

Technologizing Democracy or Democratizing Technology? A Layered-Architecture Perspective on Potentials and Challenges

Bryan Ford

Democracy is in the midst of a credibility crisis. Some of the most well-established Western democracies have become increasingly polarized to the point of tribalism and authoritarianism.¹ The information sources that voters use to understand the world and make their decisions are increasingly suspect.² While democracy preaches a gospel of treating all citizens as equal, established democracies fail in numerous ways to protect the equality of citizens' influence at the ballot box.³

Outside the ballot booth, people in real democracies depend on government to protect not only their physical safety but also their economic and social equality and human rights. Here, too, established democracies fail to protect their citizens from private coercion or feudal rent-seeking structures.⁴ They fail to ensure equal access to equal economic opportunity by accelerating transfers of public wealth to the already rich in the face of skyrocketing economic inequality.⁵ They fail to offer an adequate social safety net to protect the ability of the unlucky or disadvantaged to participate in society as equals with dignity, and they even fail even to protect many people from effective slavery.⁶ As Robert Dahl asked: "In a political system where nearly every adult may vote but where knowledge, wealth, social position, access to officials, and other resources are unequally distributed, who actually governs?"⁷

Many perceive tremendous potential for technology to improve democracy: for example, by making it more convenient (vote from home with your laptop or smartphone), more participatory (express your opinion more than once every few years), or more inclusive (even in the developing world smartphones have become ubiquitous). But this somewhat "techno-utopian" view, common among the denizens of the early internet, has gradually been over-

shadowed by our realization of the many ways technology can undermine democracy, either by accident or by design.

Technologists have often talked about technology as somehow inherently “democratizing”—using that term simplistically to refer to technological capabilities becoming inexpensive and widely available. The unstated and evidence-free implication embedded in this use of the term *democratizing*, however, is that any inexpensive and widely available technological gadget somehow makes society automatically more democratic. Our actual experience in practice seems to suggest the opposite. The evolution of “democratized” social networking capabilities into advertising-driven instruments of mass surveillance; the weaponization of “democratized” free expression capabilities into instruments of fear, chaos, and polarization; the transformation of “democratized” financial technologies like Bitcoin into shiny objects mainly attracting money launderers and financial scammers: all offer abundant experiential evidence of how antidemocratic a “democratizing” technology can be.

But we have also seen how technology is almost infinitely flexible and adaptable. Technology is what we design it to be. Can we design technology to be genuinely democratic—to support and facilitate democracy reliably rather than undermining it? This chapter explores several ways in which democracy in today’s digital world increasingly depends on technology for better or worse, ways that technology is currently failing democracy, and potential ways in which technology could be fixed to support democracy more effectively and securely.

Because effective democracy depends on far more than the occasional act of voting, we explore technology’s interaction with democracy “top to bottom,” across multiple levels at which the ability of people to self-govern depends on behavioral practices that are heavily affected by technology. Yes, effective democracy requires people to have both the right and the ability to vote. When they do vote, they need effective choice, not just a choice “between Tweedledum and Tweedledee.”⁸ Technologies such as e-voting, online deliberation, and liquid democracy show promise in expanding the convenience and effectiveness of democratic choice, but each brings associated risks and major unsolved challenges that we outline.

Effective democracy also requires that people live in a social and economic environment satisfying the conditions for intelligent, informed, and effective democratic choice. People need reliable information sources protected from both subversion through “fake news” and polarization through automated overpersonalization. People need free expression and free association to dis-

cuss ideas and organize effectively—but they also need protection from trolls and other abusers seeking to amplify their voices via sock puppets (multiple fake identities orchestrated by one person) or via fully-automated, anonymous bot armies. People need an economic environment offering them the empowerment and leisure time needed to become informed and participate deeply in the deliberative phases of democracy, and not just in the final vote. Finally, people need the digital ecosystem to be able to recognize and identify them *as people*—that is, as formal “digital citizens”—and to be able to distinguish these real people from the millions of fake accounts of bot farmers inhabiting the internet,⁹ without undermining effective participation through exclusionary and abuse-ridden digital identity systems.

Having examined some of the promises, failures, and unsolved challenges at each of these levels, I attempt to sketch briefly a long-term vision of a potential architecture for effective digital democracy, layered in the classic fashion followed in network protocol architecture.¹⁰ The following sections outline, from top to bottom, such a layered architecture for digital democracy.

The top layer, which I address first, represents the highest-level functionality that I consider the primary end goal: namely effective technology-supported self-governance through democratic deliberation and social choice. Subsequent sections address critical “building block” layers for effective technology-supported democracy: an information layer ensuring that participants have manageable feeds of high-quality, accurate, and unbiased information as an adequate basis for deliberation and decisions; an economic foundation layer to help ensure that citizens have the baseline means and freedoms to invest the time and attention required for genuine democracy; and finally, a digital citizenship layer ensuring that technology can securely but inclusively protect the rights and resources of real people from being abused, undermined, and diluted by online fakery. Finally, in the last two sections I briefly recap this architecture and summarize how appropriate technologies for each layer could eventually fit together into a fundamentally more solid foundation for digital democracy than exists today.

Democratic Deliberation and Choice

As networked computing technology was just emerging, visionaries immediately recognized its potential use to involve people more richly in the democratic process.¹¹ Instead of trekking to a physical polling place every few years to make a nearly binary choice between candidates that voters have at best heard about on TV, technology promised the possibility of “virtual town halls” in which millions could observe and participate continuously

in democratic deliberation processes. Bringing that online democracy vision into reality has been far more slow and fitful, however.

As a starting point, e-voting systems promise the convenience of voting from the comforts of one's own home, or remotely from outside the country of one's citizenship, without fundamentally changing the nature or frequency of democratic choice.¹² Switzerland's long-held and extensive practice of direct democracy results in citizens being asked to vote typically four or more times per year. This participatory approach in part motivated Switzerland's pervasive adoption of voting by mail, followed by its early adoption of e-voting.¹³

Any technology that permits voting outside the controlled environment of the ballot booth, however, may increase risks of undetected voting fraud such as coercion or vote-buying attacks. The McCrae Dowless mail-in-ballot fraud incident in North Carolina recently highlighted these risks.¹⁴ E-voting systems present particularly critical security concerns, however, due to the risks they may present of scalable electronic attacks, such as by an attacker anywhere in the world successfully compromising the vote-counting servers or exploiting a security bug common to many end-user devices.¹⁵ Further, the same efficiency and scalability that makes e-voting attractive could potentially enable attackers to coordinate large-scale voter fraud, through dark *decentralized autonomous organizations*, or DAOs, for example.¹⁶ Some of these challenges are likely to be solvable only in coordination with "lower layers" of the technology stack, such as communications and identity layers, discussed later.

There have been many attempts—with varying success—to get citizens involved not just in one-off votes or polls but in true deliberative processes where participants learn about and discuss issues in depth, often with the help of domain experts.¹⁷ Selecting participants by sortition or randomly sampling a target community can keep costs manageable while ensuring that the deliberative body is diverse and representative.¹⁸ Because the size and cost of each such representative group is small, governments and other organizations can in principle launch and run many such deliberative groups in parallel on different topics, making the process efficient and scalable. Recent computer science efforts to scale automated decentralized systems, such as blockchain and smart contract systems, have relied on essentially the same principle of running many small representatively sampled groups in parallel.¹⁹

Some of the key benefits of democratic deliberation, however, are embodied not so much in the outcome of deliberation (i.e., the lessons learned or the report written at the conclusion), but in the impact of deliberation on the participants themselves—such as giving the participants deeper under-

standing of issues that affect them, a sense of participating actively in their community, and (hopefully) a feeling of having their voices heard. Deliberation in small sampled groups, however representative and scalable, has the key limitation of awarding the latter class of benefits only to the few lucky winners of the lottery. The larger population benefits at best indirectly, from the participants' reports about their experiences and/or from the effects of better policy decisions hopefully being made.

The idea of delegative or liquid democracy pursues the goal of enabling everyone to participate in regular or even continuous online deliberative processes while recognizing the fundamental constraint that everyone has limited time and attention.²⁰ The essential idea is to give citizens the freedom to choose when and how much to participate, based on their limited attention, while delegating their voice on matters beyond their capacity or interests to others they trust to represent them. In essence, all participants receive an individual choice between direct and representative democracy, on an issue-by-issue or vote-by-vote basis.

There have been many experiments in implementing and deploying liquid democracy throughout the world over the past two decades, with promising but mixed results.²¹ The most prominent and large-scale experiment in liquid democracy so far was the German Pirate Party's adoption of the idea for online intraparty discussion via its LiquidFeedback platform.²² Liquid democracy presents many concerns and potential risks, however.

One important concern with liquid democracy is that different delegates, freely chosen by proxy voters, will necessarily exercise different amounts of voting power in the deliberative process.²³ Concern for such effects seems to be supported by the German Pirate Party's experience of one delegate accumulating (apparently by accident) an outsize share of voting power.²⁴ Many of these risks may be mere artifacts of immature implementations of liquid democracy, however, with weaknesses that are important but easily fixed. The concentration of power the Pirate Party experienced, for example, may be attributable to the LiquidFeedback software's allowing voters to choose only one person to delegate their entire vote to, artificially creating a "winner-take-all" scenario in which almost-but-not-quite-as-popular delegates lose out completely. Other formulations of liquid democracy allow voters to split their voting power among multiple delegates,²⁵ enabling delegated power to spread among all the delegates each voter trusts instead of concentrating on a few global winners. Other recent work introduces multiple-delegation mechanisms with provisions specifically designed to limit the inequality of delegated voting power.²⁶ It is not yet clear whether such provisions are strictly necessary, however, or what the attendant costs and trade-offs might be.

Other concerns that are less fundamental but equally critical in practice center on the immature technology implementations of current online deliberation and liquid democracy platforms, almost all of which rely on a single centralized server, whose compromise could undetectably corrupt the entire democratic process. The experience of Italy's "Five Star" movement, widely suspected to embody more of a techno-autocracy than a democracy facilitated by the software platform designed and run by a father-son duo, illustrates the risks inherent in centralized platforms.²⁷ There is growing interest in building liquid democracy systems on decentralized blockchain and smart contract platforms,²⁸ but these experiments and the platforms they build on are still immature, and subject to the same critical security, privacy, and voting fraud risks that apply to e-voting systems.

Information Selection, Reputation, Bias, and Polarization

Voters cannot make informed decisions without access to good information, together with the time and motivation to digest it—the key prerequisite to effective democracy that Robert Dahl terms “enlightened understanding.”²⁹ Throughout most of human history, information was scarce and precious. The digital world stands this problem on its head, creating the equally serious but opposite problem of too much information, with only inadequate, insecure, and essentially undemocratic mechanisms for users to filter, select, and mentally process that information.

The Usenet was the first global, decentralized public forum online allowing anyone to read and post messages and discuss practically any topic.³⁰ In its time, Usenet was intensely exciting and empowering to many, and was an early entrant in the long line of digital technologies frequently referred to, rightfully or not, as “democratizing.”³¹ The Usenet is now largely forgotten, not because it stopped working, but because it worked too well, reliably broadcasting signal and noise together and rendering both nearly uncensorable. Spam—both the term and the online practice—were invented on Usenet, and precipitated its effective downfall as uncontrolled spam and trolling finally sent most “netizens” scurrying away to more protected forums on centralized platforms.³²

But trading the uncontrolled chaos of the decentralized Usenet, for the protection of professional moderators and opaque filtering algorithms owned by profit-motivated technology companies, may in hindsight have been a Faustian social bargain. Centralized technology platforms like Facebook and Twitter did give people freedom to communicate among their friends with greater protection from spam and trolls. These platforms had their own

heyday of being called “democratizing”—especially around the time of the Arab Spring.³³ But spammers and trolls learned to adapt and abuse these platforms, leading to the online forum governance and exclusion problems detailed elsewhere in this volume.³⁴ Further, the effective concentration of information-filtering power into opaque and unaccountable algorithms, designed and run by a few profit-motivated technology giants, represents a crucial threat to democracy in its own right.

