



From the e-ID to the AI Action Plan – Switzerland's new power architecture



November 5, 2025

From e-ID to AI Action Plan

The new power architecture of Switzerland

Digital sovereignty? Not a chance. Switzerland is becoming a testing ground for global AI governance. How Federal Councillor Rösti, digitalswitzerland, and the WEF intend to use the e-ID as a gateway to a new power model.

What is being sold here as a "[breakthrough into the digital future](#)" is in reality the operational blueprint for a centrally coordinated digital governance structure that encompasses all crucial levels: federal government, business, science, army and media, united under the label "[digitalswitzerland](#)".

Behind the seemingly innocuous term "digital sovereignty" lies a power apparatus that aims to make Switzerland the global testing ground for AI governance. A country that once (a long time ago) stood for its direct democracy, its militia system, and its independence is gradually transforming itself into a control center for global interests.

What Federal Councillor [Albert Rösti](#) is presenting at the digitalswitzerland forum as "courage instead of fear" is not a neutral wake-up call, but a program: the transformation of Switzerland into a model digital nation under international supervision. Rösti is acting as the political facilitator of a system that redistributes power and responsibility, away from the people and towards a network of corporations, government agencies, and supranational partners.

Under his direction, "digital sovereignty" becomes the code word for centralized control and technocratic regulation.

The e-ID as a door opener

The official text states it openly: ***"Only if the e-ID succeeds can further digital projects be advanced."*** That's the key. The e-ID isn't just any digitization project, but the identity foundation for everything that will follow: AI regulation, cloud computing and data infrastructures, interoperability (*read: data linking*), and later, digital certificates, health IDs, educational IDs, and whatever else can be digitized under the guise of increasing efficiency.

Whoever controls the e-ID controls access to the entire digital economy, and thus to both the state and its citizens. The e-ID becomes the universal master key to a system that translates freedom into a logic of authorization. Those who do not possess it or do not accept its conditions gradually lose their participation in public life. In the digital age, "building trust" means trust through control.

It was clear to everyone involved that the vote on the e-ID law could not be lost under any circumstances. A second failure, like the one in 2021, would have set back the entire digital program by years and jeopardized confidence in political control.

Accordingly, the campaign was orchestrated down to the last detail, with state-affiliated companies like Swisscom as active participants. The massive communication effort, the timing, and the strikingly narrow approval rating of 50.39 percent still leave [a bitter aftertaste](#)

for many observers . It was less a spontaneous popular decision than a strategically engineered breakthrough, staged as a " [societal consensus](#) . "

The «AI Action Plan»

Continuation of the e-ID using other means

No sooner had the e-ID been politically approved than the next step followed: the "AI Action Plan." This plan doesn't originate from the government, but from a *public-private partnership (PPP)* coordinated by digitalswitzerland. This effectively outsources regulation to actors who design and use it themselves: Google, Microsoft, UBS, Swisscom, Ringier, Swiss Post, the army, and many more.

In WIR language: The governed are regulated by the rule-makers, who write the rules for themselves.

The “AI Action Plan” is intended as a strategic framework under which research, business, and government will collaborate, officially to promote innovation. In practice, however, it is creating a powerful structure in which national sovereignty becomes a mere business consideration. Whoever controls the algorithms and data spaces also controls the decision-making processes.

The goal: an "agile regulation" that is not enshrined in laws but constantly adapts, or in other words: governance without parliamentary control.

The power structure: Who is actually sitting at the table?

A glance at the [committee directory](#) of **digitalswitzerland** is enough to see how pervasive this influence is. It includes technology companies like Google, Microsoft, IBM, Meta, Huawei, and Palantir; banks and insurance companies like UBS, Zurich, Mobiliar, and Julius Baer; defense and security actors such as armasuisse, DDPS, RUAG, and the Swiss Armed Forces; as well as government and media representatives from SRG SSR, Ringier, Swiss Post, Swisscom, and the Federal Office for Cybersecurity. The list is rounded out by lawyers and auditors from EY, Schellenberg Wittmer, and others.

One could say:

The committee replaces parliament, but without opposition, consultation, or referendum. Decisions are made in meeting rooms, not in popular votes. Switzerland, once synonymous with participatory politics, is thus becoming a projection screen for a new, top-down controlled digital order.

