

The First Appointed Members of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST).

Reported by the X account of Ricardo @Ric_RTP on X on 25/03/2026:

https://x.com/Ric_RTP/status/2036817531906773109

Trump just gave 13 tech billionaires the keys to America's AI policy.

But there's a HUGE conflict of interest...

The White House just announced the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.

Sounds boring. But wait until you understand what this is actually about.

Here's who's on it:

- Jensen Huang. CEO of Nvidia. His company sells the chips that EVERY AI company on Earth needs to survive. Nvidia is worth \$4.4 trillion. And Jensen now gets to advise the president on the rules for the industry his company monopolizes.

- Mark Zuckerberg. CEO of Meta. Currently planning to fire 20% of his workforce (15,000 people) while spending \$135 billion on AI this year. His company just took a Pentagon contract. Now he's advising on AI workforce policy. The same guy firing 15,000 workers will help decide what happens to American workers displaced by AI.

- Larry Ellison. Executive Chairman of Oracle. His company is \$125 billion in debt. Bleeding cash. Betting everything on AI data centers funded by borrowed money from foreign banks. US lenders already turned him down. And he's now advising on AI infrastructure policy. The guy who can't get American banks to lend him money is going to shape how America builds its AI future.

- Marc Andreessen. The venture capitalist who literally wrote the manifesto called "The Techno-Optimist Manifesto" arguing that AI regulation is dangerous. His firm Andreessen Horowitz has billions invested in AI startups. He's now advising on AI regulation.

- Sergey Brin. Google co-founder. His company is spending \$75 billion on AI this year and just issued \$20 billion in debt including a 100-YEAR bond to fund it.

- Lisa Su. CEO of AMD. Nvidia's direct competitor. Both CEOs are on the same council. Both will advise on chip policy. Both have financial interests that directly conflict with each other AND with the public interest.

- Michael Dell. The guy who just dropped \$6.25 billion on Trump's child investment accounts and gained \$6 billion in market value the same week.

- Safra Catz. Oracle's CEO. Same company. Same debt crisis. Two Oracle execs on a 13 person council.

- Fred Ehrsam. Co-founder of Coinbase. The crypto exchange. On a council co-chaired by David Sacks, Trump's AI AND crypto czar. Crypto and AI policy being shaped by the same people who profit from both.

- Jacob DeWitte. CEO of Oklo, the nuclear startup Sam Altman chaired until last year. Oklo builds reactors to power AI data centers. Now advising on the energy policy his company depends on.

- Bob Mumgaard. CEO of Commonwealth Fusion Systems. Backed by Nvidia and Google. Building fusion reactors for AI data centers. His investors are sitting next to him on this council.

- David Friedberg. Venture capitalist. Part of the Sacks network.

- John Martinis. Google's former quantum computing lead. Built the chip that achieved quantum supremacy.

That's 13 people.

Combined market cap of the companies represented: Over \$12 trillion.

Combined AI spending commitments for 2026 alone: Roughly \$700 billion.

Zero consumer advocates. Zero labor representatives. Zero independent scientists. Zero ethicists.

The people spending \$700 billion on AI are now advising the government on how to regulate AI.

The people firing hundreds of thousands of workers are now advising on workforce policy.

The people \$125 billion in debt from AI bets are now advising on AI infrastructure spending.

This isn't a "council."

Every regulation this council recommends will directly affect their stock prices, their market positions, and their competitive advantages.

Jensen Huang advising on chip export policy affects Nvidia's revenue.

Zuckerberg advising on AI safety regulation affects Meta's product roadmap.

Ellison advising on cloud infrastructure policy affects Oracle's survival.

Andreessen advising on AI startup regulation affects his portfolio returns.

In any other industry, this would be called regulatory capture.

In tech, they call it the "Golden Age of Innovation."

11 more seats are open. The first meeting hasn't been announced yet.

But the rules of AI in America are about to be written by the people who profit the most from keeping them loose.

What do you think about this?