández^{1*}, Diego Álvarez²

¹ Department of Political Science, University of Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina

² Department of Political Science, Universidad Mayor de San Andrés, La Paz, Bolivia

* Corresponding author email address: lucia.fernandez@uba.ar

Received: 2025-03-18

Revised: 2025-05-05

Accepted: 2025-05-13

Published: 2025-10-01

EDITOR:

Richard Dodder

Emeritus Professor of Sociology and of Statistics, Oklahoma State University Stillwater, Oklahoma, USA. Email: rdodder@hotmail.com

REVIEWER 1:

Muhammad Abdul Rahman

Department of Humanities, Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Email: muhammadrahman@ntu.edu.sg

REVIEWER 2:

Zeynep Karal

Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Education, Trabzon University, Trabzon, Türkiye. Email: zeynepkaral@trabzon.edu.tr

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The statement "These systems also complicate efforts to apply traditional concepts such as jurisdiction, legal responsibility, and enforcement..." could be strengthened by including a specific example (e.g., DAO-related court cases or regulatory failures) to ground the conceptual argument in real-world legal conflict.

While quoting Chavali (2024), you write, "illustrating how legal norms can be embedded into code itself." The argument would benefit from clearer delineation between "legal norms" and "contractual obligations." Are you equating the two?

The discussion of post-statism and techno-libertarianism is insightful, but the concepts are presented as static. Please discuss their critiques or internal tensions, such as criticisms of token voting plutocracy in DAOs.

You state, "the elimination of centralized gatekeepers... introduces a new model of sovereignty." This is a provocative claim that needs further elaboration. What are the legal mechanisms (if any) that replace state-centric sovereignty in this model?

The sentence "This disconnection from territorial anchors undermines the ability of states to regulate..." could be improved by incorporating the principle of extraterritoriality and how states are currently trying to expand jurisdiction over digital actors.

You note, "contracts are often written as code and executed automatically..." Please address how contract law elements—such as offer, acceptance, and consideration—translate into smart contract execution.

In the context of IP enforcement on decentralized platforms, your claim that "content can be published...without attribution" is valid, but needs legal grounding. Refer to recent international cases or regulatory proposals (e.g., NFT-related copyright infringement).

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The list of research questions is appropriate, but consider integrating them more fluidly into the narrative. Presenting them in bullet points or italicizing them slightly disrupts the academic tone.

The phrase "Crypto-anarchy is not merely a theoretical construct; it is operationalized..." needs support through a concrete example—perhaps referencing real-world crypto-anarchist communities or applications (e.g., DarkFi or Monero).

The sentence "These contracts enforce compliance algorithmically rather than through judicial systems." requires caution. While enforcement is automated, it does not eliminate the legal consequences of flawed execution. Consider citing DAO collapse cases (e.g., "The DAO" hack in 2016) to reflect this.

The statement "risks are amplified by the absence of overarching legal frameworks" should be clarified. Are you suggesting supranational legal frameworks (e.g., EU or UN)? If so, please propose or cite emerging models.

You assert that "regulatory inconsistency undermines legal predictability." This point would be stronger with reference to specific case law or SEC enforcement actions against U.S.-based crypto firms.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.