ChatGPT

The Pyramid of Power: A Modular Framework for a New Digital Social Contract

Introduction

As the world transitions into a **post-labor economy** characterized by automation and precarious employment, twentieth-century mechanisms of social power (such as labor unions and collective bargaining) are weakening. In their place, new forms of **digital agency** are emerging. The *"pyramid of power"* framework outlines five hierarchical layers of civic infrastructure designed to empower individuals and communities in this new era. These layers – from cryptographically-secured identity to forkable governance – offer a *modular, composable blueprint* for a new social contract. Crucially, each layer is **grounded in real-world deployments** at national or sub-national scale, demonstrating that this vision is more than speculative. It is a consolidation of existing empirical successes into a cohesive model of governance. The layers, summarized in **Table 1** below, collectively enable citizens to secure their rights, transact value openly, scrutinize authority, participate directly in decisions, and even clone or exit governance systems if needed.

Table 1: The Five Layers of the "Pyramid of Power" and Real-World Examples

Layer	Description	Real-World Examples
1. Immutable Civic Bedrock	Self-sovereign digital identity; cryptographically anchored property rights and claims (tamper-proof public records).	Estonia's national digital ID (99% adoption) and KSI blockchain ensuring data immutability [1] [2]; Georgia's blockchain land registry (300,000+ land titles recorded immutably) [3].
2. Open, Programmable Value Rails	State-backed or open-source financial infrastructure enabling instant, low-cost payments and programmable money (e.g. CBDCs, stablecoins).	India's UPI (15+ billion transactions/month in 2024) [4]; Brazil's Pix (153 million users, 42 billion transactions in 2023) [5] [6]; China's e-CNY digital yuan pilot (7 trillion yuan transacted by 2024) [7].
3. Radical Transparency of Money & Algorithms	Transparent public ledgers for government finances; mandated audits and disclosure of algorithms used in governance.	Aragon, Spain's blockchain-based public procurement (smart contracts for award processes) [8]; Brazil's national blockchain network (RBB) for public expenditures accountability [9]; Amsterdam & Helsinki's public AI registers revealing city algorithms [10] [11].

Layer	Description	Real-World Examples
4. Direct, Programmable Democracy	Digital tools for direct citizen participation and novel democratic methods (e-voting, deliberation platforms, quadratic voting/funding).	Estonia's i-Voting (over 50% of votes cast online in 2023) [12]; Taiwan's vTaiwan platform (4,500 citizens crowdsourced policy on Uber, informing legislation) [13] [14]; Colorado's use of quadratic voting to set legislative priorities [15] [16]; Gitcoin's quadratic funding ($38M distributed to public projects) [17].
5. Forkable Constitutional Meta-Governance	Legal and technical capacity to *export identity and civic data*, **fork code**, and **clone institutions**, allowing communities to replicate or exit governance systems.	Decidim participatory platform (open-sourced by Barcelona, now used by ~90 cities and institutions worldwide, 1M+ users) [18]; Estonia's e-Residency (100k+ e-residents with transnational digital IDs) [19]; CivHub's Civic Protocol Registry (open templates for civic processes that communities can fork and adapt) [20] [21].

Each layer of the pyramid builds upon the layers beneath it. In combination, they aim for a **credible new social contract** in which power is derived not from traditional labor or corporate hierarchies but from digital empowerment of individuals. The following sections delve into each layer in detail, providing empirical substantiation, discussing practical feasibility, and noting interoperability and transition pathways. A rigorous, strategic tone is maintained throughout, with an emphasis on *global examples* and evidence that these are already active developments – not theoretical futurism. Critiques and challenges are noted where relevant, tempered by the fact that **each layer's core components have been tested in the real world**.

1. Immutable Civic Bedrock

At the foundation of the pyramid is the concept of an **immutable civic bedrock** – the idea that every person should have a secure, portable and sovereign digital identity, along with inviolable claims to property and other rights, all anchored by strong cryptography. This layer establishes *trust in the system's very records*: who you are, what you own, and what claims you can make are safeguarded against tampering by anyone (including cybercriminals or even the state itself). Without this bedrock, higher layers (like voting or transparency) would rest on quicksand. Fortunately, multiple jurisdictions have already deployed key elements of this layer at scale.

Digital Identity (Self-Sovereign and National ID): A robust digital identity is the cornerstone of a digital society. **Estonia** provides a compelling national-scale example. Since 2002, every Estonian has a state-issued digital ID, and today **99% of residents hold an ID-card** enabling secure online authentication and signing [1]. This system, paired with mobile-ID and smart-ID options, allows Estonians to vote, bank, and access health records online daily [22] [23]. The credentials rely on 384-bit ECC public-key cryptography and legally equal a passport or handwritten signature [23]. The result is a **seamless digital society** where digital identity underpins virtually all civic and economic transactions [24] [25]. While Estonia's system is government-issued (not self-sovereign in the strict sense), it illustrates the scale and benefits of a

ubiquitous digital ID: an estimated 800 million digital signatures have been given using these IDs, saving millions of hours of bureaucratic work [26].

Newer initiatives aim to **empower individuals with more control** (the self-sovereign identity or SSI model). For example, the European Union is building an **eIDAS 2.0 framework** featuring *digital identity wallets* – mobile apps that let citizens store and share verified credentials (IDs, licenses, diplomas) across borders [27]. This approach, championed by countries like Estonia at the EU level, uses technologies such as decentralized identifiers and verifiable credentials so that people can prove things about themselves without relying on a single central database. Some countries and regions (e.g. **British Columbia, Canada**) have piloted SSI for business registrations, allowing companies to control their own cryptographic credentials and present them as needed, reducing fraud and streamlining know-your-customer processes [28]. While fully self-sovereign national IDs are still in early stages, the trajectory is clear: **digital identity is moving toward citizen-centric models**, and governments are adapting legal frameworks to recognize these credentials.

Cryptographically Secure Property and Claims: Immutable digital identity is complemented by immutable records of rights – especially property rights. Several nations have launched **blockchain-based land registries** to secure ownership records. **Georgia** (the country) is a notable example: in 2016 its National Agency of Public Registry, with technology from Bitfury, added a blockchain timestamping layer to the existing land registry. By 2017, **over 300,000 land titles were published to the blockchain**, making them immutable and verifiable by any observer [3]. This was part of a broader anti-corruption drive – Georgia had reformed its paper-based registries after 2004, dramatically reducing bribery in land transactions, and the blockchain addition further cemented public trust that records could not be secretly altered [29] [30]. The Georgian system works by hashing each title deed and transaction and anchoring those hashes on a permissioned blockchain (Exonum), creating an incorruptible audit trail [31]. Similarly, **Sweden** and **Honduras** have run pilots to register land transfers on blockchain for integrity and efficiency, and **India**'s state of Andhra Pradesh explored a blockchain land registry to combat rampant title fraud [32]. While these projects revealed that *blockchain cannot fix errors at the data-entry stage* (if a corrupt official inputs a false record, it still gets immutably recorded – "garbage in, garbage out" [33]), they did succeed in **eliminating subsequent tampering** and in highlighting where process improvements are needed. The World Bank and other development institutions are studying these pilots as templates for improving land security in emerging economies [34] [35].

Beyond land, *other claims* like educational credentials and licenses are also being anchored to cryptographic ledgers. For instance, **MIT** and other universities issue digital diplomas secured by blockchain to their graduates, allowing instant independent verification of a credential's authenticity anywhere in the world. On a governmental level, **Colombia** ran a pilot to record academic diplomas on a blockchain to curb fraud [28]. In Africa, where lack of official IDs and records is a development hurdle, initiatives are underway to combine biometrics with decentralized ledgers (e.g. **Kiva's partnership with Sierra Leone** to create a national digital ID and credit history system) to give millions a tamper-proof economic identity.

