

Beyond the Cloud: The Case for a Hybrid Future in Personal Computing

Austin M. Baumgart

National University

ENG 240: Advanced Composition

Steven Waszak, PhD

September 12, 2026

Beyond the Cloud: The Case for a Hybrid Future in Personal Computing

Artificial intelligence is increasing demand for memory, processors, and other computing resources, creating new questions about the future of personal computer ownership. In “You May Not Actually Own Your Next Computer—Here’s Why,” Nicolae Bochis argues that these pressures could accelerate a transition toward cloud-based computing, where consumers purchase access to computing resources instead of owning increasingly expensive hardware [1]. Bochis compares this potential transition to the development of centralized electrical grids, which eventually eliminated the need for businesses to operate their own generators [1]. His argument presents a compelling case for the continued growth of cloud computing, but it leaves an important question unresolved: Does greater access to centralized computing necessarily mean that personal computer ownership will become obsolete? Unlike electricity, personal computing involves differences in privacy, customization, repairability, performance, connectivity, and control that vary considerably between users and applications. These differences suggest that cloud and local computing may not be direct substitutes for one another. Rather than making personal computers obsolete, the growth of cloud computing should be aimed at creating a hybrid future in which centralized computing and personally owned hardware coexist because each provides distinct advantages in computational resources, performance, privacy, and consumer control.

The increasing computational demands of artificial intelligence provide a strong argument for moving more computing workloads toward centralized cloud infrastructure. Modern AI applications, particularly those using deep neural networks, can require substantial amounts of memory, energy, and processing power that may become increasingly difficult or expensive to provide through consumer hardware alone. Geng et al. explain that deploying deep

neural networks presents “significant challenges due to the huge cost of memory, energy, and computation” [2]. These requirements support Bochi’s argument that consumers could increasingly access computing resources through centralized services rather than purchasing increasingly expensive hardware themselves [1]. Cloud computing can make large pools of computing resources available without requiring every user to maintain hardware capable of handling the most demanding workloads. Geng et al. similarly describe cloud computing as an architecture that centralizes computing resources, demonstrating why it has become an important option for deploying resource-intensive applications [2]. From this perspective, continued increases in AI hardware requirements could make centralized computing more practical and economical for many consumers.

However, computational capacity is not the only factor that determines where a workload should operate. Geng et al. also identify latency, energy, storage, and privacy as important considerations when selecting a computing architecture and note that cloud computing itself can face latency and infrastructure-cost limitations [2]. Therefore, while the growing resource demands of artificial intelligence strengthen the case for greater use of cloud computing, they do not establish that centralized infrastructure can satisfy every technological requirement or eliminate the value of local computing. These competing requirements demonstrate why computational capacity alone cannot determine which computing environment is most appropriate for a particular workload. These limitations become more significant when computing is viewed as a range of interconnected environments rather than a choice between entirely local or entirely cloud-based processing. Belcastro et al. describe modern computing as an edge-cloud continuum rather than a system in which all processing occurs in one location. According to the authors, “The edge-cloud continuum is organized as a hierarchical architecture

comprising multiple layers, each serving distinct purposes and integrating complementary functionalities to support efficient computing and data management” [3]. This distinction is important because it demonstrates that cloud and local computing are not necessarily competing technologies. Instead, different computing environments provide advantages depending on the requirements of a particular task. For example, cloud infrastructure can provide large amounts of computing and storage capacity, while processing data closer to the user can provide advantages when privacy or responsiveness is more important. Belcastro et al. specifically note that “Local data processing and dedicated infrastructures at the on-device and on-premise layers generally yield higher levels of privacy” [3]. This provides one example of a requirement that centralized cloud infrastructure may not always satisfy as effectively as local processing. As computing becomes increasingly dependent on cloud infrastructure, these differences will continue to influence where data is stored and processed. Therefore, the growth of cloud computing does not necessarily eliminate the need for local hardware but instead supports a model in which centralized and local computing resources coexist according to the technological requirements of different users and applications.