Despite the public’s retreat to proprietary platforms, technology researchers never lost interest in finding decentralized solutions to the noise and abuse problems that defeated Usenet. The proof-of-work algorithm underlying Bitcoin, for example, was originally proposed as a mechanism to combat spam, by requiring an e-mail’s sender to prove to have spent considerable computational effort preparing it.³⁵ Other clever decentralized algorithms could in principle efficiently pick a set of *guides*, who find and recommend content compatible with the tastes of a given user, out of an ocean of bad content and fake accounts.³⁶

The encryption tool PGP (Pretty Good Privacy) popularized the idea of decentralized social trust networks in its “web of trust” model.³⁷ Many decentralized content governance and filtering algorithms subsequently built on the idea of trust networks.³⁸ However, actually building trust networks with PGP or other decentralized tools never caught on among the public or even the tech-savvy. Even if decentralized social networks had caught on widely, it is doubtful whether the social networks constructed by the popular centralized platforms actually have the critical properties of trust networks required by decentralized content filtering algorithms.³⁹

Another fundamental problem with the social or trust network approach lies in the basic premise that it is desirable for voters to perceive the world through a lens filtered by their immediate social relationships, a practice widely suspected (though not conclusively proved) to create an “echo chamber” effect and contribute to social polarization and tribalism.⁴⁰ People who mostly rely on—and most trust—information filtered through their social network may also be more inclined to perceive bias in information sources *not* filtered by their social tribe.⁴¹ Without discounting the popularity and appeals of social communication, it seems clear that the digital ecosystem is missing an objective, unbiased, and usable source of “big picture” information and perspective.

One promising idea is to employ the sampling methods discussed here to the problem of selecting and filtering information.⁴² For example, we might try to design news feeds whose topics and viewpoints are chosen through some deliberative information selection process, by members of a represen-

tative sample population, to ensure diversity and objectively avoid bias. Although this approach seems worth exploring, it presents further challenges.

A small representative group might conceivably be effective at choosing among and selecting information on topics already of widespread interest. A sample population is much less likely to be effective, however, at identifying rare topics of not-yet-widely-recognized importance or at finding valuable but obscure information about such topics. This is an instance of the perennial “needle in a haystack” problem or of the “rare event” problem in statistics.

Here again, liquid democracy ideas may be useful in synergy with sortition methods. In an online forum dedicated to gathering and selecting information, suppose we initially give voting power only to the members of a small sample population. However, we allow these sampled voters to delegate their voice selectively—in whole or in fractions—to others outside the representative group whom they deem trustworthy and knowledgeable on particular topics. This delegation could enable the small original sample population to spread and multiply their information-gathering power, effectively recruiting a much larger crowd of assistants and advisers to their aid, while preserving the sampling-based diversity and democratic representativeness of the group’s composition and perspectives.

Any approach to information filtering and selection runs into the fundamental problem of accounting (or not) for expertise. We generally expect information from domain experts to be more reliable and trustworthy precisely because experts are supposed to know more about the domain. Being able to identify and utilize domain expertise increases in importance as topics and policy questions become more complex and deeply technical. Experts may also bring domain-related biases, however. An obvious example of such bias is the tendency of technology developers to perceive the positive uses of their systems and algorithms far more readily than the negative risks their designs carry.

Further, there is the fundamental question of who decides who is an expert, on what grounds, and whether that expert-selection process can be called “democratic” in any sense. Neither ordinary citizens nor professional politicians without domain knowledge are necessarily good at distinguishing experts from smooth-talking charlatans.⁴³ But professional organizations and certification systems, in which yesterday’s experts vet and choose tomorrow’s experts, are subject to narrow groupthink, gradual inbreeding, and cultural ossification.⁴⁴ Organizations that vet, fund, or reward experts for their work may become disconnected from and unaccountable to the broader public.⁴⁵

Can we find more democratic and accountable ways to recognize and vet

experts and the critical role they play in both producing and evaluating information serving the broader public on deeply technical topics? One observation that may be useful is that although nonexperts may have trouble distinguishing top experts from lesser experts or charlatans who merely speak the language, it might be more feasible to rely on people merely to identify others with *greater expertise than themselves* in a domain. This observation suggests a variation on the delegation ideas explored above: ask members of a community or a representative group to identify a few other people each—inside or outside the original group—who they consider trustworthy and to have more expertise than themselves on some topic. Sort the resulting group by delegated voting weight, eliminate (say) the bottom half, and repeat. The hypothesis, yet to be fully developed and tested, is that each iteration of this process will use progressively better (more expert) information to narrow the population of candidate experts, and ensure that charlatans will be discovered and eliminated at some level at which the genuine experts can reliably distinguish them.⁴⁶

Yet another important question is how we can democratically finance and reward journalism and the production of good information, and manage it once produced.⁴⁷ I defer exploration of this topic to the next section.

Access, Inclusion, and Economic Empowerment

Real voters in functioning democracies aren't just disembodied decision-making entities in an academic's theoretical model; they must make decisions and participate (or not) in the context of the real environment they live in. The opportunities and constraints their environment provides—including their education, social networks, money, and free time—has significant practical impact on their effective inclusion or exclusion in political and civic society.⁴⁸

Many practical factors can present exclusionary barriers to the act of voting, such as to voters who have no identity card, no home address, or past criminal convictions.⁴⁹ Timing and other logistical factors may affect voter turnout, although in complex and often-unclear ways.⁵⁰

Excluding citizens from voting, however, is merely the most blunt and crude way to compromise Dahl's democratic criterion of inclusiveness.⁵¹ For effective democracy, citizens also need good information, the time to digest and discuss it and form their preferences, and the time and opportunity to participate in controlling the agenda—whether by attending town-hall meetings, joining political demonstrations, calling their representatives, or other activities. People also need the requisite education and political culture to

have a basic sense of what democracy is.⁵² Those struggling to survive while juggling three precarious part-time jobs may reasonably consider voting, let alone taking the time required for informed voting and active participation, to be a luxury they cannot afford.⁵³

Given the evidence that political participation is linked with economic inequality, which has been growing uncontrollably, we may justifiably consider the economic equality and well-being of voters to be as essential to effective democracy as voting itself.⁵⁴ This raises the question of whether the economic foundations of today's democracies are adequately "democratic"—and if not, to what extent the proper use of technology could improve that situation.

In the developing world experiencing the highest global inequality, mobile phones have become surprisingly ubiquitous.⁵⁵ There is evidence this penetration has helped mitigate inequality and stimulate financial development.⁵⁶ This ubiquity of mobile devices could potentially offer a technological foundation for further projects to improve financial inclusion, as exemplified by the M-Pesa project in Kenya.⁵⁷

Bitcoin and its many derivative cryptocurrencies represent another class of technologies often loosely called "democratizing"—this time usually in the sense of enabling people to perform cashlike transactions electronically without relying on trusted parties such as banks.⁵⁸ While Bitcoin may in principle be usable by anyone without banks, however, to use it one must either buy Bitcoin from someone, or mine it oneself by competing to solve cryptographic puzzles. Because the nature of Bitcoin mining confers huge advantages on those with access to cheap energy and the latest specialized hardware, however, mining is no longer economically viable to ordinary users—or to anyone but a few large entrenched specialists, in fact.⁵⁹ Thus, to use Bitcoin, the have-nots must buy or borrow it from the haves. Bitcoin and most cryptocurrencies thus merely replicate and digitally automate the inequality-increasing status quo and cannot justifiably be described as "democratic" at least in a sense of equality of participation or inclusiveness.

An increasingly popular idea is to replace, or augment, traditional social "safety net" programs with a universal basic income, or UBI—a regular income that citizens of some jurisdiction receive automatically regardless of whether or how much they work.⁶⁰ UBI is an intriguing idea that has seen limited experiments.⁶¹ There is at least one important downside of the usually proposed approach of implementing UBI in a political jurisdiction such as a town, state, or country, however: it would create an incentive for anyone outside the relevant jurisdiction to move in—or try to gain residency status fraudulently—thereby exacerbating already-inflamed xenophobic and protectionist tendencies.⁶²

An interesting alternative approach would be to build a cryptocurrency with a built-in UBI.⁶³ Like Bitcoin, such a crypto-UBI currency would be usable by anyone “across borders” and not tied with existing geopolitical jurisdictions or currencies. Several cryptocurrency start-ups are already attempting such projects, in fact.⁶⁴ Such crypto-UBI currencies could also conceivably be designed to offer collectively financed economic rewards to the producers of information that the user community finds useful. This possibility suggests new ways to fund news, media, and open-source technologies more democratically rather than via traditional profit-motivated or philanthropic channels.⁶⁵

Many social, economic, and technical issues remain to determine whether and in what form the crypto-UBI idea is viable, however. And like many of the other potentially democratizing technology ideas discussed above, no crypto-UBI scheme can operate fairly or improve equality unless it can identify real people and distinguish them from fake identities of fraudsters, the fundamental challenge we focus on next.

Identity, Personhood, and Digital Citizenship

When humans interact in the real world, we use multiple senses tuned over millions of years of evolution to detect and distinguish other humans, creatures, inanimate objects, and unknown potential threats. We therefore take it for granted that we can easily and reliably distinguish people from nonpeople. Professions such as computer graphics and robotics that try to simulate human forms have discovered just how difficult it is to fool our senses, due to the widely observed *uncanny valley* effect, in which almost-but-not-quite-perfect simulations can unintentionally trigger deep emotional reactions.⁶⁶ Our physical-world identity challenges thus tend to focus on classifying and differentiating between people: known or unknown, friend or enemy, attractive or unattractive, insider or outsider, member or nonmember, citizen or foreigner.

But our intuitive assumption that distinguishing between real and fake people is easy completely fails to translate into the digital world—in part because our electronic devices do not have human senses with their millions of years of evolutionary tuning. By default, digital technologies know a “person” only as an electronic record or account someone entered claiming, correctly or incorrectly, to represent a person. This inability to recognize personhood underlies one of the most fundamental unsolved challenges in our technology ecosystem: preventing abusers from creating several (or many) fake identities—whether for fun, for profit, or to undermine democracy. In distributed systems, this problem is termed the Sybil attack, after a famous psychiatric case of multiple-personality disorder.⁶⁷

The reason the Sybil attack is so important is that it renders most of our common and intuitive defenses against abuse ineffective. Blocking a spammer's e-mail address is useless because the spammer will just create many more fake identities automatically, leaving the spam problem unsolved after decades of attempted solutions.⁶⁸ As technology companies try to employ more sophisticated automated algorithms such as machine learning to detect fake identities, professional spammers and trolls adapt the same automation technologies to create ever-more-convincing fake identities,⁶⁹ with increasingly serious consequences.⁷⁰ Automated Turing tests such as CAPTCHAs fail to stem fake accounts in part because machine-learning algorithms are getting better than real humans at solving such tests.⁷¹ Sybil attacks allow trolls to amplify their voices in collaborative forums by creating sock puppets supporting their cause.⁷² Because the internet cannot distinguish between real and fake people, and ideologically, politically, or profit-motivated users can exploit this fundamental vulnerability at increasingly massive scales without significant risk, our digital ecosystem is evolving into one in which a large fraction of the "people"—and their online "discourse"—is fake.⁷³

This increasingly-correct perception that so much of the internet is fake, including a large portion of its supposed inhabitants, marginalizes *real* people online and fuels the growing technology backlash.⁷⁴ Further, the fact that such a high percentage of likes, upvotes, reviews, or any other online artifacts purportedly representing the opinions of "people" are well known to be fake or readily forgeable, undermines any presumption that anything about the internet can be justifiably or legitimately called "democratic."

The scope, generality, and global consequences of the fake identity problem demand a correspondingly robust and general solution, but all of the currently popular proposed solutions have significant flaws. Bitcoin's attempt to address Sybil attacks via proof-of-work failed to ensure either equality or inclusiveness in participation, but also created an environmentally-disastrous runaway competition to waste energy.⁷⁵ The cryptocurrency community has explored many variations such as memory-hard proof-of-work, proof-of-space, and proof-of-stake.⁷⁶ All these variations reward participants in proportion to some form of investment, however, whether in terms of computation, memory, or purchasing and "staking" existing currency. All these investment-centric mechanisms, therefore, can be expected to retain "rich get richer" tendencies toward inequality in the power and influence of participants, and thus cannot hope to offer person-centric fairness or ensure equality of participation in a truly democratic sense.