Ensuring Immutability and Trust: A critical component of this layer is the use of advanced cryptography and distributed consensus to **prevent any single actor from undetectably altering records**. Estonia, again, has been a pioneer here: after suffering a severe cyberattack in 2007, Estonia adopted **blockchain integrity systems (KSI)** across its government databases [36]. The KSI blockchain (invented by Estonian company Guardtime) is a *keyless signature infrastructure* that hashes government data and links those hashes into a globally witnessed ledger [37]. The system is deployed nation-wide – Estonia was *the first*

country to use blockchain at a national level [38] – and ensures that "history cannot be rewritten by anybody" [2]. If anyone (external hacker or internal admin) tries to modify a healthcare record or a court verdict in the database, the cryptographic chain of hashes will not match and the tampering is evident [2]. This means even the government **cannot alter or delete its records in secret**; data integrity has become a mathematically provable property, anchoring citizens' trust [2]. The success of Estonia's approach is now studied by NATO and the EU cybersecurity agency as a model for resilient digital government [39]. In effect, Estonia built an **immutable civic bedrock**: a combination of universal digital ID, ubiquitous digital services, and an "always-auditable" data infrastructure [36] [2].

Practical Feasibility and Interoperability: The above examples prove that an immutable civic bedrock is not only feasible – it is already improving governance. These systems **scale to entire nations** (Estonia, India, etc.) and can interoperate: for example, Estonia's digital ID is recognized across the EU, and its data integrity proofs could be integrated with other countries' systems. The main challenges lie in **governance and inclusion** – ensuring everyone can obtain and use a digital ID, and that cryptographic systems are governed transparently. On inclusion, countries like India have had to work through biometric exceptions (for those with worn fingerprints, for example) and data privacy scares. India's Aadhaar ID, while not blockchain-based, showed both the pros and cons of rapid digital ID rollout: it reached over 1.3 billion people and enabled new services like instant bank accounts, but also raised concerns about surveillance and data leaks. The SSI movement aims to resolve such issues by giving individuals control over who sees their data and by minimizing centralized honeypots of information [40] [41].

In summary, the first layer of the pyramid is coming into place globally. Countries on every continent have demonstrated aspects of **self-sovereign identity and cryptographically assured records**. The trajectory points toward **interoperable digital identities and ledgers** that transcend borders – for example, someone might use an EU digital wallet to prove their property ownership in Georgia's blockchain land registry, or an Estonian e-resident ID to sign a contract in another country. This lays the groundwork for everything else: a citizen empowered with an incorruptible identity and claims is equipped to engage confidently in the digital public sphere.

2. Open, Programmable Value Rails

The second layer of the pyramid envisions **open, programmable value rails** – financial infrastructures that enable anyone to transact and innovate with money as easily as sending an email. This includes government-built instant payment systems, central bank digital currencies (CBDCs), and even privately issued stablecoins, so long as they are **widely accessible, low-cost, and programmable**. In a post-labor economy, where traditional wages might be supplemented by universal basic income or creative digital earnings, such rails are crucial. They allow value to flow freely and transparently, and they provide the means for higher-layer innovations like conditional cash transfers or quadratic funding. Here again, the world has made significant strides: a number of countries have deployed next-generation payment systems with remarkable success.

Instant Payments as a Public Utility: Perhaps the clearest examples of *state-led open payment rails* come from large emerging economies:

- **India's Unified Payments Interface (UPI)** – launched in 2016 by a non-profit consortium under the central bank – has become *a cornerstone of India's digital economy*. UPI allows instant bank-to-bank transfers 24/7 through a simple mobile app interface. Crucially, it is an **open platform**: over 300

banks and dozens of third-party apps (Google Pay, PhonePe, etc.) plug into UPI, all interoperating seamlessly. The results have been staggering: by late 2024 UPI was processing **over 15 billion transactions per month** [4], a figure that dwarfs most countries' card networks. Growth was driven by an open architecture (standard APIs and easy onboarding for new apps) and a policy of zero fees for consumers [42] [43]. Anyone with a mobile phone and bank account can instantly send money via UPI to any other individual or merchant, even by simply using a phone number or QR code as the identifier [44]. As the BIS observes, UPI's *technology-agnostic, interoperable design* and user-friendly interfaces have made it a true public good – a "digital public infrastructure" that advances financial inclusion [42] [43]. In fact, UPI has brought millions of unbanked into the formal economy: it is credited with a **significant rise in digital payments adoption among first-time users**, contributing to India's financial inclusion gains [45]. Recognizing UPI's success, other countries are now linking to it or emulating it (e.g. India has signed agreements to connect UPI with Singapore's PayNow system for cross-border transfers).

- **Brazil's Pix** – launched by the Central Bank of Brazil in late 2020 – tells a similar success story. Pix is a real-time payment network that, like UPI, is *fast, free for consumers, and open to many providers*. Within just **3 years, Pix reached 153 million individual users (about 75% of Brazil's population)**, plus 15 million companies [5]. In 2023 alone, Pix handled **42 billion transactions totaling R$17.2 trillion (US$3.5 trillion)** [6]. It has rapidly become the dominant payment method in Brazil, surpassing cash and cards – by early 2024, nearly **half of all retail payments in Brazil were via Pix (46% by volume)** [46]. The platform's design choices echo those of UPI: *no fees for people*, open access allowing fintech startups and credit unions alongside banks, easy user experiences (simple aliases and QR codes), and continuous feature expansion (like Pix for payroll, Pix for taxes, and upcoming offline Pix) [47] [48]. The central bank also involved the private sector through a "Pix Forum" to get input on rules and features, ensuring buy-in and innovation [49] [50]. The outcome is a highly competitive payments ecosystem (over 800 payment providers participate) with **high service quality and low costs** [51] [52]. The social impact is significant: by end of 2022, Pix had already introduced *over 70 million Brazilians to electronic payments for the first time*, many of whom previously relied only on cash [6]. In a country known for banking spreads and inequality, Pix effectively *leapfrogged* legacy infrastructure, giving ordinary people a near-instant, safe way to transact and even **withdraw cash at local shops via Pix** (an important feature in remote areas) [53].

These examples illustrate how **open value rails can supplant older systems** (cash, cards, remittance services) with something more accessible and programmable. Both UPI and Pix were built as public infrastructures with open standards, which contrasts with proprietary networks like Visa/Mastercard that charge fees and limit participation. The **programmability** aspect is also emerging: Brazil's Pix is adding support for automated recurring payments and even exploring smart contracts integration via a system called **Drex** (the Brazilian CBDC project) [54] [55]. Drex, currently in pilot, uses distributed ledger technology to allow programmable money features (like lending against tokenized assets) on top of Pix's instant transfer capability [54] [55]. This kind of layering shows how an open payment rail can evolve into a full financial ecosystem, where value moves instantly *and* can be subject to complex logic (e.g., a payment that automatically splits into taxes, savings, etc., or money that can be traced in real-time for public expenditures).

Stablecoins and Digital Currencies: In parallel to state-run systems, **stablecoins** – privately issued digital tokens pegged to fiat currencies – have grown into a significant global phenomenon, effectively becoming an *alternative value rail*. By late 2024, the supply of USD-denominated stablecoins like USDT and USDC was

over $125 billion, and these circulate on public blockchain networks accessible to anyone with a smartphone. Crucially, stablecoins are heavily used in countries facing economic instability: *Latin America is a prime example.* Citizens in **high-inflation economies such as Argentina (117% inflation in 2024) and Venezuela (47%) flock to stablecoins as a store of value** [56] [57]. Instead of holding rapidly depreciating pesos or bolívars, people buy USD-linked stablecoins to preserve savings [58]. In Venezuela, the use of crypto (mainly stablecoins) has grown so much that the country ranked among the top in the world for crypto adoption – driven by "ordinary Venezuelans seeking stable stores of value" amid currency collapse [59] [58]. Similarly in Argentina, faced with strict capital controls and a volatile peso, stablecoins provide a lifeline for both savings and commerce. A 2023 analysis showed **a parallel stablecoin economy emerging as recipients of remittances opt to receive USD tokens** instead of local currency [60] [61].

Even in more stable economies, stablecoins play a growing role. In **Brazil**, which has embraced both open banking and crypto, local exchanges report that **stablecoin trading volume now exceeds that of Bitcoin or Ethereum**, reflecting demand for dollar-linked assets [62] [63]. Stablecoins account for roughly *70% of flows between Brazilian exchanges and international crypto exchanges*, indicating they are a primary vehicle for cross-border value transfer [64] [65]. This has attracted institutional attention: for instance, **Circle (issuer of USDC)** officially launched in Brazil in 2024, partnering with local companies to integrate USDC into businesses and remittances [65] [66]. The promise is near-instant, 24/7 dollar transfers, far cheaper than traditional bank wires or Western Union. We are essentially seeing **a globally accessible, dollar-based value rail** emerge that runs parallel to (and sometimes over) the internet.