The performance requirements of individual computing tasks provide another reason that cloud infrastructure should complement local hardware rather than completely replace it. Although cloud systems can provide substantially greater computing resources, accessing those resources requires data to travel across a network before a task can be processed and its results returned to the user. Wang et al. explain that cloud offloading can improve processing time by providing access to abundant computing resources, but it also increases the amount of transmitted data, which can increase transmission time and negatively affect application performance when network conditions are unstable [5]. This tradeoff means that sending every

workload to centralized infrastructure does not automatically produce better performance. Wang et al. describe an edge-cloud architecture in which tasks can instead be performed on the user device, at the edge, or in the cloud depending on available resources and application requirements [5]. The authors further explain that different types of tasks have different resource requirements and should therefore be managed using different methods [5]. For tasks requiring substantial computational resources, cloud infrastructure may provide the most effective option. In contrast, workloads that depend heavily on responsiveness or reliable access may benefit from remaining closer to the user when sufficient local resources are available. This distinction is especially important when considering personal computers because their workloads can range from relatively simple local applications to computationally demanding artificial intelligence programs. A hybrid computing model preserves the ability to choose where a workload operates instead of making its performance dependent on a single computing environment.

Technical performance is not the only reason personally owned computers continue to provide value. Ownership also gives consumers an interest in maintaining, repairing, and extending the useful life of the hardware they purchase. Gonzales et al. explain that manufacturers can limit repairability through nonrepairable product designs, electronic protections, and restrictions on repair instructions or spare parts, potentially requiring consumers to return to the original manufacturer for support or replace a device entirely [4]. Right-to-repair policies attempt to reduce these restrictions by improving access to parts and repair information and allowing modifications that can extend the lifespan of electronic products [4]. These considerations are particularly relevant as increasing hardware costs raise questions about whether consumers will continue purchasing personal computers. Gonzales et al. note that extending the life of a device through repair is often more affordable than purchasing a new

device and that stronger repair and refurbishment markets can help consumers maintain devices they already own [4]. Personally owned hardware therefore has value beyond simply providing access to computing resources. A computer that can be maintained, repaired, or upgraded can remain useful even as newer and more computationally powerful services become available through the cloud. Preserving personally owned computers alongside cloud services therefore provides consumers with greater control over the lifespan and maintenance of their hardware while still allowing access to centralized resources when those resources provide an advantage.

The continued growth of cloud computing does not require personally owned computers to become obsolete. Instead, future computing development should take advantage of both centralized and local resources because each environment addresses different technological and consumer needs. Cloud infrastructure provides substantial computing and storage resources, particularly for demanding applications such as artificial intelligence, while local computing provides advantages involving privacy, responsiveness, repairability, and user control. These differences demonstrate why treating cloud and local computing as direct substitutes overlooks the benefits provided by each model. Wang et al. support a combined approach, explaining that “edge-cloud computing is one of the most promising ways” to improve device battery life and application performance by combining the benefits of cloud and edge computing [5]. Their research also demonstrates that computing tasks can be performed on a user device, at the edge, or in the cloud depending on application requirements [5]. Rather than concentrating future development entirely within centralized infrastructure, a hybrid approach can preserve the advantages of local hardware while using cloud resources where they are most effective. As artificial intelligence continues to increase computing demands, future research should examine

how hardware costs, network performance, privacy requirements, and consumer needs can shape the most effective balance between centralized and personally controlled computing resources.

References

- [1] N. Bochis, “You may not actually own your next computer—Here’s why,” *BGR*. Accessed: Aug. 22, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bgr.com/2083454/why-you-wont-own-computer-renting-ai-ram-shortage/>
- [2] X. Geng *et al.*, “From algorithm to hardware: A survey on efficient and safe deployment of deep neural networks,” *IEEE Trans. Neural Netw. Learn. Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 5837–5857, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2024.3394494.
- [3] L. Belcastro, F. Marozzo, A. Orsino, D. Talia, and P. Trunfio, “Navigating the edge-cloud continuum: A state-of-practice survey,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 14, pp. 40622–40647, 2026, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2026.3673012.
- [4] A. L. Gonzales, Y. Kim, and L. H. Wang, “Multisolving innovations: How digital equity, e-waste, and right-to-repair policies can increase the supply of affordable computers,” *Policy Internet*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 162–177, 2023, doi: 10.1002/poi3.331.
- [5] B. Wang, C. Wang, W. Huang, Y. Song, and X. Qin, “A survey and taxonomy on task offloading for edge-cloud computing,” *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 186080–186101, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3029649.