The most obvious solution to identifying people is simply to transplant traditional identity documentation and verification processes online. Today's

“know your customer” (KYC) regulations for anti-money-laundering (AML) in banking have made checking identification a critical step in online finance businesses and have created a booming market in identity-verification start-ups.⁷⁷ These verification processes typically involve asking users to present a physical photo ID over a video-chat session and use machine learning for automation and liveness detection techniques such as eyeball tracking in attempt to detect spoofing attacks.⁷⁸

Besides being privacy-invasive, however, this approach is not particularly secure either. Computer-generated imagery technology has already traversed the “uncanny valley” to produce deep fakes, or video-simulated people that look convincing to real people.⁷⁹ Because abusers can use this ever-improving simulation technology to counter advances in detection, this approach offers at best an endless arms race that will likely end in deep fakes eventually becoming more reliably convincing than real people to detection algorithms.

A second problem with ID verification processes is that the physical IDs that they verify are not difficult or costly to fake. Digital passport scans sell for \$15 on the black market, for example, with forged passports sufficient for online ID verification but not to cross borders selling for \$1,000, and genuine passports usable to cross borders available for around \$15,000.⁸⁰ Because these are retail prices of black market IDs sold individually, the vendors and their corrupt sources can doubtless perform wholesale ID forgery much more cheaply. In effect, ID verification appears inevitably destined to become little more than security theater and a legal compliance checkbox while offering no real protection against determined identity forgery.⁸¹

Another approach to Sybil attack protection utilizes automated graph analysis of social trust networks. These algorithms typically rely on the assumption that a Sybil attacker can easily and cheaply create nodes (fake identities) in the social graph but has a harder time creating edges (trust relationships) connecting them to real people.⁸² As mentioned, however, it is doubtful that popular online social networks actually constitute trust networks satisfying this assumed property.⁸³ For example, many Twitter users intentionally engage in *link farming*, or following a large number of other accounts on the (well-placed) hope that a significant fraction will reciprocate.⁸⁴ The presence of a significant number of link-promiscuous real users makes it easy for Sybil accounts to hide in that group and defeat graph algorithms that assume attackers are link limited. In more sophisticated infiltration attacks, social bots interact with other users by forwarding or synthesizing content.⁸⁵

Even if real users could build a well-disciplined trust network, these graph algorithms would detect only egregious Sybil attacks, such as the case of one attacker creating a large number of fake identities. Graph algorithms could

not and would not prevent many users from each cheating a little bit, by coordinating with their friends to create a few fake identities for example. Finally, Sybil resistance via trust networks would also be exclusionary against real people or groups who are in fact poorly connected socially, and who would likely be falsely eliminated as Sybil identities.

Biometrics present another approach to identity and Sybil attack protection, as exemplified in India's Aadhaar digital identity project, which has issued biometric identities to more than a billion people.⁸⁶ While attractive in terms of usability, the use of biometrics for identification is problematic in numerous ways. First, protecting against Sybil attacks and ensuring that each person registers only once requires de-duplication checks during enrollment, or comparing the new enrollee's biometrics against all existing ones, that is, over a billion in the case of Aadhaar.⁸⁷ This de-duplication requires all users' biometrics to be collected in a massive searchable database, creating huge privacy and surveillance concerns, in part because biometrics are effectively "passwords you can't change."⁸⁸ Second, since biometric matching is inherently imprecise, it can both falsely accept duplicate enrollments and falsely reject legitimate new users. The Aadhaar program estimated a 0.035 percent false accept rate in 2017, but a different method produced an estimate of 0.1 percent the following year, implying that hundreds of thousands of Aadhaar records might be duplicates.⁸⁹ There are signs that false rejections may be an increasing problem, as well, leading to another form of digital exclusion.⁹⁰ Biometric exclusion threatens not just the participation opportunities, but even the very lives of unlucky or marginalized people who fall through the inevitable gaps left by biometric technologies.⁹¹

Having exhausted the commonly-proposed but uniformly-flawed solutions to distinguishing real people from fake Sybil accounts, what else is left? One idea is to create digital "proof-of-personhood" tokens via in-person ceremonies called *pseudonym parties*.⁹² This idea builds on a back-to-basics security foundation, by relying on a person's physical presence at some time and place. For now, real people still have only one body each, and thus can be in only one place at a time. Expendable clones are still science fiction, and robots have yet to follow Hollywood across the uncanny valley.⁹³

Leveraging this property, a few times per year we might organize concurrent pseudonym parties at various locations, wherever a suitable group of organizers is available to run one. Before a certain critical moment, synchronized across a set of coordinated events, anyone is allowed to enter an enclosed or cordoned-off space. After the critical moment, people may only leave, getting one anonymous digital credential scanned on the way out, such as a QR code displayed on a smartphone or printed on paper. If properly run, witnessed,

and recorded for public transparency, such a process could ensure that any participant can get one and only one “verified real person” credential valid for a given time period. Because pseudonym parties rely only on physical presence for their security, they avoid requiring any privacy-invasive identity checks or biometrics, or problematic security assumptions about social trust networks.

There is ample precedent for people participating in events requiring physical presence. The billions of members of the world’s largest religious traditions often attend in-person ceremonies in churches or temples several times a year, once a week, or more. Two Swiss cantons, Glarus and Appenzel Interior, have used open-air assemblies, or *Landsgemeinden*, for direct democracy for hundreds of years.⁹⁴ Political protests play a regular role in many democracies despite producing only rough media estimates of numbers present, and to uncertain and nonobvious concrete political effect.⁹⁵ Scheduling and organizing such events to double as pseudonym parties could provide both the organizers and the public more precise statistics on attendance and could give the attendees themselves verifiably Sybil-resistant anonymous credentials that might eventually become useful for many purposes.

After a pseudonym party, for example, attendees could later use their digital credentials merely to “prove they were there,” or to form anonymous but abuse-resistant online forums for follow-up discussion or deliberation with attendance restricted to the in-person attendees. More broadly, attendees could use personhood badges to obtain “verified real person” status similar to verified account (“blue checkmark”) status on websites and social networks. Attendees could use their digital credentials as voting tokens in online polls or deliberative forums. They could use their digital credentials to represent a one-per-person notion of stake to build proof-of-personhood decentralized blockchains and crypto-UBI currencies.⁹⁶

Regular attendance of pseudonym parties could eventually become part of a social contract that offers a kind of Sybil-resistant formal digital citizenship, with various rights and abilities unlocked by digital proof-of-personhood credentials. These rights include secure, private, and democratically equitable online participation, together with the necessary protection from abuse, trolling, and ballot stuffing by fake identities. Because proof-of-personhood tokens have limited value and validity period, they are inherently “renewable” simply by showing up at a future pseudonym party anywhere. Digital citizenship rights attached to such time-limited but renewable tokens may therefore prove both more democratically equitable (fair) and more inalienable (inclusive) than offline or online identity-based approaches can achieve. The main cost to citizens imposed by this social contract is simply to show up and “prove personhood” periodically.

While promising, many social, process, and implementation challenges remain to develop and test the viability of proof-of-personhood. Addressing these challenges remains an ongoing research project.⁹⁷

An Architecture for Digital Democracy

This chapter has explored several levels of societal functionality that appear to be critical to effective democracy: deliberation and choice, information selection, inclusion and economic empowerment, personhood and digital citizenship. It has also explored ways technology attempts to address these levels of functionality, ways it fails to do so, and potential ways we might improve our technology to address some of those flaws.

I now attempt to stitch these functionality levels together and look at them as a sketch for a potential architecture for digital democracy. This architectural perspective is directly inspired by classic layered network architectures such as the OSI model,⁹⁸ which attempts to decompose functionality into layers so that higher-level layers providing more sophisticated functionality depend only on the simpler services of lower layers. Taking this inspiration, we might arrange the functional layers of digital democracy described in the previous sections as follows:

Democratic Deliberation and Choice
Information Filtering and Selection
Inclusion and Economic Empowerment
Personhood and Digital Citizenship

Although this is only one of no doubt many potential architectural perspectives and is most likely not complete or perfect, we can at least briefly justify this particular layering as follows, from bottom to top.

At the base level we need personhood and digital citizenship—specifically, some technological mechanism to differentiate real people from fake accounts, whether or not that means identifying them in a traditional sense—to enable all the layers above to function securely and provide inclusion and democratic equality. Without a secure personhood foundation, financial inclusion technologies such as cryptocurrencies cannot allocate stake or resources (e.g., crypto-UBI) fairly among real people, information filtering and selection technologies are vulnerable to sock puppetry and content reputation manipulation attacks, and deliberation and choice mechanisms are vulnerable to trolling and ballot stuffing. Online democracy can never be legitimate, either in fact or in public perception, without a legitimate demos comprised of real people.

At the next level up, citizens of democracies need a stable social and economic “floor” to stand on before they can be expected to take time for or prioritize enlightened participation in democracy. This is simply an inevitable result of the “survival first” principle. A UBI or crypto-UBI might or might not be the right economic mechanism to help ensure such an economic floor and the assurance of personal independence of dignity it is intended to provide. However, it seems that every conceivable such mechanism, if democratic, will need to rely on some notion of personhood to allocate resources and services of all kinds equitably, and thus must be built atop some form of personhood and digital citizenship layer.

Given sufficient social and economic freedom to participate in democracy, citizens then need access to good information with which to make decisions, whose provision in whatever form is the function of the information filtering and selection layer. Again, we have explored some potential ways current abuse-ridden social information filtering and reputation systems might be improved and made more democratic, for example by relying on representative sample populations, with or without delegation capability, to prioritize topics, to evaluate and filter information, and to choose experts in a democratically egalitarian fashion. While we have not much discussed models for the funding and compensation of news and information, leaving that topic to other chapters in this volume,⁹⁹ we might envision such funding and reward mechanisms building on the economic empowerment mechanisms of the layer below, such as cryptocurrencies supporting collective rewards or micropayments for information content. Regardless, because almost all realistic filtering and selection mechanisms become vulnerable if abusers can use Sybil attacks to inject fake upvotes or downvotes or reviews, this layer depends like the others on the personhood and citizenship foundation.

Finally, at the top level, we feel ready to envision more solid digital mechanisms for democratic participation, deliberation, and choice, building on all the functionality of the lower layers. It may not be too far off the mark to consider this layer the “mind” of the democratic digital collective: the decentralized organ at which the deliberative body hopefully achieves awareness and well-informed collective decision-making capability. We can hope for this collective “mind” to make truly democratic decisions, reflecting the interests of the entire population, only if it has the critical lower architectural layers to build on: layers ensuring that people have good information with which to make decisions, that guarantee a universal baseline of access to the time and economic resources to do so, and that protect participants’ rights as people from both individual exclusion and collective manipulation through digital fakery.

Again, we offer this perspective only as a likely incomplete and imperfect sketch of a potential reference model fitting together a few of the critical support functions for digital democracy. The hope is merely that it provide be a useful starting point to think about and build on.

Conclusion

Inspired by Robert Dahl's analysis of critical elements of effective democracy,¹⁰⁰ I have attempted a high-level exploration of key areas of functionality where digital technologies seem relevant to the mechanisms of democracy but are currently failing to fill these roles reliably or securely. In this exploration, I have attempted to fit together these functionality areas into a layered architectural perspective designed around the principle of ensuring that higher layers depend only on lower layers. Higher layers derive from lower layers all the functional services they need to operate in a reliable, secure, abuse resistant, and democratically egalitarian fashion.

All elements of digital democratic functionality seem to depend fundamentally on a currently missing personhood or digital citizenship foundation to distinguish real people from fake Sybil accounts. The inclusion and economic empowerment layer depends on the personhood layer to build a "floor" of economic freedom and financial empowerment for all digital citizens to stand on and be able to have the time for real democratic participation. The information filtering and selection layer ensures that citizens have access to good information, depending on the economic layer to fund the production of information and the personhood layer to ensure that information filtering and selection is broad, representative, and objectively unbiased. Finally, the deliberation and choice layer builds on all lower layers—personhood to ensure "one person, one vote" equality in participation, the economic layer to ensure the time and economic freedom to participate, and the information layer to support enlightened understanding.

While only the barest sketch, this architectural perspective might help us break down and think about the complex problems of digital democracy in a more modular, systematic fashion than has been typical, and hopefully will provide a baseline for more detailed future architectural models for digital democracy to build from.