Meanwhile, central banks have not stood idle. **Central Bank Digital Currencies (CBDCs)** are being developed to marry the confidence of fiat money with the innovation of crypto. According to the Atlantic Council, as of mid-2025, **three countries have fully launched retail CBDCs (Bahamas "Sand Dollar", Jamaica "JamDex", and Nigeria "eNaira")** and *137 countries* (98% of global GDP) are exploring a CBDC in some form [67] [68]. **China's digital yuan (e-CNY)** remains the largest project: by June 2024, the pilot expanded to 17 provinces, with cumulative transactions reaching **¥7 trillion RMB (~$1 trillion)** [7]. Though this is still a fraction of China's total retail payments, it is nearly *4× growth from a year earlier* [7]. Over 260 million e-CNY wallets were reportedly opened in the pilot's early phase [69], and usage spans paying taxes, transit fares, and consumer purchases in pilot cities. China's approach emphasizes programmability (e.g., smart contract features for business payments) and strategic goals (reducing dependence on the dollar system). India, too, has rolled out pilots for a **digital rupee** in 2023–24, which by March 2025 had ₹10 billion in circulation (about $122 million) and is rapidly expanding in testing volume [70]. India's focus appears to be on wholesale interbank uses and complementing the already successful UPI for retail, with offline functionality and integration in progress [70]. These CBDCs, if implemented with open standards, could eventually interlink – projects like **mBridge** (connecting central banks of China, UAE, Thailand, Hong Kong for cross-border transfers) are already demonstrating multi-CBDC interoperability [71].

Interoperability and Programmability: A key attribute of these new rails is that they are *programmable*. UPI and Pix support rich metadata and APIs, allowing businesses to automate payments. Pix is planning a standardized API for "Pix credit" (buy-now-pay-later via Pix) [72] [73]. Stablecoins, running on blockchains like Ethereum or Solana, can be embedded in smart contracts – enabling things like automated escrow, or splitting a payment among multiple parties instantly according to coded rules. This opens the door for **complex financial applications**: e.g., quadratic funding mechanisms (discussed later) that automatically match funds, or welfare payments that are released when certain conditions (like a child's school attendance) are met and are fully traceable on a public ledger. Moreover, interoperability efforts are in motion: India and Singapore linking UPI-PayNow is one; the EU is pushing all banks to adopt *SEPA Instant*

payments and exploring a **digital euro** that would dovetail with private fintech solutions [74]. The **G20 roadmap for faster cross-border payments** explicitly considers linking domestic instant payment systems and using CBDCs to reduce friction.

Real-World Impact: The deployments of open value rails have had immediate societal impact. In India, UPI's ubiquity has led to innovative use cases such as *digital cash for the gig economy*: many ride-share drivers and delivery workers receive dozens of small UPI payments per day instead of cash, formalizing their income. During COVID-19, India used the digital infrastructure to deliver relief payments directly to millions of citizens' bank accounts (the "Jan-Dhan" program), relying on Aadhaar and UPI connectivity to avoid leakage – an approach that would be even more transparent and swift with a CBDC. In Brazil, Pix has been a tool for financial inclusion and even crime reduction (early evidence suggests armed robberies fell as fewer people carry cash, though online fraud remains a challenge – prompting the central bank to introduce Pix transaction value limits and time delays for suspicious transactions [75] [76]). The open rails have also empowered **innovation**: Brazil has a flourishing fintech scene partly because startups can build on Pix and open banking APIs without needing to create payment networks from scratch [52] [77].

Challenges and Mitigations: While these examples prove feasibility, there are challenges. One is *security and fraud*: When everyone is connected in real-time, scammers will try to exploit the unwary. Brazil had to implement safeguards (e.g., allowing users to cap their Pix outgoing amounts, and an anti-fraud shared database among banks) to clamp down on scams [75] [78]. Another challenge is *privacy*: CBDCs or national instant payment logs could enable unwarranted government surveillance of spending. This is being addressed in designs (for instance, the ECB has floated anonymity vouchers for a digital euro, and Nigeria's eNaira is tiered with some offline/cash-like privacy for small transactions). Interoperability also raises the issue of *standards and governance* – but initiatives by BIS and others are underway to standardize messaging and APIs so that these systems work across borders in the future [79].

In conclusion, the second layer of the pyramid – **open, programmable value rails – is robustly demonstrated by global deployments.** We have seen that governments can successfully provide instant payment utilities used by hundreds of millions (India, Brazil), and that the private sector can complement this with global stablecoin networks that fill gaps (especially in countries with unstable currencies) [56] [58]. For a new social contract, these rails mean **economic agency for individuals**: one can receive funds (whether wages, UBI, or crowdfunding) instantly and at negligible cost; one can store and send value in a currency that holds its worth; and one can do so without being locked into expensive intermediaries. Furthermore, the programmability means higher-layer governance solutions – like transparent budgeting or conditional incentive schemes – can be directly implemented in the financial system. In a post-labor economy, these digital rails could facilitate, for example, *micropayments for personal data*, or *smart contracts that redistribute productivity gains* to citizens. The technology and uptake are no longer barriers; the focus now is on governance, interoperability, and ensuring inclusion (so that the poor and digitally less literate are not left out of this cashless revolution).

3. Radical Transparency of Money and Algorithms

Layer 3 calls for **radical transparency** in how public resources are used and how algorithmic decisions are made. In essence, it proposes that the **"source code" of governance – financial flows and computation that affect citizens – be opened up to meaningful scrutiny**. This is a response to rampant issues of corruption, inefficiency, and bias that often erode trust in institutions. By making government money flows visible in real time and by subjecting government algorithms to audits and disclosure, this layer seeks to

shift power back to the public, enabling continuous accountability. Around the world, several bold initiatives have demonstrated pieces of this vision, from putting city budgets on blockchain to pioneering algorithm registries.

Open Budget Ledgers and Expenditure Transparency: Public finance has historically been an opaque domain in many countries, with annual budgets and audits offering only coarse oversight. Radical transparency implies moving to *real-time, transaction-level visibility* of public spending, leveraging modern ledgers. A few trailblazers:

- **Aragon, Spain – Blockchain Procurement:** The autonomous region of Aragon launched a **blockchain-based procurement platform in 2018**, one of the first in Europe [8]. In this system (initially a limited proof-of-concept), each step of a public tender – from posting requirements to final contract – is recorded on a distributed ledger, and *smart contracts enforce the rules of the bidding process* [8] [80]. The blockchain acts essentially as a **tamper-proof log of the entire procurement**, open for any citizen or auditor to inspect. While the Aragon platform was permissioned (operating more like a distributed database than a fully public blockchain), it demonstrated the feasibility of **binding public contracts to code** and making their execution transparent [8]. This helps prevent common corruption tactics like backdating contract amendments or hiding side agreements; once the rules are encoded in the smart contract and bids are submitted, *any deviation would be evident on the ledger*. Observers noted that even this limited deployment increased trust among vendors and encouraged more competitive bidding, since companies could verify that no one received special treatment in the process.

- **Latin America – Toward On-Chain Budgeting:** Inspired by corruption scandals, countries like **Peru** also explored blockchain for government integrity. In 2019, Peru's government worked with a tech firm on a prototype to **track public procurement contracts on LACChain (an IDB-backed blockchain network)** [81]. Although that particular project did not advance beyond pilot, it reflected a regional interest in tech solutions to graft (the effort came on the heels of the Odebrecht scandal, which spanned multiple countries) [81]. **Brazil**, in 2022, launched the **Brazilian Blockchain Network (RBB)** in partnership with its federal audit court (TCU) and development bank (BNDES) [82]. The RBB is envisioned as a *permissioned public blockchain for all sorts of government applications*, with a primary goal of **greater accountability in public expenditures** [83]. It uses a proof-of-authority consensus with both public and private validators and notably has **no cryptocurrency or token** – it's purely for transparency and integrity of data [9] [84]. As one official stated, the goal is to have "the finances of governments become the blockchain" – meaning every transaction by any agency can be recorded and traced [85] [86]. Though still in development, RBB signals strong institutional will in Brazil to harness blockchain for cleaning up government finance. (Brazil consistently ranks high in corruption perception, so the promise of an immutable audit trail is attractive.)