The “Cybersecurity Committee” lever

This is where it gets particularly interesting. The cyber architecture is directly networked with the army, the DDPS (Digital Defense Procurement Service), and the private sector. [The committee](#) includes representatives with titles such as "Head of Training, Cyber Command," "Head of Cyber Defence Campus, armasuisse," "CISO, UBS," "Head of Network & Security Switch," and "Head of Group Security, Swisscom." This isn't just protection; this is civil-military system integration, **digital homeland security 2.0**.

The official mission is: "to contribute to a cyber-resilient Switzerland." But in practice, a security complex is emerging in which the boundaries between civil society, the army, and the economy are blurring.

Data is becoming the new weapon, and control over it lies in the hands of a network that is neither democratically elected nor accountable.

The international context

The interim report is to be presented at the WEF in Davos in 2026, followed by the "Global AI Summit Geneva" in 2027. This is a coordinated agenda, both in terms of timing and structure. Geneva, home to the UN, WEF, WHO, and ITU, is becoming the global hub for AI governance and digital regulatory frameworks. Switzerland is serving as "neutral ground," a testing ground for exploring how global governance can be marketed at the national level.

What Federal Councillor Albert Rösti is selling at the digitalswitzerland forum as "courage instead of fear" is not a new beginning, but a *systemic relaunch*. Rösti is not playing the visionary, but the political gatekeeper of a new era of technocratic control. Under his direction, Switzerland is becoming a testing ground for the merging of state, corporations, and algorithms, packaged in the PR buzzword "digital sovereignty."

He calls it "building trust." In reality, trust is replaced by complete traceability: protocols instead of principles, certificates instead of consent, algorithms instead of responsibility.

Switzerland no longer serves as a neutral mediator, but as a testing ground for a controlled society in which every interaction—whether financial, medical, or administrative—becomes digitally verifiable, traceable, and analyzable. What was once a nation of citizens **is becoming a digitally managed zone where freedom is replaced by authorization.**

The "militia system" as a power amplifier

On paper, it sounds like a Swiss virtue: everyone participates, no one dominates. In reality, it's the perfect alibi for institutional infiltration. The representatives on the committee don't work for digitalswitzerland, but for their employers—corporations, banks, insurance companies, the military, and government agencies. They aren't there on a voluntary basis, but as lobbying vehicles for their institutions, which thereby gain direct access to policymaking.

This is the privatization of governance under the guise of cooperation. And because each actor officially only "contributes their know-how," no one can be held accountable for a conflict of interest. A brilliant system. For the players, not for the people.

Who pays for all this?

digitalswitzerland is a private association, not a government institution. Its budget is financed by membership fees from over 170 companies (Google, UBS, Swisscom, SRG, Microsoft, etc.), sponsorships, and government co-financing for strategic projects (e.g., e-ID communication, cybersecurity, educational initiatives).

In short: **The state contributes financially, but others make the rules.** The operational work—the "experts," "data strategy," "cybersecurity"—is carried out by employees seconded

from corporations. This means that the salaries of these lobbyists are paid by the taxpayer or the corporation, depending on who wants to profit from the digital pie first. The "citizen-led system" is, in reality, a coordination network that outsources governmental tasks to private power centers.

Enough with the technocracy show!

What is happening here under the label "digital future" is not progress, but a creeping takeover by systems that no one has elected. The new gods are called "AI governance," "trust," and "innovation," and they demand submission, not participation.

digitalswitzerland acts as the political and industrial link between the Federal Council, corporations, and international tech governance programs. The e-ID was the first major test: would the population's voluntary self-submission work? The answer: yes. The next step is already underway.

And Rösti? The man seems like the cheerful salesman of an idea whose scope he himself barely grasps. **A minister as the mascot of an agenda** that has long since escaped democratic control.

This whole technocracy show, the panels, the forums, the buzzwords, serves only one purpose: the total digitalization of humans as economic resources. Anyone who believes this serves freedom hasn't understood the code.

NO!

We don't want that. We don't need AI trust models, networked identities, or over-regulated self-determination. We need citizens, not users. Democracy, not a user interface.

Because in the end, there is no longer a vote, but only acceptance with a click on "I agree".

But it's not too late. As long as people pay attention, ask questions, and refuse to be digitally manipulated, freedom remains more than just a code. Sovereignty begins where someone says: *No, we won't go along with this.*

Switzerland became great through dissent, not through conformity. And that is exactly what it will need again.

The use of the e-ID, should it be implemented, should be categorically rejected. Because whoever digitizes their identity relinquishes control of it. Forever!