Notes

1. On polarization, see Prior, "Media and Political Polarization"; Iyengar and Westwood, "Fear and Loathing across Party Lines." On tribalism, see Hawkins et al., "Hidden Tribes";

Packer, "A New Report Offers Insights into Tribalism in the Age of Trump." On authoritarianism, see Browning, "The Suffocation of Democracy."

2. Woolley, "Automating Power"; Ferrara et al., "The Rise of Social Bots"; Woolley and Guilbeault, "Computational Propaganda in the United States of America"; Broniatowski et al., "Weaponized Health Communication"; Shao et al., "The Spread of Low-Credibility Content by Social Bots."

3. Smith, "Political Donations Corrupt Democracy in Ways You Might Not Realise"; Gilens and Page, "Testing Theories of American Politics"; Cost, *A Republic No More*; Flavin, "Campaign Finance Laws, Policy Outcomes, and Political Equality in the American States"; Kalla and Broockman, "Campaign Contributions Facilitate Access to Congressional Officials"; Samuel, "Rigging the Vote"; Tisdall, "American Democracy Is in Crisis, and Not Just Because of Trump."

4. Shlapentokh and Woods, *Feudal America*.

5. Keller and Kelly, "Partisan Politics, Financial Deregulation, and the New Gilded Age"; Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*.

6. Weitzer, "Human Trafficking and Contemporary Slavery"; Kara, *Modern Slavery*.

7. Dahl, *Who Governs?*

8. Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*.

9. Berger, "Bot vs. Bot"; Read, "How Much of the Internet Is Fake?"

10. Day and Zimmermann, "The OSI Reference Model."

11. Heinlein, *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress*; Tullock, *Toward a Mathematics of Politics*; Miller, "A Program for Direct and Proxy Voting in the Legislative Process."

12. Moynihan, "Building Secure Elections"; Alvarez, Hall, and Trechsel, "Internet Voting in Comparative Perspective"; Germann and Serdült, "Internet Voting and Turnout."

13. Luechinger, Rosinger, and Stutzer, "The Impact of Postal Voting on Participation." See also Gerlach and Gasser, "Three Case Studies from Switzerland"; Serdült et al., "Fifteen Years of Internet Voting in Switzerland"; Mendez and Serdült, "What Drives Fidelity to Internet Voting?"; Germann and Serdült, "Internet Voting and Turnout."

14. Blinder, "New Election Ordered in North Carolina Race at Center of Fraud Inquiry"; Ford, "The Remote Voting Minefield."

15. Schryen and Rich, "Security in Large-Scale Internet Elections"; Zetter, "Experts Find Serious Problems with Switzerland's Online Voting System before Public Penetration Test Even Begins."

16. Daian et al., "On-Chain Vote Buying and the Rise of Dark DAOs"; Puddu et al., "TEEvil: Identity Lease via Trusted Execution Environments."

17. Iyengar, Luskin, and Fishkin, "Facilitating Informed Public Opinion"; Grönlund, Strandberg, and Himmelroos, "The Challenge of Deliberative Democracy Online"; Esau, Friess, and Eilders, "Design Matters!"

18. Fishkin, *Democracy and Deliberation*; Iyengar, Luskin, and Fishkin, "Facilitating Informed Public Opinion"; Landemore, this volume.

19. Luu et al., "A Secure Sharding Protocol for Open Blockchains"; Kokoris-Kogias et al., "OmniLedger."

20. Ford, "Delegative Democracy"; Sayke, "Liquid Democracy"; Litvinenko, "Social Media and Perspectives of Liquid Democracy"; Green-Armytage, "Direct Voting and Proxy Voting"; Blum and Zuber, "Liquid Democracy"; Landemore, this volume; Ford, "A Liquid Perspective on Democratic Choice."

21. Litvinenko, "Social Media and Perspectives of Liquid Democracy"; Ford, "Delegative

Democracy Revisited”; Hardt and Lopes, “Google Votes”; Ford, “A Liquid Perspective on Democratic Choice.”

22. Swierczek, “5 Years of Liquid Democracy in Germany”; Litvinenko, “Social Media and Perspectives of Liquid Democracy”; Behrens, “The Evolution of Proportional Representation in LiquidFeedback.”

23. Blum and Zuber, “Liquid Democracy.”

24. Becker, “Liquid Democracy.”

25. Ford, “Delegative Democracy”; Boldi et al., “Viscous Democracy for Social Networks”; Ford, “A Liquid Perspective on Democratic Choice.”

26. Gözl et al., “The Fluid Mechanics of Liquid Democracy.”

27. Horowitz, “The Mystery Man Who Runs Italy’s ‘Five Star’ from the Shadows”; Loucaides, “What Happens When Techno-Utopians Actually Run a Country.”

28. Agarwal, “On-Chain Liquid Democracy”; Crichton, “Liquid Democracy Uses Blockchain to Fix Politics, and Now You Can Vote For It”; Zhang and Zhou, “Statement Voting.”

29. Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*.

30. Hauben and Hauben, *Netizens*; Templeton, “I Remember USENET.”

31. Hill and Hughes, “Is the Internet an Instrument of Global Democratization?”; Blumler and Gurevitch, “The New Media and Our Political Communication Discontents.”

32. Templeton, “Origin of the Term ‘Spam’ to Mean Net Abuse”; Templeton, “Reflections on the 25th Anniversary of Spam.” See also Templeton, “I Remember USENET.”

33. Comminos, “Twitter Revolutions and Cyber Crackdowns”; Howard and Hussain, *Democracy’s Fourth Wave?*

34. See chapters in this volume by Caplan, Gangadharan, Farrell and Schwartzberg, and Cohen and Fung.

35. Nakamoto, “Bitcoin.” See also Dwork and Naor, “Pricing via Processing or Combatting Junk Mail.”

36. Yu et al., “DSybil.”

37. Stallings, “The PGP Web of Trust”; Abdul-Rahman, “The PGP Trust Model.”

38. Kamvar, Schlosser, and Garcia-Molina, “The EigenTrust Algorithm for Reputation Management in P2P Networks”; Mislove et al., “Ostra”; Yu et al., “SybilLimit”; Tran et al., “Sybil-Resilient Online Content Voting”; Viswanath et al., “Canal.”

39. Mislove et al., “Measurement and Analysis of Online Social Networks”; Viswanath and Post, “An Analysis of Social Network-Based Sybil Defenses”; Ghosh et al., “Understanding and Combating Link Farming in the Twitter Social Network”; Messias et al., “You Followed My Bot!”

40. On echo chambers, see Barberá et al., “Tweeting from Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber?”; Dubois and Blank, “The Echo Chamber Is Overstated.” On social polarization, see Iyengar and Westwood, “Fear and Loathing across Party Lines.” On tribalism, see Hawkins et al., “Hidden Tribes”; Packer, “A New Report Offers Insights into Tribalism in the Age of Trump.”

41. Saez-Trumper, Castillo, and Lalmas, “Social Media News Communities”; Eberl, Boomgard, and Wagner, “One Bias Fits All?”; Kaye and Johnson, “Across the Great Divide”; Budak, Goel, and Rao, *Fair and Balanced?*; Ribeiro et al., “Media Bias Monitor”; Farrell and Schwartzberg, this volume.

42. Iyengar, Luskin, and Fishkin, “Facilitating Informed Public Opinion”; Landmore, this volume.

43. Edens et al., “‘Hired Guns,’ ‘Charlatans,’ and Their ‘Voodoo Psychobabble’”; Gemberling and Cramer, “Expert Testimony on Sensitive Myth-Ridden Topics.”

44. Collins and Evans, “The Third Wave of Science Studies”; “‘Democratising’ Expertise, ‘Expertising’ Democracy”; Kotzee, “Expertise, Fluency and Social Realism about Professional Knowledge.”

45. Brewster, *Unaccountable*; Reich, *Just Giving Why Philanthropy Is Failing Democracy and How It Can Do Better*.

46. Ford, “Experts and Charlatans, Breakthroughs and Bandwagons.”

47. See the chapters in this volume by Cagé; Lee, Levi, and Brown; Farrell and Schwartzberg; and Bernholz.

48. See the chapters in this volume by Landemore, Gangadharan, and Ananny.

49. Hicks et al., “A Principle or a Strategy?”; Hajnal, Lajevardi, and Nielson, “Voter Identification Laws and the Suppression of Minority Votes”; Highton, “Voter Identification Laws and Turnout in the United States.” See also Feldman, *Citizens without Shelter*; Manza and Uggen, *Locked Out*.

50. Quinlan, “Facilitating the Electorate.”

51. Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*.

52. Cho, “How Well Are Global Citizenries Informed about Democracy?”

53. Standing, *The Precariat*.

54. Armingeon and Schädel, “Social Inequality in Political Participation”; Filetti, “Participating Unequally?” See also Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*.

55. Aker and Mbiti, “Mobile Phones and Economic Development in Africa.”

56. Asongu, “The Impact of Mobile Phone Penetration on African Inequality”; Asongu, “How Has Mobile Phone Penetration Stimulated Financial Development in Africa?”

57. Mbiti and Weil, “Mobile Banking.”

58. Nakamoto, “Bitcoin.”

59. Vorick, “The State of Cryptocurrency Mining.”

60. Parijs, *Basic Income*; Standing, *Basic Income*; Jackson and Victor, “Confronting Inequality in a Post-Growth World”; Bidadanure, “The Political Theory of Universal Basic Income.”

61. Forget, “The Town with No Poverty”; Koistinen and Perkiö, “Good and Bad Times of Social Innovations.”

62. Wagner, “The Swiss Universal Basic Income Vote 2016.”

63. Ford, “Democratic Value and Money for Decentralized Digital Society.”

64. eternalgloom, “Overview of Universal Basic Income Crypto Projects.”

65. Cagé, this volume.

66. Mori, “The Uncanny Valley”; MacDorman, “Subjective Ratings of Robot Video Clips for Human Likeness, Familiarity, and Eeriness.”

67. Douceur, “The Sybil Attack”; Schreiber, *Sybil*.

68. Dwork and Naor, “Pricing via Processing or Combatting Junk Mail”; Cranor and LaMacchia, “Spam!”; Koprowski, “Spam Filtering and the Plague of False Positives”; Templeton, “Reflections on the 25th Anniversary of Spam”; Shaw, “Avoid the Spam Filter”; Chellapilla et al., “Computers Beat Humans at Single Character Recognition in Reading Based Human Interaction Proofs (HIPs)”; Ramachandran, Dagon, and Feamster, “Can DNS-Based Blacklists Keep up with Bots?”; Mislove et al., “Ostra.”

69. Ferrara et al., “The Rise of Social Bots.”

70. Bessi and Ferrara, "Social Bots Distort the 2016 US Presidential Election Online Discussion"; Broniatowski et al., "Weaponized Health Communication."

71. Ahn et al., "CAPTCHA." See also Chellapilla et al., "Computers Beat Humans at Single Character Recognition in Reading Based Human Interaction Proofs (HIPs)"; May, "Inaccessibility of CAPTCHA."

72. Bu, Xia, and Wang, "A Sock Puppet Detection Algorithm on Virtual Spaces"; Solorio, Hasan, and Mizan, "Sockpuppet Detection in Wikipedia"; Liu et al., "Sockpuppet Gang Detection on Social Media Sites"; Yamak, Saunier, and Vercouter, "Detection of Multiple Identity Manipulation in Collaborative Projects."

73. Berger, "Bot vs. Bot"; Read, "How Much of the Internet Is Fake?"

74. Doward, "The Big Tech Backlash."

75. Dwork and Naor, "Pricing via Processing or Combatting Junk Mail." See also Vorick, "The State of Cryptocurrency Mining." See de Vries, "Bitcoin's Growing Energy Problem"; Digiconomist, "Bitcoin Energy Consumption Index."

76. Boneh, Corrigan-Gibbs, and Schechter, "Balloon Hashing"; Park et al., "SpaceMint"; Kiayias et al., "Ouroboros"; Gilad et al., "Algorand."

77. nanalyze, "6 Digital Identity Verification Startups to Check Out"; Abhishek and Mandal, "Digital ID Verification."

78. Doughty, "Know Your Customer"; nanalyze, "6 Digital Identity Verification Startups to Check Out"; Pan, Wu, and Sun, "Liveness Detection for Face Recognition"; Bao et al., "A Liveness Detection Method for Face Recognition Based on Optical Flow Field"; Wen and Jain, "Face Spoof Detection with Image Distortion Analysis."