What would it look like if fully realized? A white paper by the Tony Blair Institute envisions **on-chain government accounting** where *"each and every monetary transaction is recorded on the blockchain and can be seen by anyone"*, creating an **immediate "Google search" of government spending** [85] [87]. In such a scenario, every public wallet address is known (e.g., the address of each ministry, department, or project), and their incoming/outgoing funds are visible in real-time to citizens [86]. This would enable "red-flag" algorithms to monitor patterns (say, a sudden spike in spending by a department right before an election, or payments going to an unapproved vendor) [88] [89]. Italy has already done something analogous with offline data – researchers used machine learning on traditional procurement data to successfully predict

and flag likely instances of contract fraud [88]. Putting data on-chain would supercharge such efforts by making data standardized, immediate, and irrevocable [90] [91].

Importantly, **open data reforms have paved the way** for this radical transparency. Many governments have open data portals (e.g., Data.gov in the US has 335,000+ datasets online) [92]. These include budgets, spending, procurement, etc., but usually after significant lag and often in cumbersome formats. The push now is to adopt *Open Data 2.0: on-chain data as the default for public transactions*, which would mean **no delay and full machine-readability** [90] [91]. Imagine a scenario where a citizen can go to a "government blockchain explorer" website and type in, say, "School No.5 Construction Project" and immediately see all payments made to that project's contractors, all in real time. This is what radical financial transparency could deliver.

Some cities have already taken steps in this direction even without blockchain. **New York City's Checkbook NYC** portal (launched 2010) publishes nearly every expenditure by city agencies online daily, allowing drilling down to individual checks. **Ukraine's ProZorro** e-procurement system, though not on a public ledger, posts all government purchase tenders and awards openly, significantly reducing post-Soviet corruption in procurement. These are precursor examples demonstrating that openness *can* be achieved and that it *yields trust and savings*. Notably, Chile's public e-procurement platform (ChileCompra) saved an estimated **$693 million per year** by increasing price competition and transparency [93]. Radical transparency via technology is thus an accelerant of trends already underway.

Transparency of Algorithms (AI Accountability): As governments increasingly rely on algorithms (from AI systems in welfare and policing to simple automated decision rules in administration), a democratic society requires that these "black boxes" be illuminated. Several innovative efforts worldwide are pushing algorithmic transparency and accountability:

- **Public Algorithm Registers:** In September 2020, the cities of **Amsterdam and Helsinki** became the world's first to launch **public AI registers** [10]. These online registers list the algorithms each city uses in public services, along with plain-language explanations of how they work, the datasets that trained them, the purpose, and even contact info of the person in charge [11]. For example, Helsinki's register might describe an AI system that helps answer citizens' questions on a helpline, including what data it learns from and how its accuracy/bias were evaluated. Amsterdam's register similarly details algorithms used for things like parking control or welfare fraud detection [94] [11]. Crucially, the registers also provide a channel for citizens to give feedback or raise concerns about specific algorithms [11]. This kind of openness is *revolutionary*: traditionally, governments treated their software systems as internal matters. By making them public, Amsterdam and Helsinki not only educate citizens but invite public oversight (civil society or researchers can query whether an algorithm might be unfair). The EU has taken note – these cities' approach aligns with broader European moves to require transparency for high-impact algorithms.

- **Algorithmic Audits and Bans:** Transparency also comes through *auditing and regulation*. A landmark case occurred in **the Netherlands**: the Dutch government had developed an algorithmic risk scoring system called SyRI to detect welfare fraud. However, in 2020 a court *ordered the halt of SyRI*, judging that its lack of transparency and its discriminatory impacts (it singled out poorer, immigrant neighborhoods) violated human rights [95]. This was one of the first instances of a court shutting down a government algorithm for opaqueness/bias, sending a clear message: **"secret" algorithms that affect the public are unacceptable**. In the UK, after public outcry (including "*fuck*

the algorithm" protests), the government reversed an opaque algorithmic grading system that had unfairly downgraded students' exam scores [95] [96]. These instances show the new expectation that important algorithms be **explainable and fair** – otherwise they face public and legal rejection.

Legislatively, we see momentum for **AI accountability laws**. The **European Union's AI Act**, nearing finalization in 2025, will impose strict requirements on high-risk AI systems, including *mandatory transparency, documentation, and human oversight*. It effectively mandates that companies and governments *prove* their algorithms' safety and fairness through conformity assessments (a form of audit) and could require disclosure of algorithmic logic in certain cases [97] [98]. Meanwhile, **New York City passed a law (Local Law 144 of 2021)** requiring that any AI tools used in hiring (by employers in NYC) undergo an annual **bias audit** by an independent evaluator, with the results publicly posted [99] [100]. Enforcement of this began in July 2023, making NYC the first jurisdiction to actually enforce algorithmic audits in practice. The audits must report on whether the AI's recommendations show disparate impact by race or gender, and employers must notify candidates about such tools [99]. This kind of sector-specific algorithm accountability likely foreshadows broader policies.

Additionally, **open-source algorithms** are encouraged in some governance contexts. France's "Digital Republic" law (2016) established that when government uses automated decision systems, the underlying code should be public or at least explainable to those affected. Some French agencies subsequently released source code for algorithms (e.g., tax calculation formulas, certain educational assignment algorithms) on public repositories. **UK's Algorithmic Transparency Standard (2021)** similarly provides a framework for government departments to publish information about their algorithmic tools, and a few pilot disclosures have been made (like how a local authority triages welfare benefit applications via an algorithm). Though voluntary for now, it sets a template.

Integrating Money and Algorithm Transparency: Layers 2 and 3 together create powerful synergies. Consider that **financial transparency (open budgets)** is greatly enhanced by *algorithmic transparency* when algorithms are used to allocate funds. If a city uses an AI to decide which neighborhoods need more policing or more school funding, both the spending data and the decision logic could be open – allowing citizens to question not just "where is the money going" but "why is it going there?". Conversely, the availability of open financial data can feed *algorithm audits*: independent analysts can train their own models on open spending data to detect patterns of waste or favoritism that an insider algorithm might be perpetuating.

Challenges and Critiques: The push for radical transparency must balance **privacy and security** concerns. Publishing every government transaction raises questions: Do we reveal salaries of public employees by name? (Many jurisdictions already do, as open data, but some argue this could deter talent or breach privacy). How do we handle national security or defense-related expenditures? One approach is hierarchical transparency – routine and civil expenditures are fully open, whereas sensitive ones are logged on chain with a delay or accessible only to authorized overseers. Another issue is *information overload*: dumping massive data doesn't automatically yield accountability unless tools (and journalists, NGOs, citizens) are there to interpret it. This is being addressed by UX efforts – e.g., designing user-friendly explorers and red-flag alert systems as mentioned [88].

For algorithms, a common critique is **trade secrecy** – companies may resist revealing their model details. But governments can navigate this by requiring disclosures as a condition of procurement or by using algorithms that are developed in-house and open-sourced. There's also the risk of **"audit-washing"**, where

meaningless audits give a false sense of security. To counter this, standards for audit quality (as discussed by institutions like Germany's TÜV or NIST in the US) are being developed, and civil society watchdogs are closely watching initial implementations (like NYC's bias audits) to ensure they have teeth.

Despite these challenges, the trend line is clear: *societies are demanding more transparency in both money and code.* As evidenced by the examples, the technology to meet this demand exists. Blockchain and distributed ledgers provide the tool for **financial radical transparency**, while legal mandates and participatory registers provide the mechanism for **algorithmic transparency**. Together, they significantly **shift power**: corruption becomes harder when anyone can audit the books in real time, and biased or unjust algorithms cannot hide in darkness. This layer strengthens the social contract by ensuring that citizens are not treated as passive subjects of arcane processes – instead, they become auditors, co-creators, and informed participants.

4. Direct, Programmable Democracy

The fourth layer of the pyramid focuses on transforming how collective decisions are made, using digital technology to enable more **direct and participatory democracy**. It encompasses secure internet-based voting, online deliberation platforms that can scale up citizen engagement, and new decision mechanisms like quadratic voting and funding that capture the intensity of public preferences. Essentially, this layer is about moving beyond the traditional model of infrequent voting and disconnected representatives, toward a model where citizens can *directly and continuously shape governance*. As ambitious as that sounds, numerous real-world deployments provide proof-of-concept that digital democracy can be both **secure and effective at scale** – when designed well.

Secure Internet Voting (E-Voting): One of the boldest expressions of digital democracy is letting people vote in official elections over the internet. The clear pioneer here is **Estonia**, which has conducted nationwide **internet voting (i-Voting)** since 2005. Over the past 18 years, Estonia steadily built public trust in the system through transparency and security measures, to the point that by the **2023 parliamentary elections, 51% of all votes were cast online – the first time anywhere that a national election saw a majority of votes come in electronically** [12]. This is a remarkable achievement in terms of both adoption and technical execution. Estonia's i-Voting works via the digital ID card: voters authenticate with their ID's private key and a PIN, then vote through a client that encrypts their ballot. The system has end-to-end verifiability (voters can download an app to confirm their vote was counted as cast) and a slew of legal safeguards – for instance, online voting is open for several days prior to election day, and a person can vote multiple times online with only the last vote counting (this prevents coercion – a voter under pressure could re-vote later in private) [101] [102]. On election day, if a person votes on paper at a polling station, that automatically cancels any online vote. These measures, coupled with public audits (Estonia even invites international observers to inspect code and processes), have led to growing confidence: every election, the share of i-voters rose (30.5% in 2015, 43.8% in 2019, and 50.7% in 2023) [103]. The benefit is convenience and inclusion – Estonians abroad can vote without traveling to a consulate, and even domestically it saves time. In 2023, after polls closed it took only a few hours to *decrypt and count all e-votes*, demonstrating efficiency alongside integrity [12] [102].

Other jurisdictions have tested e-voting, albeit with mixed results. **Switzerland** conducted e-voting trials for expatriates in multiple federal elections and referenda (using systems in Geneva and from Swiss Post), but halted broader rollout after researchers found critical vulnerabilities in 2019. **West Virginia (USA)** ran a pilot in 2018 allowing overseas military voters to cast absentee ballots via a blockchain-based mobile app (Voatz);

several small counties participated, but subsequent security audits raised concerns, and West Virginia limited further use [104] [105]. **Moscow, Russia** attempted a blockchain e-vote for part of its 2019 city elections; a French cryptographer famously cracked the encryption due to a flaw, though the system was patched and continued to be used in some form later [106] [107]. These experiences reveal that e-voting is *possible* but must be approached with extreme care. Estonia's success is often attributed to its broader digital infrastructure (digital IDs, etc. from Layer 1) and the incremental way it built and tested the system. The takeaway: **secure online voting at a national scale is achievable** [12], but it demands a foundation of digital identity, public audits, and legal adaptations to mitigate risks (e.g., coercion or vote selling, which Estonia addressed via re-voting and paper override).

The *programmable* aspect of digital voting is also intriguing: pilots have explored ideas like *quadratic voting for citizens* or *proxy voting via blockchain* as a form of liquid democracy. For example, the **Colorado Democratic Party in 2021** allowed delegates to allocate tokens (votes) across issues at a statewide assembly, a sort of proxy for direct democratic input on platform priorities. And in **Taiwan**, some local city councils have discussed using e-voting for participatory budgeting votes, letting residents allocate budgets among projects through a secure app (though in practice many still use websites with login codes rather than full PKI security).

Deliberative Platforms: Voting is the final act, but democracy thrives on the process of *deliberation and idea generation*. Digital platforms can radically scale up participatory governance beyond the limits of town hall meetings or surveys. A standout example is **vTaiwan**, an initiative run by civic tech activists in collaboration with the Taiwan government. vTaiwan is an **online-offline consultation process** that has tackled numerous policy issues by crowdsourcing input from citizens, experts, and stakeholders [108] [109]. Its most famous case was the controversy over Uber's legality in Taiwan: instead of the government unilaterally deciding, vTaiwan convened a multi-stage process. First, *online discussions* were held using the Polis platform – over **4,500 citizens participated, contributing and voting on 145 statements about ride-sharing and taxi services** [13] [110]. Polis uses AI to map opinion clusters and find points of consensus. It turned out that while people were split into pro-Uber and anti-Uber camps on some issues, they agreed on certain principles (like the need for safety checks and insurance). These consensus points became the basis for a **facilitated face-to-face meeting** between Uber representatives, taxi unions, officials, and citizens [111]. The output of that meeting was a set of recommendations (e.g., Uber drivers should get commercial licenses, the company should pay taxes) which the government translated into a **draft bill that eventually passed**, legalizing and regulating UberX in line with the public's input [14]. This process set a global benchmark for digital deliberation: it showed that even on divisive issues, an open platform can yield constructive solutions, if designed to foster consensus rather than flame wars. Taiwan's government subsequently institutionalized parts of this: the **Join platform** (join.gov.tw) allows any citizen to propose policies or petitions; **by June 2022 over 13,853 proposals had been submitted, 289 of which met the support threshold (5,000 signatures) to receive an official government response** [112]. Many of those responses have led to tangible policy changes – for example, a successful petition to lift a ban on menstrual cups led to regulatory change in 2017 [113] [114]. The **Join platform** now serves as a hub for participatory budgeting, regulatory pre-announcements (where people can comment on draft laws), and more, effectively embedding direct democracy into day-to-day governance.

Elsewhere, numerous cities have adopted similar platforms. **Decidim**, an open-source participatory democracy platform born in Barcelona, has been used for everything from soliciting ideas for city master plans to letting citizens vote on how to spend parts of the budget. By 2022, Decidim had been **adopted by close to 90 cities/organizations worldwide, engaging over 1 million users** [18]. Notably, **Helsinki's**

OmaStadi platform (based on Decidim) enabled residents to propose and vote on city projects using a €4.4 million participatory budget in 2019, with broad participation. **Madrid's CONSUL platform** (also open-source) was used in 35 countries and 135 institutions by 2022 [18] – Madrid famously let citizens vote on key local issues like whether to reform a major plaza or if the city should bid for the Olympics. These platforms demonstrate that **direct democracy can be scaled**: large cities (and even countries – CONSUL was used in Uruguay and for nationwide youth consultations in France) have successfully involved tens or hundreds of thousands of people in making real decisions, beyond just periodic elections.

Quadratic Voting and Quadratic Funding: Traditional voting (one person, one vote) doesn't capture how strongly someone feels about an issue. **Quadratic Voting (QV)** is a mechanism to address that by allowing people to allocate not just votes but "voice credits" in a way that the cost of additional votes on the same issue grows quadratically. This way, participants can express intensity of preference but at an increasing "price" – preventing a small group from dominating unless they feel extraordinarily strongly (and are willing to spend many credits). While QV was a theoretical concept a few years ago, it's now been tested in governance. The state of **Colorado (USA)** provides a pioneering case. In **2019, the Democratic caucus of the Colorado House of Representatives used QV** in a retreat to prioritize which budget proposals (bills) to pursue among a long list [15] [16]. Each lawmaker had a budget of tokens (voice credits) and could allocate more to the bills they cared about more. The outcome gave a clear ranked list of priorities, which leadership said was more nuanced and informative than a yes/no vote or trying to negotiate informally [115]. The experiment was successful enough that they repeated it: in 2020, executive branch working groups in Colorado's government applied QV to set agency goals (e.g. the Dept of Higher Education used QV for its budget priorities) [116] [117]. In 2021, both the House and for the first time the **Senate caucuses** (and of both parties) in Colorado conducted QV polls for budgeting [118] [119]. By 2022, even the Senate Republicans joined in this once-esoteric practice [119]. Over multiple years, Colorado officials, in partnership with academics and the RadicalxChange Foundation, refined a software tool for QV and made the process routine [118] [120]. This is a striking example of *directly importing a novel voting paradigm into an official governance context*. It proved **practical and popular** among participants, enough to become an "ongoing routine," as one state senator hoped [121]. The only pushback came regarding transparency: initially the QV polls were anonymous and secret (to let legislators vote their conscience without lobbying pressures). Some journalists and civic groups argued this violated open-meetings laws [122]. In response, by 2024 Colorado's caucuses agreed to publish the results of QV polling, balancing openness with the integrity of the process [123]. This evolution shows that *programmable democracy requires accompanying legal adjustments* (e.g., updating transparency laws for new forms of voting), but it can be integrated into legislative practice.