79. Chesney and Citron, "Deep Fakes"; Mack, "This PSA about Fake News from Barack Obama Is Not What It Appears."

80. Durden, "From \$1,300 Tiger Penis to \$800K Snipers"; Bischoff, "Passports on the Dark Web"; Havocscope, "Fake ID Cards, Driver Licenses, and Stolen Passports."

81. Kline, "Security Theater and Database-Driven Information Markets"; Sethi, Kantardzic, and Ryu, "Security Theater."

82. Mislove et al., "Ostra"; Yu et al., "SybilLimit"; Tran et al., "Sybil-Resilient Online Content Voting"; Viswanath et al., "Canal."

83. Mislove et al., "Measurement and Analysis of Online Social Networks"; Viswanath and Post, "An Analysis of Social Network-Based Sybil Defenses."

84. Ghosh et al., "Understanding and Combating Link Farming in the Twitter Social Network"; Messias et al., "You Followed My Bot!"

85. Freitas et al., "Reverse Engineering Socialbot Infiltration Strategies in Twitter"; Ferrara et al., "The Rise of Social Bots"; Bessi and Ferrara, "Social Bots Distort the 2016 US Presidential Election Online Discussion"; Broniatowski et al., "Weaponized Health Communication."

86. Bhatia and Bhabha, "India's Aadhaar Scheme and the Promise of Inclusive Social Protection"; Chaudhuri and König, "The Aadhaar Scheme."

87. Abraham et al., "State of Aadhaar Report 2016–17."

88. Dixon, "A Failure to 'Do No Harm'"; Srinivasan et al., "The Poverty of Privacy"; Schneier, "Tigers Use Scent, Birds Use Calls"; Chanthadavong, "Biometrics."

89. Abraham et al., "State of Aadhaar Report 2016–17"; Abraham et al., "State of Aadhaar Report 2017–18."

90. Venkatanarayanan, "Enrolment Rejections Are Accelerating"; Mathews, "Flaws in the UIDAI Process."

91. Ratcliffe, "How a Glitch in India's Biometric Welfare System Can Be Lethal."
92. Ford and Strauss, "An Offline Foundation for Online Accountable Pseudonyms"; Ford, "Let's Verify Real People, Not Real Names"; Borge et al., "Proof-of-Personhood."
93. Brin, *Kiln People*; Scott, "5 Lifelike Robots That Take You Straight into the Uncanny Valley."
94. Dürst, "The 'Landsgemeinde'"; Reinisch, "Swiss *Landsgemeinden*"; Schaub, "Maximising Direct Democracy."
95. Madestam et al., "Do Political Protests Matter?"; Acemoglu, Hassan, and Tahoun, "The Power of the Street"; Enikolopov, Makarin, and Petrova, "Social Media and Protest Participation."
96. Borge et al., "Proof-of-Personhood."
97. Ford, "Privacy-Preserving Foundation for Online Personal Identity."
98. Day and Zimmermann, "The OSI Reference Model."
99. Cagé, this volume.
100. Dahl, *Who Governs?*; Dahl, *Democracy and Its Critics*.

References

- Abdul-Rahman, Alfarez. "The PGP Trust Model." *Journal of Electronic Commerce* 10, no. 3 (April 1997): 27–31.
- Abhishek, Kumar, and Diwakar Mandal. "Digital ID Verification: Competitive Analysis of Key Players." MEDICI, October 2017. <https://gomedici.com/diving-deep-into-id-verification-market-comprehensive-evaluation-of-competitive-landscape/>.
- Abraham, Ronald, Elizabeth S. Bennett, Rajesh Bhusal, Shreya Dubey, Qian (Sindy) Li, Akash Pattanayak, and Neil Buddy Shah. "State of Aadhaar Report 2017–18." IDinsight, May 2018. <https://www.idinsight.org/state-of-aadhaar>.
- Abraham, Ronald, Elizabeth S. Bennett, Noopur Sen, and Neil Buddy Shah. "State of Aadhaar Report 2016–17." IDinsight, May 2017. <https://www.idinsight.org/state-of-aadhaar>.
- Acemoglu, Daron, Tarek A. Hassan, and Ahmed Tahoun. "The Power of the Street: Evidence from Egypt's Arab Spring." *Review of Financial Studies* 31, no. 1 (January 2018): 1–42. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhx086>.
- Agarwal, Arpit. "On-Chain Liquid Democracy." *Medium*, November 5, 2018. <https://medium.com/coinmonks/on-chain-liquid-democracy-c08ed8c07f6e>.
- Ahn, Luis von, Manuel Blum, Nicholas J. Hopper, and John Langford. "CAPTCHA: Using Hard AI Problems for Security." In *Advances in Cryptology—Eurocrypt*, International Association for Cryptologic Research (IACR), Warsaw, May 2003, 294–311. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-39200-9_18.
- Aker, Jenny C., and Isaac M. Mbiti. "Mobile Phones and Economic Development in Africa." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 24, no. 3 (September 2010): 207–32. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.3.207>.
- Alvarez, R. Michael, Thad E. Hall, and Alexander H. Trechsel. "Internet Voting in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Estonia." *Political Science & Politics* 42, no. 3 (June 26, 2009): 497–505. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090787>.
- Armingeon, Klaus, and Lisa Schädel. "Social Inequality in Political Participation: The Dark Sides of Individualisation." *West European Politics* 38, no. 3 (January 2015): 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2014.929341>.
- Asongu, Simplicé A. "How Has Mobile Phone Penetration Stimulated Financial Development

- in Africa?" *Journal of African Business* 14, no. 1 (April 1, 2013): 7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228916.2013.765309>.
- . "The Impact of Mobile Phone Penetration on African Inequality." *International Journal of Social Economics* 42, no. 8 (August 10, 2015): 706–16. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-11-2012-0228>.
- Bao, Wei, Hong Li, Nan Li, and Wei Jiang. "A Liveness Detection Method for Face Recognition Based on Optical Flow Field." In *International Conference on Image Analysis and Signal Processing*, IEEE, Taizhou, China, April 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IASP.2009.5054589>.
- Barberá, Pablo, John T. Jost, Jonathan Nagler, Joshua A. Tucker, and Richard Bonneau. "Tweeting from Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber?" *Psychological Science* 26, no. 10 (October 1, 2015): 1531–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615594620>.
- Becker, Sven. "Liquid Democracy: Web Platform Makes Professor Most Powerful Pirate." *Der Spiegel Online*, March 2, 2012. <https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/liquid-democracy-web-platform-makes-professor-most-powerful-pirate-a-818683.html>.
- Behrens, Jan. "The Evolution of Proportional Representation in LiquidFeedback." *Liquid Democracy Journal* 1 (March 2014): 32–41. https://liquid-democracy-journal.org/issue/1/The_Liquid_Democracy_Journal-Issue001-04-The_evolution_of_proportional_representation_in_LiquidFeedback.html.
- Berger, Andreas. "Bot vs. Bot: Will the Internet Soon Be a Place without Humans?" Singularity Hub, July 7, 2018. <https://singularityhub.com/2018/07/07/bot-vs-bot-will-the-internet-soon-be-a-place-without-humans/#sm.0001ny1wyu1iuc07q081h41v7wnyr>.
- Bessi, Alessandro, and Emilio Ferrara. "Social Bots Distort the 2016 US Presidential Election Online Discussion." *First Monday* 21, no. 11 (November 7, 2016). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v21i11.7090>.
- Bhatia, Amiya, and Jacqueline Bhabha. "India's Aadhaar Scheme and the Promise of Inclusive Social Protection." *Oxford Development Studies* 45, no. 1 (January 2017): 64–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600818.2016.1263726>.
- Bidadanure, Juliana Uhuru. "The Political Theory of Universal Basic Income." *Annual Review of Political Science* 22 (May 2019): 481–501. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-050317-070954>.
- Bischoff, Paul. "Passports on the Dark Web: How Much Is Yours Worth?" *Comparitech*, October 4, 2018. <https://www.comparitech.com/blog/vpn-privacy/passports-on-the-dark-web-how-much-is-yours-worth/>.
- Blinder, Alan. "New Election Ordered in North Carolina Race at Center of Fraud Inquiry." *New York Times*, February 21, 2019. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/21/us/mark-harris-nc-voter-fraud.html>.
- Blum, Christian, and Christina Isabel Zuber. "Liquid Democracy: Potentials, Problems, and Perspectives." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 24, no. 2 (June 2016): 162–82. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12065>.
- Blumler, Jay G., and Michael Gurevitch. "The New Media and Our Political Communication Discontents: Democratizing Cyberspace" *Information, Communication & Society* 4, no. 1 (2001): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713768514>.
- Boldi, Paolo, Francesco Bonchi, Carlos Castillo, and Sebastiano Vigna. "Viscous Democracy for Social Networks." *Communications of the ACM* 54, no. 6 (June 2011): 129–37. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1953122.1953154>.

- Boneh, Dan, Henry Corrigan-Gibbs, and Stuart Schechter. "Balloon Hashing: A Memory-Hard Function Providing Provable Protection against Sequential Attacks." In *Advances in Cryptology—Asiacrypt*, International Association for Cryptologic Research (IACR), Hanoi, Vietnam, December 2016, 220–48. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53887-6_8.
- Borge, Maria, Eleftherios Kokoris-Kogias, Philipp Jovanovic, Nicolas Gailly, Linus Gasser, and Bryan Ford. "Proof-of-Personhood: Redemocratizing Permissionless Cryptocurrencies." In *1st IEEE Security and Privacy on the Blockchain*, IEEE, Paris, April 29, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1109/EuroSPW.2017.46>.
- Brewster, Mike. *Unaccountable: How the Accounting Profession Forfeited a Public Trust*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2003. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Unaccountable:+How+the+Accounting+Profession+Forfeited+a+Public+Trust-p-9780471423621>.
- Brin, David. *Kiln People*. New York: Tor Books, 2002. <https://us.macmillan.com/books/9780765342614>
- Broniatowski, David A., Amelia M. Jamison, SiHua Qi, Lulwah AlKulaib, Tao Chen, Adrian Benton, and Sandra C. Quinn, and Mark Dredze. "Weaponized Health Communication: Twitter Bots and Russian Trolls Amplify the Vaccine Debate." *American Journal of Public Health* 108, no. 10 (October 1, 2018): 1378–84. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304567>.
- Browning, Christopher R. "The Suffocation of Democracy." *New York Review of Books*, October 25, 2018. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2018/10/25/suffocation-of-democracy/>.
- Bu, Zhan, Zhengyou Xia, and Jiandong Wang. "A Sock Puppet Detection Algorithm on Virtual Spaces." *Knowledge-Based Systems* 37 (January 2013): 366–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2012.08.016>.
- Budak, Ceren, Sharad Goel, and Justin M. Rao. "Fair and Balanced? Quantifying Media Bias through Crowdsourced Content Analysis." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80, no. S1 (January 2016): 250–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw007>.
- Chanthadavong, Aimee. "Biometrics: The Password You Cannot Change." *ZDNet*, August 26, 2015. <https://www.zdnet.com/article/biometrics-the-password-you-cannot-change/>.
- Chaudhuri, Bidisha, and Lion König. "The Aadhaar Scheme: A Cornerstone of a New Citizenship Regime in India?" *Contemporary South Asia* 26, no. 2 (September 2017): 127–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09584935.2017.1369934>.
- Chellapilla, Kumar, Kevin Larson, Patrice Simard, and Mary Czerwinski. "Computers Beat Humans at Single Character Recognition in Reading Based Human Interaction Proofs (HIPs)." In *Second Conference on E-Mail and Anti-Spam (CEAS 2005)*, IACR and IEEE. Stanford University, July 2005. <https://web.archive.org/web/20051210090512/http://www.ceas.cc/papers-2005/160.pdf>.
- Chesney, Robert, and Danielle Keats Citron. "Deep Fakes: A Looming Challenge for Privacy, Democracy, and National Security." *California Law Review* 107, no. 6 (July 2018): 1753–820. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J>
- Cho, Youngho. "How Well Are Global Citizenries Informed about Democracy? Ascertaining the Breadth and Distribution of Their Democratic Enlightenment and Its Sources." *Political Studies* 63, no. 1 (March 2015): 240–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.12088>.
- Collins, H. M., and Robert Evans. "The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise and Experience" *Social Studies of Science* 32, no. 2 (April 2002): 235–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312702032002003>.
- Comminos, Alex. "Twitter Revolutions and Cyber Crackdowns: User-Generated Content and Social Networking in the Arab Spring and Beyond." Association for Progressive Communi-