Quadratic Funding (QF), meanwhile, has taken off in the domain of public goods funding. QF is a mechanism where community donations to projects are matched from a central pool, not linearly, but quadratically – meaning matching funds disproportionately boost broadly-supported projects over narrowly-supported ones. The largest experiment here is **Gitcoin Grants**, a platform primarily funding open-source software and social good projects in the blockchain ecosystem. Since 2019, Gitcoin has run QF rounds where a pool of money (from sponsors) is divided among projects based on the distribution of many small crowdfunded donations. Over four years, **Gitcoin QF has distributed over $38 million to more than 3,000 projects, with 18,000+ contributors participating** [17]. This is essentially *direct democracy in budgeting* – anyone can contribute even $1 to a project they like, and the quadratic formula ensures that if many people give that $1, the matching pool rewards that project significantly. It puts power in the hands of the crowd rather than a few grantmakers. The mechanism has been so successful at identifying projects people value that it has drawn increasing funds (Gitcoin's matching pools often come from protocols or philanthropists that recognize the wisdom of the crowd). By 2024, Gitcoin had conducted 19 rounds of

quadratic funding and funneled over **$59 million** (matching + donations) to community-chosen initiatives [124]. This model is now being adapted beyond tech: **Downtown Stimulus** in 2020 used QF to distribute relief to small businesses in downtown neighborhoods in the U.S. during COVID, letting local residents decide which shops to save. Cities like Boulder, Colorado and **Taiwan's presidential hackathon** have toyed with QF for allocating innovation budgets. These pilots suggest that **communities can directly allocate resources in a fair way using digital platforms** – essentially a form of direct democracy in fiscal policy.

Direct Democracy at Scale – Feasibility: The cases above demonstrate that scaling citizen participation is entirely feasible with digital tools. Taiwan (23 million people) routinely invites the whole country into participatory governance online; small jurisdictions like Estonia enable global voting by citizens; large states like Colorado introduce new voting methods in government; and global digital communities allocate funding via QF. Key to success is *design and security*. The design must lower barriers to participate (e.g., mobile-friendly interfaces, support for multiple languages in diverse cities, etc.) and highlight constructive input (for deliberation tools like Polis). Security, particularly for voting, must be rock solid – which often means *public penetration testing and incremental trust-building*. Estonia's system has survived intact partly because it engaged researchers and gradually scaled up usage over many elections.

Another key factor is **integration with traditional processes**. These digital tools don't replace representative institutions overnight; they supplement and transform them over time. For example, participatory budgeting (PB) often starts by allocating a small portion of a city's budget via citizen vote (Paris began with 5% of its budget in PB, one of the largest such experiments). As people get used to it and the kinks are worked out (like ensuring marginalized communities are included through proactive outreach), it can expand. The pyramid model envisions that as trust in these tools grows (a trust buttressed by layers 1, 2, and 3 providing secure ID, open data, etc.), **more of governance can become direct and programmable**.

Challenges: Naturally, there are challenges and criticisms. One concern is the **digital divide**: those without internet access or digital skills could be left out of e-democracy. Governments must pair any digital democracy initiative with inclusion programs – e.g., public kiosks, digital literacy campaigns, alternative offline participation options when needed. In Taiwan's vTaiwan, for instance, offline workshops are used to complement online engagement for those not comfortable online, and facilitators actively reach out to stakeholders who might not show up by themselves [13] [111]. Another concern is **security** – the specter of hacking or foreign interference in online voting is taken extremely seriously. Skeptics often cite a 2018 US Pentagon study that said secure online voting was not yet solved. Estonia's counterexample shows it's possible but does rely on a very particular context (a small, tech-savvy population with a strong national cybersecurity framework). For larger countries, a cautious approach (maybe starting with municipal elections or expat voting, as many are doing) is prudent. Advances in cryptographic voting protocols (like zero-knowledge proofs, end-to-end verification, etc.) are rapidly improving the equation.

There's also the question of **deliberation quality**: moving discussions online can sometimes lead to polarization (witness social media). However, platforms like Polis have shown that with the right structure (no reply threads to fight in, just voting on statements) and AI summarization, online discussions can *reduce* polarization by finding common ground. It requires careful moderation and design to avoid bots or brigading – hence many civic platforms require real-name login (often via digital ID, as in Estonia or BankID in some Scandinavian e-consultations) to ensure genuine participation.

Interoperability and Programmability: The word "programmable" in this layer is key. It hints that these democratic processes can be *augmented by algorithms and smart contracts.* For example, one could imagine **binding smart contracts for policy**: if citizens vote in a participatory budgeting process via a blockchain-based system, the winning projects could automatically trigger release of funds on a transparent ledger (combining Layer 2 and Layer 4) – no delays or political second-guessing. In essence, the execution of the public's will could be partially automated, under public audit. Already, in some Decidim instances, the results of online votes are officially binding (Barcelona committed to implement the top proposals from its Decidim process for its 2016–2019 City Plan, and it did). As these tools standardize, they can interoperate: e.g., a digital ID from Layer 1 can be used to securely log into a voting platform; a transparency ledger from Layer 3 can publish the outcome of a quadratic vote along with proof that it wasn't manipulated; the funding rails from Layer 2 can deliver funds to QF-selected projects immediately.

Layer 4 ultimately seeks to **supplant the power structures of the industrial era (which concentrated decision-making in a few hands) with a more networked, responsive form of decision-making.** It brings many more voices in, but also ensures decisions can be *higher quality*, informed by collective intelligence and preference intensity. Real-world deployments show that citizens are not only willing to engage when given the chance, they often make thoughtful choices. For instance, analyses of participatory budgeting results worldwide find that citizens tend to fund sensible, broadly beneficial projects (like fixing parks, upgrading schools in poorer areas) – often more equitably than politicians would have, because the process surfaces needs from across the community. In other words, **direct democracy, when well-structured, can enhance equity and legitimacy** rather than devolve into chaos or populism.

5. Forkable Constitutional Meta-Governance

The apex of the pyramid is the most forward-looking layer: **forkable constitutional meta-governance**. This concept envisions that the very **rules and institutions of governance become exportable and duplicable** – much like open-source software – giving communities the freedom to "fork" their social operating system if the current one fails to serve them. In simpler terms, it's about ensuring *choice and competition in governance*, by making identities and institutions portable. This draws on trends in both technology (open-source, decentralized platforms) and governance (special economic zones, transnational citizenship) to imagine a world where people are not inexorably bound to one government's code of laws and services; instead, they could choose, remix, or create anew.

While this sounds radical, early manifestations are visible:

Exportable Digital Identity and E-Residency: One aspect is the ability to **carry your civic identity across boundaries**, diminishing the monopoly of nation-states over personal identity. **Estonia's e-Residency program**, launched in 2014, is a pioneering step. It offers anyone in the world a government-issued digital identity from Estonia – without residing there. Over **100,000 people from 170+ countries have become Estonian e-residents** [19], gaining the ability to start EU-based companies, digitally sign documents, and access certain Estonian e-services remotely. While e-Residency is not full citizenship (no voting rights or passport), it shows a government effectively *scaling its jurisdiction digitally* and foreigners "plugging into" another country's system voluntarily [19]. It's a form of **opt-in governance**: entrepreneurs choose Estonian corporate law and digital infrastructure to run their business because it's efficient and trustworthy. In doing so, they partially **port their economic identity** out of their home country's system into Estonia's. This hints at a future where individuals might mix and match governance: e.g., use one country's digital ID/e-citizenship for business, another jurisdiction's dispute resolution system for contracts, etc., based on which

is best – a concept sometimes called "jurisdictional arbitrage" or, more optimistically, a **marketplace of governance**.

Open-Source Institutional Templates: Another facet is making the *processes of governance open and forkable*. The **Civic Protocol Registry by CivHub**, for instance, is creating a library of **"modular, remixable governance protocols"** that anyone can fork and adapt [125] [126]. These include things like participatory budgeting processes, citizens' assembly formats, voting methods – described in a standard format with steps, roles, and examples [127]. The idea is that a community or local government wanting to adopt a new democratic practice doesn't have to design it from scratch; they can go to the registry, find (for example) a quadratic voting protocol or a Brazil-style participatory budgeting protocol, and implement it, even modifying it ("forking" it) to suit local needs [20] [21]. The registry explicitly uses software analogies: it talks about *versioning, forking histories, and modular components* for governance [128] [129]. This reflects an emerging **"GovTech open-source" movement**, where cities and nations share code and practices. We saw earlier how Decidim and CONSUL platforms spread to dozens of countries [18]; those are tangible examples of *cloning civic tech*. Through efforts like the registry, not just the code but the very **protocols of decision-making** become globally copyable. Essentially, one city's innovation in democracy (say, Paris's method for online participatory budgeting or Reykjavik's crowdsourced laws platform) can be catalogued and then cloned by any other city. This dramatically accelerates institutional evolution – best practices propagate like software updates.