- cations, June 2011. https://www.apc.org/sites/default/files/AlexComminos_MobileInternet.pdf.
- Cost, Jay. *A Republic No More: Big Government and the Rise of American Political Corruption*. New York: Encounter Books, 2015. <https://www.encounterbooks.com/books/a-republic-no-more-big-government-and-the-rise-of-american-political-corruption-paperback/>.
- Cranor, Lorrie Faith, and Brian A. LaMacchia. "Spam!" *Communications of the ACM* 41, no. 8 (August 1998): 74–83. <https://doi.org/10.1145/280324.280336>.
- Crichton, Danny. "Liquid Democracy Uses Blockchain to Fix Politics, and Now You Can Vote for It." *TechCrunch*, February 24, 2018. <https://techcrunch.com/2018/02/24/liquid-democracy-uses-blockchain/>.
- Dahl, Robert A. *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300049381/democracy-and-its-critics>.
- . *Who Governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1961. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300103922/who-governs>.
- Daian, Philip, Tyler Kell, Ian Miers, and Ari Juels. "On-Chain Vote Buying and the Rise of Dark DAOs." *Hacking, Distributed*, July 2, 2018. <https://hackingdistributed.com/2018/07/02/on-chain-vote-buying/>.
- Day, John D., and Hubert Zimmermann. "The OSI Reference Model." In *Proceedings of the IEEE* 71, no. 12 (December 1983): 1334–40. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PROC.1983.12775>.
- "'Democratising' Expertise, 'Expertising' Democracy: What Does This Mean, and Why Bother?" *Science and Public Policy* 30, no. 3 (June 2003): 146–50. <https://doi.org/10.3152/147154303781780551>.
- de Vries, Alex. "Bitcoin's Growing Energy Problem." *Joule* 2, no. 5 (May 2018): 801–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2018.04.016>.
- Digiconomist. "Bitcoin Energy Consumption Index," 2020. <https://digiconomist.net/bitcoin-energy-consumption>.
- Dixon, Pam. "A Failure to 'Do No Harm'—India's Aadhaar Biometric ID Program and Its Inability to Protect Privacy in Relation to Measures in Europe and the US." *Health and Technology* 7, no. 4 (December 2017): 539–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12553-017-0202-6>.
- Douceur, John R. "The Sybil Attack." In *First International Workshop on Peer-to-Peer Systems (IPTPS)*, Cambridge, MA, February 2002: 251–260. <http://research.microsoft.com/pubs/74220/IPTPS2002.pdf>.
- Doughty, Caroline. "Know Your Customer: Automation Is Key to Comply with Legislation." *Business Information Review* 22, no. 4 (December 2005): 248–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266382105060603>.
- Doward, Jamie. "The Big Tech Backlash: Tech Giants Are Drawing Political Fire over Fake News and Russian Meddling." *The Guardian*, January 28, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/jan/28/tech-backlash-facebook-google-fake-news-business-monopoly-regulation>.
- Dubois, Elizabeth, and Grant Blank. "The Echo Chamber Is Overstated: The Moderating Effect of Political Interest and Diverse Media." *Information, Communication & Society* 21, no. 5 (January 2018): 729–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1428656>.
- Durden, Tyler. "From \$1,300 Tiger Penis to \$800K Snipers: The Complete Black Market Price Guide." *ZeroHedge*, August 13, 2015. <https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-08-13/1300-tiger-penis-800k-snipers-complete-black-market-price-guide>.
- Dürst, Hansjörg. "The 'Landsgemeinde': The Cantonal Assembly of Glarus (Switzerland),

- History, Present and Future.” In *IX Congreso internacional del CLAD sobre la reforma del Estado y de la administración pública*, Centro Latinoamericano de Administración para el Desarrollo (CLAD), Madrid, November 2004. <https://cladista.clad.org/bitstream/handle/123456789/2992/0049818.pdf>.
- Dwork, Cynthia, and Moni Naor. “Pricing via Processing or Combatting Junk Mail.” In *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto*, International Association for Cryptologic Research (IACR), Santa Barbara, CA, August 1992. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48071-4_10.
- Eberl, Jakob-Moritz, Hajo G. Boomgaarden, and Markus Wagner. “One Bias Fits All? Three Types of Media Bias and Their Effects on Party Preferences.” *Communication Research* 44, no. 8 (December 2017): 1125–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215614364>.
- Edens, John F., Shannon Toney Smith, Melissa S. Magyar, Kacy Mullen, Amy Pitta, and John Pettila. “‘Hired Guns,’ ‘Charlatans,’ and Their ‘Voodoo Psychobabble’: Case Law References to Various Forms of Perceived Bias among Mental Health Expert Witnesses.” *Psychological Services* 9, no. 3 (August 2012): 259–71. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028264>.
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova. “Social Media and Protest Participation: Evidence from Russia.” *Econometrica*, November 15, 2019. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2696236>.
- Esau, Katharina, Dennis Friess, and Christiane Eilders. “Design Matters! An Empirical Analysis of Online Deliberation on Different News Platforms.” *Policy and Internet* 9, no. 3 (September 2017): 321–42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.154>.
- eternalgloom. “Overview of Universal Basic Income Crypto Projects.” Bitcoin Forum, April 2, 2018. <https://bitcointalk.org/index.php?topic=3242065.0>.
- Feldman, Leonard C. *Citizens without Shelter: Homelessness, Democracy, and Political Exclusion*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006. <https://www.cornellpress.cornell.edu/book/9780801441240/citizens-without-shelter/>.
- Ferrara, Emilio, Onur Varol, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. “The Rise of Social Bots.” *Communications of the ACM* 59, no. 7 (July 2016): 96–104. <https://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2016/7/204021-the-rise-of-social-bots/>.
- Filetti, Andrea. “Participating Unequally? Assessing the Macro-Micro Relationship Between Income Inequality and Political Engagement in Europe.” *Partecipazione e Conflitto* 9, no. 1 (2016): 72–100. <http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco/article/view/15893>.
- Fishkin, James S. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, September 1993. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300051636/democracy-and-deliberation>.
- Flavin, Patrick. “Campaign Finance Laws, Policy Outcomes, and Political Equality in the American States.” *Political Research Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (March 2015): 77–88. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24371973>.
- Ford, Bryan. “A Liquid Perspective on Democratic Choice,” November 2018. <https://bford.info/book/>.
- . “Delegative Democracy,” May 15, 2002. <https://bford.info/deleg/deleg.pdf>.
- . “Delegative Democracy Revisited,” November 16, 2014. <https://bford.info/2014/11/16/deleg.html>.
- . “Democratic Value and Money for Decentralized Digital Society,” June 2018. <https://bford.info/book/>.
- . “Experts and Charlatans, Breakthroughs and Bandwagons: Collectively Distinguishing Signal from Noise under Attack,” 2020. <https://bford.info/book/>.

- . “Let’s Verify Real People, Not Real Names.” October 7, 2015. <https://bford.info/2015/10/07/names.html>.
- . “Privacy-Preserving Foundation for Online Personal Identity,” US Office of Naval Research Grant No. N000141912361, May 2019.
- . “The Remote Voting Minefield: From North Carolina to Switzerland,” February 22, 2019. <https://bford.info/2019/02/22/voting/>.
- Ford, Bryan, and Jacob Strauss. “An Offline Foundation for Online Accountable Pseudonyms.” In *1st Workshop on Social Network Systems (SocialNets)*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Glasgow, April 2008, 31–36. <http://bford.info/pub/net/sybil.pdf>.
- Forget, Evelyn L. “The Town with No Poverty: The Health Effects of a Canadian Guaranteed Annual Income Field Experiment.” *Canadian Public Policy* 37, no. 3 (September 2011): 283–305. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.37.3.283>
- Freitas, Carlos A., Fabrício Benevenuto, Saptarshi Ghosh, and Adriano Veloso. “Reverse Engineering Socialbot Infiltration Strategies in Twitter.” In *International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM)*, IEEE/ACM, Paris, August 2015, 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2808797.2809292>.
- Gemberling, Tess M., and Robert J. Cramer. “Expert Testimony on Sensitive Myth-Ridden Topics: Ethics and Recommendations for Psychological Professionals.” *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 45, no. 2 (April 2014): 120–27. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0036184>
- Gerlach, Jan, and Urs Gasser. “Three Case Studies from Switzerland: E-Voting.” Research Publication No. 2009-03, Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, March 2009. https://cyber.harvard.edu/sites/cyber.harvard.edu/files/Gasser_SwissCases_ExecutiveSummary.pdf.
- Germann, Micha, and Uwe Serdült. “Internet Voting and Turnout: Evidence from Switzerland.” *Electoral Studies* 47 (June 2017): 1–12. <https://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/136119/>.
- Ghosh, Saptarshi, Bimal Viswanath, Farshad Kooti, Naveen Kumar Sharma, Gautam Korlam, Fabrício Benevenuto, Niloy Ganguly, and Krishna Phani Gummadi. “Understanding and Combating Link Farming in the Twitter Social Network.” In *21st International Conference on World Wide Web (WWW)*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Lyon, France, April 2012, 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2187836.2187846>
- Gilad, Yossi, Rotem Hemo, Silvio Micali, Georgios Vlachos, and Nikolai Zeldovich. “Algorand: Scaling Byzantine Agreements for Cryptocurrencies.” In *26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Shanghai, October 2017, 51–68. <https://dl.acm.org/authorize?N47148>.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. “Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens.” *Perspectives on Politics* 12, no. 3 (September 2014): 564–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592714001595>.
- Gölz, Paul, Anson Kahng, Simon Mackenzie, and Ariel D. Procaccia. “The Fluid Mechanics of Liquid Democracy.” In *International Conference on Web and Internet Economics*, 188–202. New York: Springer, December 2019. <https://paulgoelz.de/papers/fluid.pdf>.
- Green-Armytage, James. “Direct Voting and Proxy Voting.” *Constitutional Political Economy* 26, no. 2 (June 2015): 190–220. <https://jamesgreenarmytage.com/proxy.pdf>.
- Grönlund, Kimmo, Kim Strandberg, and Staffan Himmelroos. “The Challenge of Deliberative Democracy Online—A Comparison of Face-to-Face and Virtual Experiments in Citizen

- Deliberation.” *Information Polity* 14, no. 3 (August 2009): 187–201. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.5555/1735346.1735352>.
- Hajnal, Zoltan, Nazita Lajevardi, and Lindsay Nielson. “Voter Identification Laws and the Suppression of Minority Votes.” *Journal of Politics* 79, no. 2 (April 2017): 363–79. <https://doi.org/10.1086/688343>.
- Hardt, Steve, and Lia C. R. Lopes. “Google Votes: A Liquid Democracy Experiment on a Corporate Social Network.” Technical Disclosure Commons, June 5, 2015. https://www.tdcommons.org/dpubs_series/79.
- Hauben, Michael, and Ronda Hauben. *Netizens: On the History and Impact of Usenet and the Internet*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-IEEE Computer Society Press, May 1997.
- Havocscope. “Fake ID Cards, Driver Licenses, and Stolen Passports,” December 2, 2019. <https://web.archive.org/web/20191202092629/https://www.havocscope.com/fake-id/>.
- Hawkins, Stephen, Daniel Yudkin, Míriam Juan-Torres, and Tim Dixon. “Hidden Tribes: A Study of America’s Polarized Landscape.” London: More in Common, October 2018. <https://hiddentribes.us>.
- Heinlein, Robert A. *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress*. New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1966.
- Hicks, William D., Seth C. McKee, Mitchell D. Sellers, and Daniel A. Smith. “A Principle or a Strategy? Voter Identification Laws and Partisan Competition in the American States.” *Political Research Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (March 2015): 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912914554039>
- Highton, Benjamin. “Voter Identification Laws and Turnout in the United States” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20 (May 2017): 149–67. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-022822>.
- Hill, Kevin A., and John E. Hughes. “Is the Internet an Instrument of Global Democratization?” *Democratization* 6, no. 2 (September 2007): 99–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510349908403613>.
- Horowitz, Jason. “The Mystery Man Who Runs Italy’s ‘Five Star’ from the Shadows.” *New York Times*, February 28, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/28/world/europe/italy-election-davide-casaleggio-five-star.html>.
- Howard, Philip N., and Muzammil M. Hussain. *Democracy’s Fourth Wave? Digital Media and the Arab Spring*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199936953.001.0001>.
- Iyengar, Shanto, Robert C. Luskin, and James S. Fishkin. “Facilitating Informed Public Opinion: Evidence from Face-to-face and Online Deliberative Polls.” In *Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association*, Philadelphia, August 27, 2003. <https://pcl.stanford.edu/common/docs/research/iyengar/2003/facilitating.pdf>.
- Iyengar, Shanto, and Sean J. Westwood. “Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization.” *American Journal of Political Science* 59, no. 3 (July 2015): 690–707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12152>
- Jackson, Tim, and Peter Victor. “Confronting Inequality in a Post-Growth World—Basic Income, Factor Substitution and the Future of Work.” *CUSP Working Paper Series* No. 11. Guildford, UK: Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity, University of Surrey, April 2018. <https://www.cusp.ac.uk/themes/s2/wp11/>.
- Kalla, Joshua L., and David E. Broockman. “Campaign Contributions Facilitate Access to Congressional Officials: A Randomized Field Experiment.” *American Journal of Political Science* 60, no. 3 (July 2016): 545–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12180>.
- Kamvar, Sepandar D., Mario T. Schlosser, and Hector Garcia-Molina. “The EigenTrust Algo-