Cloning Civic Institutions: We can extend the idea further: entire institutions could be forked. For instance, **charter cities and special economic zones** have tried importing other countries' legal systems to new locales. The new city of **Prospera in Honduras** adopted a governance framework based on Common Law and arbitration, quite foreign to the rest of Honduras, effectively "forking" aspects of e.g. Delaware's corporate law and the Cayman Islands' trust law into a new jurisdiction. On the digital side, **decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs)** in the crypto world offer a living laboratory: a DAO is governed by open-source code (smart contracts) and if members dislike decisions, they can literally fork the code and start a new DAO, taking some of the community and assets with them. Notably, major blockchain networks like **Ethereum have forked** (split into two communities with different rules) – Ethereum Classic is a fork that preserved an original code rule that the majority wanted to change. In that case, people had the freedom to follow the fork whose "constitution" (the code and ledger rules) they preferred. While blockchain communities aren't nations, this demonstrates *meta-governance forking in action*: the ability to exit a governance system and start a modified one, without having to physically move – a kind of **voluntary migration in cyberspace**.

Looking to formal nations, there are hints of forkability: **UK's legal system has been "exported"** historically to many countries (common law system), and more recently, some countries are considering recognizing **"e-citizenships" or digital second citizenships**. For example, countries like **Portugal and Malta** have offered e-resident or nomad visas that come with digital access to services. The concept of a **"Network State"** (popularized by Balaji Srinivasan in 2022) imagines a digitally-coordinated community that could negotiate recognition as a state once it has enough members and economic weight – essentially founding a new polity by forking aspects of existing ones and leveraging the network.

Legal and Technical Underpinnings: For forkable governance to be reality, certain legal capacities are needed. One is **interoperability of identity and records** – if you "move" to a new digital jurisdiction, you'd want your credentials, diplomas, etc. to be recognized there. Projects like the **European Digital Identity wallet** aim to create that baseline: any participating authority can validate credentials issued by any other

[27]. Another needed capacity is **data portability** for personal and group data. Perhaps a future law will ensure that your personal data (medical, financial, social) held by one state can be securely transferred to another state's system if you change citizenship – analogous to how bank account portability or phone number portability works in some places.

Another requirement is that institutions be **codified in a transparent, replicable way**. For instance, if a city's budgeting process is encoded in smart contracts (as proposed by the Open Budget initiatives), then that code can be forked to start a similar budgeting process in a new community. If a country's laws are all published as open machine-readable code (there are projects like Lexon that try to make legal contracts executable), then startup societies can reuse those instead of writing laws from scratch. Already, **Estonia has offered to help other countries "copy" its digital government** – indeed, after Ukraine's infrastructure was damaged in 2022, Estonia set up "Data Embassies" and advised Ukraine on adopting its X-Road data exchange system, effectively exporting a chunk of Estonia's digital state for Ukraine to fork and use.

Empowering Exit and Voice: The overarching political promise of this layer is to give citizens **credible exit options** and thereby enhance their voice. If people can *easily switch* to a different governance service provider (be it another city, a network state, or a cloud community), then governments must become more responsive to retain people – similar to how competition in business forces companies to treat customers well or lose them. In traditional nation-states, exit is hard (you must migrate physically, often at great cost, and give up your network and property). But in a world of forkable governance, one could imagine "migrating" virtually: e.g., shifting one's tax payments and service usage to a different city's digital jurisdiction while remaining in place. Some of this is speculative, but we see early glimmers: **remote work and digital nomads** leveraging countries competing for them with e-residency and tax perks; **city network collaborations** where, for instance, a resident of City A could contribute to City B's participatory process because they share values and City B welcomes it for diversity of input.

Challenges and Safeguards: This layer faces profound questions. Sovereign states jealously guard their jurisdiction – widespread forkable governance would disrupt the Westphalian order. There would need to be new legal frameworks, perhaps akin to how **the EU allows freedom of movement and mutual recognition of qualifications** among member states, but on a global scale and even for virtual polities. It's a long-term prospect. Additionally, one must avoid a scenario of governance shopping that undermines equity – e.g., only the wealthy effectively exit to low-tax or low-regulation jurisdictions, leaving others behind (this already happens to an extent with corporate and individual tax havens). A balance is needed between **competition and cooperation**: ideally, forkable governance creates pressure for all governments to improve (just as open-source software competition often improves all projects) while allowing diversity for different preferences.

Interestingly, the presence of *common global challenges* (climate change, pandemics) means completely splintering governance isn't practical – we'd still need coordination. But forkability doesn't mean isolation; it means modularity. Communities might fork a particular service (say, adopt Estonia's e-health system code) while still aligning on global standards (like WHO health regulations). In fact, interoperability could make cooperation easier: if many places run similar code for budgeting, perhaps comparing budgets and sharing improvements becomes trivial – just as multiple forks of an open-source program can still share updates.

Meta-Governance in Practice: We have a current illustration in the digital sphere: **crypto governance forums** often have constitutions and rules written in code (Layer 4) and anyone can propose to change those (meta-governance). If a majority doesn't agree, the dissenting minority can fork away (Layer 5). Some

DAOs explicitly state this "right to fork" in their charters as the ultimate check on majority power. Translating that to civic life: imagine a city that says, if a substantial minority (say 30%) consistently dislikes the city's direction, they have a legal pathway to carve out a new municipality or join another – facilitated by all records and systems being easily copied over. This could make secession more manageable and less violent (today it often leads to conflict due to physical territory disputes). It's admittedly a complex and controversial notion, but the digital dimension (identity, services, virtual communities) allows experimentation without immediately redrawing physical borders.

One concrete move in this direction is **legal harmonization and plug-and-play law**. For example, some U.S. states let businesses incorporate under Delaware law no matter where they operate – effectively forking Delaware's corporate governance model widely. **UNIFORM Act projects** aim to standardize certain laws so that moving from one state to another doesn't require a legal overhaul (similar to code interoperability). On the tech side, frameworks like **COSMOS or Polkadot in blockchain** allow different communities (chains) to fork and run independently but interoperate through protocols when needed, analogous to independent municipalities with a common federation.

In summation, forkable constitutional meta-governance is about **flexibility and resilience** at the system level. It means if the current social contract in a country fails (say it becomes authoritarian or dysfunctional), people aren't irrevocably stuck – they might digitally exit to a parallel system that offers a better contract. It means if one community innovates a superior governance process, others can emulate it quickly (like a "patch" to the social OS). This layer ties together the others: it relies on universal digital ID (Layer 1) to allow easy switching of allegiance, on digital value systems (Layer 2) to allow your economic life to move with you, on transparency (Layer 3) so you can *evaluate* different governance options clearly, and on direct democracy tools (Layer 4) so that even new forked communities maintain legitimacy through participation.

While fully forkable governance remains an aspirational frontier, the incremental developments cited – e-residency, open-source civic tech, DAO governance, special jurisdictions – **indicate a trajectory towards more modular, competitive governance**. In a post-labor economy where individuals might not have the leverage of a union or the anchor of a lifelong career in one place, this flexibility in governance can become a new source of bargaining power: the ability to say *"if I'm treated poorly by my government, I can take my identity, data, and talents elsewhere (or even help build a new elsewhere)"*. That prospect might be the ultimate empowerment of citizens in the 21st century.

Synthesis: A New Social Contract in a Post-Labor Era

Having examined each layer of the pyramid, it's clear that **none of these ideas are merely theoretical** – each is substantiated by real deployments that have demonstrated their value. What remains is to understand how these layers *interact and reinforce each other* to form a coherent new social contract, and how we might navigate the transition from today's governance to this envisioned model. The overarching theme is replacing the lost power of traditional labor and social structures with **digital agency and collective intelligence**. The pyramid's layers, when combined, aim to ensure that individuals in a highly automated, globalized world still have **security, voice, and choice** in their societies.