- rithm for Reputation Management in P2P Networks,” In *The Twelfth International World Wide Web Conference (WWW 2003)*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). Budapest, May 2003, 640–51. <https://doi.org/10.1145/775152.775242>.
- Kara, Siddharth. *Modern Slavery: A Global Perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press, October 2017. <https://cup.columbia.edu/book/modern-slavery/9780231158466>.
- Kaye, Barbara K., and Thomas J. Johnson. “Across the Great Divide: How Partisanship and Perceptions of Media Bias Influence Changes in Time Spent with Media.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 60, no. 4 (November 2016): 604–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2016.1234477>.
- Keller, Eric, and Nathan J. Kelly. “Partisan Politics, Financial Deregulation, and the New Gilded Age.” *Political Research Quarterly* 68, no. 3 (September 2015): 428–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912915591218>.
- Kiayias, Aggelos, Alexander Russell, Bernardo David, and Roman Oliynykov. “Ouroboros: A Provably Secure Proof-of-Stake Blockchain Protocol.” *Advances in Cryptology—Crypto*, International Association for Cryptologic Research (IACR). Santa Barbara, CA, August 2017, 357–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63688-7_12.
- Kline, Candice L. “Security Theater and Database-Driven Information Markets: A Case for an Omnibus US Data Privacy Statute.” *University of Toledo Law Review* 39, no. 1 (February 2008): 443–95. <https://www.utoledo.edu/law/studentlife/lawreview/pdf/v39n2/Kline%20Corr%20Final.pdf>
- Koistinen, Pertti, and Johanna Perkiö. “Good and Bad Times of Social Innovations: The Case of Universal Basic Income in Finland.” *Basic Income Studies* 9, nos. 1–2 (December 2014): 25–57. <https://ideas.repec.org/a/bpj/bistud/v9y2014i1-2p25-57n5.html>.
- Kokoris-Kogias, Eleftherios, Philipp Jovanovic, Linus Gasser, Nicolas Gailly, Ewa Syta, and Bryan Ford. “OmniLedger: A Secure, Scale-Out, Decentralized Ledger via Sharding.” In *IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (S&P)*, IEEE, San Francisco, May 2018, 583–98. <https://bford.info/pub/dec/omniledger-abs/>.
- Koprowski, Gene J. “Spam Filtering and the Plague of False Positives.” *TechNewsWorld*, September 30, 2003. <http://www.technewsworld.com/story/31703.html>.
- Kotzee, Ben. “Expertise, Fluency and Social Realism about Professional Knowledge.” *Journal of Education and Work* 27, no. 2 (November 2012): 161–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2012.738291>.
- Litvinenko, Anna. “Social Media and Perspectives of Liquid Democracy: The Example of Political Communication in the Pirate Party in Germany.” In *12th European Conference on E-Government (ECEG 2012)*, European Commission, Barcelona, June 2012, 403–7. <https://pureportal.spbu.ru/en/publications/social-media-and-perspectives-of-liquid-democracy-the-example-of-2>.
- Liu, Dong, Quanyuan Wu, Weihong Han, and Bin Zhou. “Sock Puppet Gang Detection on Social Media Sites.” *Frontiers of Computer Science* 10, no. 1 (February 2016): 124–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-015-4287-7>
- Loucaides, Darren. “What Happens When Techno-Utopians Actually Run a Country.” *Wired*, February 14, 2019. <https://www.wired.com/story/italy-five-star-movement-techno-utopians/>.
- Luechinger, Simon, Myra Rosinger, and Alois Stutzer. “The Impact of Postal Voting on Participation: Evidence for Switzerland.” *Swiss Political Science Review* 13, no. 2 (Summer 2007): 167–202. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1662-6370.2007.tb00075.x>.

- Luu, Loi, Viswesh Narayanan, Chaodong Zheng, Kunal Baweja, Seth Gilbert, and Prateek Saxena. "A Secure Sharding Protocol for Open Blockchains." In *ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS 2016)*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). Vienna, Austria, October 2016: 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978389>.
- MacDorman, Karl F. "Subjective Ratings of Robot Video Clips for Human Likeness, Familiarity, and Eeriness: An Exploration of the Uncanny Valley." In *5th International Conference of the Cognitive Science (ICCS 2006)*, Cognitive Science Society, Vancouver, BC, July 2006, 48–51. <http://www.macdorman.com/kfm/writings/pubs/MacDorman2006SubjectiveRatings.pdf>.
- Mack, David. "This PSA about Fake News from Barack Obama Is Not What It Appears." *BuzzFeed News*, April 17, 2018. <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/davidmack/obama-fake-news-jordan-peepe-psa-video-buzzfeed>.
- Madestam, Andreas, Daniel Shoag, Stan Veuger, and David Yanagizawa-Drott. "Do Political Protests Matter? Evidence from the Tea Party Movement." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128, no. 4 (November 2013): 1633–85. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt021>.
- Manza, Jeff, and Christopher Uggen. *Locked Out: Felon Disenfranchisement and American Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195149326.001.0001>.
- Mathews, Hans Verghese. "Flaws in the UIDAI Process." *Economic & Political Weekly* 51, no. 9 (February 2016). <https://www.epw.in/journal/2016/9/special-articles/flaws-uidai-process.html>.
- May, Matt. "Inaccessibility of CAPTCHA: Alternatives to Visual Turing Tests on the Web," *W3C Working Group Note*, World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), December 9, 2019. <https://www.w3.org/TR/turingtest/>.
- Mbiti, Isaac, and David N. Weil. "Mobile Banking: The Impact of M-Pesa in Kenya." In *African Successes*, vol. 3, *Modernization and Development*, edited by Sebastian Edwards, Simon Johnson, and David N. Weil, 247–93. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. <https://www.nber.org/books/afri14-3>.
- Mendez, Fernando, and Uwe Serdült. "What Drives Fidelity to Internet Voting? Evidence from the Roll-Out of Internet Voting in Switzerland." *Government Information Quarterly* 34, no. 3 (September 2017): 511–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.05.005>
- Messias, Johnatan, Lucas Schmidt, Ricardo Oliveira, and Fabricio Benevenuto. "You Followed My Bot! Transforming Robots into Influential Users in Twitter" *First Monday* 18, no. 7 (July 1, 2013). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v18i7.4217>.
- Miller, James C., III. "A Program for Direct and Proxy Voting in the Legislative Process." *Public Choice* 7 (1969): 107–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01718736>.
- Mislove, Alan, Massimiliano Marcon, Krishna P. Gummadi, Peter Druschel, and Bobby Bhattacharjee. "Measurement and Analysis of Online Social Networks." In *Internet Measurement Conference, ACM/USENIX*. San Diego, CA, October 2007, 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1298306.1298311>.
- Mislove, Alan, Answy Post, Peter Druschel, and Krishna P. Gummadi. "Ostra: Leveraging Trust to Thwart Unwanted Communication." In *5th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI '08)*, USENIX Association, San Francisco, April 2008, 15–30. <https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/nsdi08/tech/mislove.html>.
- Mori, Masahiro. "The Uncanny Valley [From the Field]." *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine* 19, no. 2, June 2012: 98–100. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MRA.2012.2192811>.
- Moynihan, Donald P. "Building Secure Elections: E-Voting, Security, and Systems Theory."

- Public Administration Review* 64, no. 5 (September 2004): 515–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00400.x>.
- Nakamoto, Satoshi. “Bitcoin: A Peer-to-Peer Electronic Cash System.” 2008. <https://bitcoin.org/bitcoin.pdf>.
- nanalyze. “6 Digital Identity Verification Startups to Check Out,” September 5, 2017. <https://www.nanalyze.com/2017/09/6-digital-identity-verification-startups/>.
- Packer, George. “A New Report Offers Insights into Tribalism in the Age of Trump.” *New Yorker*, October 13, 2018. <https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/a-new-report-offers-insights-into-tribalism-in-the-age-of-trump>.
- Pan, Gang, Zhaohui Wu, and Lin Sun. “Liveness Detection for Face Recognition.” In *Recent Advances in Face Recognition*, edited by Kresimir Delac, Mislav Grgic, and Marian Stewart Bartlett, 109–24. Rijeka, Croatia: InTech, December 1, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.5772/6397>.
- Parijs, Philippe Van. *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674052284>.
- Park, Sunoo, Albert Kwon, Georg Fuchsbaauer, Peter Gaž, Joël Alwen, and Krzysztof Pietrzak. “SpaceMint: A Cryptocurrency Based on Proofs of Space.” In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security* (FC ’18), International Financial Cryptography Association, Curaçao, February 2018, 480–99. <https://fc18.ifca.ai/preproceedings/78.pdf>.
- Piketty, Thomas. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, April 15, 2014. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674430006>.
- Prior, Markus. “Media and Political Polarization.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16 (May 2013): 101–27. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242>.
- Puddu, Ivan, Daniele Lain, Moritz Schneider, Elizaveta Tretiakova, Sinisa Matetic, and Srdjan apkun. “TEEvil: Identity Lease via Trusted Execution Environments,” May 9, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1903.00449.pdf>.
- Quinlan, Stephen. “Facilitating the Electorate: A Multilevel Analysis of Election Timing, Registration Procedures, and Turnout.” *Irish Political Studies* 30, no. 4 (November 2015): 482–509. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07907184.2015.1099041>.
- Ramachandran, Anirudh, David Dagon, and Nick Feamster. “Can DNS-Based Blacklists Keep up with Bots?” In *3rd Conference on Email and Anti-Spam* (CEAS 2006). Mountain View, CA, USA, July 2006. https://web.archive.org/web/20070625203520fw_/http://www.ceas.cc/2006/listabs.html#14.pdf.
- Ratcliffe, Rebecca. “How a Glitch in India’s Biometric Welfare System Can Be Lethal.” *The Guardian*, October 16, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/oct/16/glitch-india-biometric-welfare-system-starvation>.
- Read, Max. “How Much of the Internet Is Fake? Turns Out, a Lot of It, Actually.” *New York Magazine*, December 26, 2018. <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2018/12/how-much-of-the-internet-is-fake.html>.
- Reich, Rob. *Just Giving: Why Philanthropy Is Failing Democracy and How It Can Do Better*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, November 20, 2018. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691183497/just-giving>.
- Reinisch, Charlotte. “Swiss *Landsgemeinden*: A Deliberative Democratic Evaluation of Two Outdoor Parliaments.” In *ECPR Joint Sessions*, European Consortium for Political Research. Helsinki, Finland, May 2007. <https://ecpr.eu/Events/PaperDetails.aspx?PaperID=12373>

- Ribeiro, Filipe N., Lucas Henriqueo, Fabrício Benevenuto, Abhijnan Chakraborty, Juhi Kulshrestha, Mahmoudreza Babaei, and Krishna P. Gummadi. "Media Bias Monitor: Quantifying Biases of Social Media News Outlets at Large-Scale." In *Twelfth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI), Stanford, CA, June 2018, 290–99.
- Saez-Trumper, Diego, Carlos Castillo, and Mounia Lalmas. "Social Media News Communities: Gatekeeping, Coverage, and Statement Bias." In *22nd International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management (CIKM '13)*, Association for Computing Machinery, San Francisco, October 2013, 1679–84. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2505515.2505623>.
- Samuel, Ian. "Rigging the Vote: How the American Right Is on the Way to Permanent Minority Rule." *The Guardian*, November 4, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/nov/04/america-minority-rule-voter-suppression-gerrymandering-supreme-court>.
- Sayke. "Liquid Democracy." 2003. <https://web.archive.org/web/20040726071737/http://twistedmatrix.com/wiki/python/LiquidDemocracy>.
- Schaub, Hans-Peter. "Maximising Direct Democracy—By Popular Assemblies or by Ballot Votes?" *Swiss Political Science Review* 18, no. 3 (August 2012): 305–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2012.02075.x>.
- Schneier, Bruce. "Tigers Use Scent, Birds Use Calls—Biometrics Are Just Animal Instinct." *The Guardian*, January 8, 2009. <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2009/jan/08/identity-fraud-security-biometrics-schneier-id>.
- Schreiber, Flora Rheta. *Sybil: The True Story of a Woman Possessed by Sixteen Separate Personalities*. New York: Warner Books, 1973. <https://www.grandcentralpublishing.com/titles/flora-rheta-schreiber/sybil/9780446550123/>
- Schryen, Guido, and Eliot Rich. "Security in Large-Scale Internet Elections: A Retrospective Analysis of Elections in Estonia, The Netherlands, and Switzerland." *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 4, no. 4 (December 2009): 729–44. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2009.2033230>.
- Scott, Grace Lisa. "5 Lifelike Robots That Take You Straight into the Uncanny Valley." *Inverse*, September 24, 2017. <https://www.inverse.com/article/36745-5-lifelike-robots-that-take-you-straight-into-the-uncanny-valley>
- Serdült, Uwe, Micha Germann, Fernando Mendez, Alicia Portenier, and Christoph Wellig. "Fifteen Years of Internet Voting in Switzerland: History, Governance and Use." In *Second International Conference on eDemocracy and eGovernment (ICEDEG 2015)*, IEEE, Quito, April 2015, 126–32. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICEDEG.2015.7114482>.
- Sethi, Tegiyot Singh, Mehmed Kantardzic, and Joung Woo Ryu. "'Security Theater': On the Vulnerability of Classifiers to Exploratory Attacks." In *12th Pacific Asia Workshop on Intelligence and Security Informatics (PAISI 2017)*, Jeju Island, South Korea, May 2017, 49–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-57463-9_4.
- Shao, Chengcheng, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. "The Spread of Low-Credibility Content by Social Bots." *Nature Communications* 9 (November 2018). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-06930-7>.
- Shaw, Russell. "Avoid the Spam Filter." *iMedia Connection*, June 18, 2004. <http://www.imediaconnection.com/content/3649.asp>.
- Shlapentokh, Vladimir, and Joshua Woods. *Feudal America: Elements of the Middle Ages in Contemporary Society*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2011. <http://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-03781-3.html>

- Smith, Warwick. "Political Donations Corrupt Democracy in Ways You Might Not Realise." *The Guardian*, September 11, 2014. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/11/political-donations-corrupt-democracy-in-ways-you-might-not-realise>
- Solorio, Thamar, Ragib Hasan, and Mainul Mizan. "Sockpuppet Detection in Wikipedia: A Corpus of Real-World Deceptive Writing for Linking Identities." In *Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2014)*, European Language Resources Association (ELRA), Reykjavik, May 2014, 1355–58. <http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2014/index.html>.
- Srinivasan, Janaki, Savita Bailur, Emrys Schoemaker, and Sarita Seshagiri. "The Poverty of Privacy: Understanding Privacy Trade-Offs From Identity Infrastructure Users in India." *International Journal of Communication* 12 (March 2018): 1228–47. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/7046/2296>
- Stallings, William. "The PGP Web of Trust." *BYTE Magazine* 20, no. 2 (February 1995): 161–62. https://archive.org/details/eu_BYTE-1995-02_OCR/page/n210/mode/1up.
- Standing, Guy. *Basic Income: A Guide for the Open-Minded*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017. <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300230840/basic-income>.
- . *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011. <https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/the-precariat-9781849664561/>.
- Swierczek, Björn. "Five Years of Liquid Democracy in Germany." *Liquid Democracy Journal* 1 (March 2014): 8–19. https://liquid-democracy-journal.org/issue/1/The_Liquid_Democracy_Journal-Issue001-02-Five_years_of_Liquid_Democracy_in_Germany.html.
- Templeton, Brad. "I Remember USENET." O'Reilly Network, December 21, 2001. <https://web.archive.org/web/20050824032345/http://www.oreillynet.com/pub/a/network/2001/12/21/usenet.html?page=1>.
- . "Origin of the Term 'Spam' to Mean Net Abuse." O'Reilly Network, December 2001. <https://web.archive.org/web/20050825120621/http://www.templetons.com/brad/spamterm.html>.
- . "Reflections on the 25th Anniversary of Spam." O'Reilly Network, May 2003. <https://web.archive.org/web/20050826005609/http://www.templetons.com/brad/spam/spam25.html>
- Tisdall, Simon. "American Democracy Is in Crisis, and Not Just Because of Trump." *The Guardian*, August 7, 2018. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/aug/07/american-democracy-crisis-trump-supreme-court>.
- Tran, Nguyen, Bonan Min, Jinyang Li, and Lakshminarayanan Submaranian. "Sybil-Resilient Online Content Voting." In *6th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, USENIX Association, Boston, April 2009, 15–28. https://www.usenix.org/legacy/events/nsdi09/tech/full_papers/tran/tran.pdf.
- Tullock, Gordon. *Toward a Mathematics of Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1967.
- Venkatanarayanan, Anand. "Enrolment Rejections Are Accelerating." *Medium*, November 22, 2017. <https://medium.com/karana/aadhaar-enrollment-rejections-are-accelerating-5aa76191d9a9>.
- Viswanath, Bimal, Mainack Mondal, Krishna P. Gummadi, Alan Mislove, and Ansley Post. "Canal: Scaling Social Network-Based Sybil Tolerance Schemes." In *EuroSys 2012*, Association for Computing Machinery (ACM), Bern, Switzerland, April 2012, 309–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2168836.2168867>.

- Viswanath, Bimal, and Ansley Post. "An Analysis of Social Network-Based Sybil Defenses." *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 40, no. 4 (October 2010): 363–74. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851182.1851226>.
- Vorick, David. "The State of Cryptocurrency Mining," *Sia Blog*, May 13, 2018. <https://blog.sia.tech/the-state-of-cryptocurrency-mining-538004a37f9b>.
- Wagner, Che. "The Swiss Universal Basic Income Vote 2016: What's Next?" Economic Security Project, February 7, 2017. <https://medium.com/economicsecproj/the-swiss-universal-basic-income-vote-2016-d74ae9beafea>.
- Weitzer, Ronald. "Human Trafficking and Contemporary Slavery." *Annual Review of Sociology* 41 (August 2015): 223–42. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112506>.
- Wen, Di, Hu Han, and Anil K. Jain. "Face Spoof Detection with Image Distortion Analysis." *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security* 10, no. 4 (April 2015): 746–761. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIFS.2015.2400395>.
- Woolley, Samuel C. "Automating Power: Social Bot Interference in Global Politics." *First Monday* 21, no. 4 (April 4, 2016). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v21i4.6161>.
- Woolley, Samuel C., and Douglas R. Guilbeault. "Computational Propaganda in the United States of America: Manufacturing Consensus Online." Working Paper No. 2017.5, Computational Propaganda Research Project, Oxford Internet Institute, Oxford, UK, June 19, 2017. <https://comprop.oii.ox.ac.uk/research/working-papers/computational-propaganda-in-the-united-states-of-america-manufacturing-consensus-online/>.
- Yamak, Zaher, Julien Saunier, and Laurent Vercouter. "Detection of Multiple Identity Manipulation in Collaborative Projects." In *25th International World Wide Web Conference (WWW 2016)*, World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), Montreal, April 2016, 955–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872518.2890586>.
- Yu, Haifeng, Phillip B. Gibbons, Michael Kaminsky, and Feng Xiao. "SybilLimit: A Near-Optimal Social Network Defense against Sybil Attacks." *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking* 18, no. 3 (June 2010): 885–98. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2009.2034047>.
- Yu, Haifeng, Chenwei Shi, Michael Kaminsky, Phillip B. Gibbons, and Feng Xiao. "DSybil: Optimal Sybil-Resistance for Recommendation Systems." In *30th IEEE Symposium on Security & Privacy*, IEEE, Oakland, CA, May 2009, 283–98. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2009.26>.
- Zetter, Kim. "Experts Find Serious Problems with Switzerland's Online Voting System before Public Penetration Test Even Begins." *Motherboard*, February 21, 2019. https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/vbwz94/experts-find-serious-problems-with-switzerlands-online-voting-system-before-public-penetration-test-even-begins.
- Zhang, Bingsheng, and Hong-Sheng Zhou. "Statement Voting." In *Financial Cryptography and Data Security (FC '19)*, International Financial Cryptography Association. St. Kitts, February 2019. <https://fc19.ifca.ai/preproceedings/97-preproceedings.pdf>.
- Zinn, Howard. *A People's History of the United States*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, November 17, 2005. <https://www.harpercollins.com/9780062397348/a-peoples-history-of-the-united-states/>.

Acknowledgments

Writing a book like this is an exercise in time travel. It began with gathering the chapter authors, each of whom has a different time horizon in mind for their writing. It moved into the three workshops that led to these chapters, during which the authors and editors debated issues of timeliness and time-boundedness. Each of us struggled with the pendulum swings of technological triumphalism and dystopia. We strove to include breaking insights and current topics, from digital disinformation to concerns about election hacking, while trying to write beyond any specific moment. And we went to press in early 2020, in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, during which the capacity of democracies to respond effectively was called into question and major technology companies were simultaneously battling misinformation on their platforms and rushing to assist public authorities with health surveillance. And of course, we sent the book off knowing that it would reach you, the reader, after the 2020 US presidential election, for which none of us dared predict the process, let alone the outcome. One thing was a certainty: the rise of digital technologies has profound consequences for democratic institutions, even, and perhaps especially, as those institutions are confronted with historic challenges.

Our greatest gratitude goes to the chapter authors who contributed to the book. They came from different methodological perspectives; brought with them a willingness to engage, learn, and disagree; and pushed one another to produce chapters that do the same.

An undertaking like this also depends on the work of many whose names do not appear as authors. The support of the Stanford Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society (PACS), particularly executive director Kim Meredith, was critical. Of all PACS's contributions, the most notable may be the support it

provided for H el ene to join Rob and Lucy at Stanford for six weeks in 2017, during which time the idea for this editorial collaboration came to fruition. We are grateful to Heather Robinson and Laura Seaman, of PACS’s Digital Civil Society Lab, who handled all the logistics of this three-year project with humor and exactitude. Margaret Levi and the Center of Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science provided space, food, and research assistance in Federica Carugati. We’d also like to thank Hilary Cohen and Gabriel Karger for their help taking notes at the author workshops. Finally, Elizabeth Branch Dyson and her team at University of Chicago Press took on the book and the process of expediting it for publication. We are grateful to Elizabeth and her team specifically and appreciative of the role that independent university presses fill in today’s landscape of ideas.

Each of the people named herein spent countless hours on this volume. The choice to do so requires time spent away from home; in some cases this time was spent continents away. We are grateful to the authors’ families for making space and time for this work.

Finally, some personal acknowledgments.

Lucy Bernholz: To my father, Peter Bernholz, who let me help “pull the levers” in those old election booths. Those were my first opportunities to ask questions about technology and democracy. Decades later, I’m still asking.

H el ene Landemore: To my husband, Darko Jelaca, who likes to say he builds unnecessary electronics and to whom I owe some serendipitous time spent in California and much of my interest in questions of democracy and technology.

Rob Reich: To my parents, Nancy Reich and Bob Reich, whose enthusiasm for my enthusiasms, bulliness for my bookishness, and rock-solid love made it seem possible that I might one day make a life out of ideas.