Interoperability and Synergy Across Layers: The layers are designed to be *modular but mutually supportive*. For instance:

- **Layer 1 (Identity & Bedrock) underpins Layer 4 (Direct Democracy):** Without secure digital identity verification, online voting or deliberation could be gamed by bots or fake personas. Conversely, when citizens have trusted e-IDs (or self-sovereign IDs), a whole range of democratic participation options open up, from binding e-votes to personalized civic dashboards. Estonia's success in i-Voting is inseparable from its digital ID system [23] [12]; similarly, Taiwan's participation platforms leverage people's real-name IDs to ensure one person, one account, adding credibility to online inputs. Thus, robust digital identity is the *authentication layer* for digital democracy, and we see many countries (like those in the EU) now moving to implement digital ID precisely to enable such services [27].

- **Layer 2 (Value Rails) empowers new participation models in Layer 4 and transparency in Layer 3:** Consider participatory budgeting – it becomes far more powerful when citizens can *directly receive and manage funds*. With instant payment systems and potentially personal wallets (CBDC or otherwise), a community could vote on a budget and then have the funds disbursed to project implementers immediately via smart contracts on the open rails [130] [54]. Financial transparency (Layer 3) also benefits: if government spending is done through an open payment network, then publishing spending data is trivial and real-time (as opposed to manual reporting). In Brazil, for example, one can imagine Pix being used not just for private payments but also all government disbursements, such that every Pix transaction from a public account is flaggable and traceable. In general, digital money that is programmable can carry *tags and conditions* that enhance transparency – e.g., marking a government subsidy token so it can only be spent on certain items and tracking its flow.

- **Layer 3 (Transparency) creates trust for Layers 2 and 4:** People will embrace digital payments and digital voting if they trust the systems are fair and accountable. Radical transparency helps by making it *observable* that the system isn't being abused. For example, if a quadratic funding round happens, publishing the contributions and matching calculations on a public ledger (with privacy protections) can prove to participants that the outcome was correct and no funds disappeared (Gitcoin does publish detailed data after each round). Similarly, open algorithm registries build public confidence that when AI is used in, say, vote counting or benefit allocation, it's been vetted and can be challenged if it misbehaves. Transparency thus is the **confidence layer** without which the more experimental ideas might not get public buy-in.

- **Layer 4 (Direct Democracy) provides legitimacy and adaptability to Layer 5 (Meta-Governance):** If people are going to fork or export their governance, they need mechanisms to collectively decide doing so. Direct democracy tools could, for instance, allow a subset of citizens to democratically decide to form a new "digital municipality" that better fits their needs, or to collectively adopt another jurisdiction's code of law. Moreover, continuous participation (Layer 4) means the social contract is *never static* – it can be regularly updated via referenda, citizens' assemblies, or quadratic votes, rather than waiting for infrequent elections or crises. This continuous refresh is key to meta-governance, which is about *governing the governance*. We see an echo of this in how Colorado's legislature used QV internally to decide how to change their budgeting priorities [16] – essentially legislators directly tweaking their internal rules via a democratic method. In the future, we might see citizens in a digital polity vote on meta-questions like "should we switch to X open-source legal code

for our contract law?" or "should we join coalition Y of network states?" – effectively constitutional decisions made directly by the people.

A Post-Labor Social Contract: The cumulative effect of the pyramid is to outline a **new basis of power and security for individuals** that does not rely on holding a lifelong job or being part of a strong labor union (as was common in the mid-20th century social contract). In the classical social contract, the state promised employment, or at least a safety net, and individuals contributed through labor and taxes; power imbalances were mediated by labor movements and political parties. In the emerging scenario, where automation and gig economies fragment work, individuals must instead rely on:

- **Digital rights and assets:** A self-sovereign identity and cryptographically secured personal data become as important as property was in classical liberal theory. One's digital identity (with reputation, credentials, etc.) is an asset that cannot be arbitrarily taken – it's protected by Layer 1. That gives people leverage: for example, one could carry their work history and skills proof to any platform or country (preventing lock-in to a single employer or state system).

- **Participatory income and collective decision on resource distribution:** If traditional wages are scarce, society might implement mechanisms like UBI or public goods funding. The pyramid supports this by providing transparent value rails and democratic allocation. Quadratic funding could, for instance, be used by a city to allocate a "citizen dividend" to various community projects chosen by residents – effectively citizens deciding how to spend what might have been corporate profits automated labor generated. The *RadicalxChange* school of thought (Posner, Weyl, etc.) has proposed "data dividends" or "Harberger taxes" to redistribute wealth in novel ways; such ideas plug into this architecture by requiring open value tracking (so we know who owes what) and democratic allocation (to decide how to use the commons revenue).

- **Continuous voice:** Instead of depending on employment for bargaining (strikes, etc.), people gain voice through institutionalized participation channels. A citizen assembly can influence policy more directly than a protest, if properly integrated. Taiwan's model showed that rational consensus can beat street clashes if given structure [108] [13]. So, the new contract says: you have a voice not because you might riot or strike, but because the system *by design* asks for your input at every turn – and because if it doesn't listen, you could exit to a competitor governance (the ultimate threat that enforces responsiveness).

- **Algorithmic justice:** In the job-based society, fairness was often ensured by regulations on employers (anti-discrimination law, etc.). In a data-driven society, algorithms decide a lot – credit, job screening, legal sentencing guidelines, etc. The new social contract insists on algorithmic accountability to ensure tech doesn't become an unchecked ruler. By mandating open audits and bias corrections [131] [95], it extends the concept of civil rights into the digital realm (sometimes termed "digital civil rights" or an AI Bill of Rights). This protects individuals from new forms of oppression (AI-driven or data-driven), much as labor laws protected workers from exploitation.

- **Community and stakeholder networks:** As formal employment ties weaken, people may derive belonging and support more from digital communities or city networks. The governance pyramid envisions *multiple overlapping communities* – one might be part of a local city for daily services, a global online collective for one's profession or interest, and a network state for certain rights. Interoperability means these need not conflict but can complement, giving a person a mosaic of

affiliations that together provide security (e.g., if one community falters, others still support you). It's analogous to diversifying one's social capital.

Transition Pathways: Getting from here to there will likely be an incremental, multi-stage process. We can foresee some milestones:

- **Digitize what exists:** Governments digitize current processes (IDs, payments, records) – this is already well underway globally, as seen with digital ID rollouts and instant payment systems. These often start centralized, but using open standards (e.g., MOSIP for ID, ISO20022 for payments) can ensure later interoperability.

- **Implement pilot programs for each layer:** Many countries will try one piece at a time: perhaps a city introduces participatory budgeting (Layer 4) without yet having a blockchain ledger (Layer 3); or a country like Nigeria launches a CBDC (Layer 2) before having strong digital ID (Layer 1). Pilots inform refinement. For example, early e-voting pilots exposed flaws (like the Moscow hack [107]) which then guide better designs. There may be *regulatory sandboxes* where new governance tech is tested in controlled environments before broad scaling.

- **Combine layers in flagship projects:** As comfort grows, we'll see combined use-cases. For instance, **"smart city" projects** in places like Dubai or Singapore are trying to integrate digital ID, cashless payments, AI services, and citizen apps – touching on multiple layers (though not always with the openness ideally desired). A more grassroots example: a small nation or a progressive city might declare itself a "digital republic" and deploy many layers at once – e.g., **Ukraine's Diia platform** post-2020 has moved many public services to a smartphone app, including digital ID, payments, and even an e-petition feature for direct voice, aiming to rebuild trust after years of corruption. That's a real-world attempt to leapfrog into a new social contract, driven partly by necessity and public demand for transparency (especially during the war and reconstruction).

- **Legal and institutional reforms:** For these layers to cement, laws must adapt. Many countries will need data protection laws aligned with open transparency (to protect privacy while opening data), legal recognition for digital signatures and smart contracts (already happening via laws like ESIGN in the US, eIDAS in EU), and perhaps constitutional amendments to allow things like online voting or citizen-initiated digital referenda. International law may also evolve: perhaps treaties will emerge to mutually recognize e-residencies or to prevent punitive treatment of digital exiles (imagine an international right to digital self-determination, analogous to right of emigration).

- **Cultural change and capacity building:** A critical transitional element is educating citizens and officials. People need to trust and effectively use these tools. Estonia spent heavily on public awareness for i-Voting, including encouraging people to try it in EU elections first (lower stake) to gain confidence. Taiwan's digital ministry runs workshops teaching public servants how to engage with citizen input online constructively [132]. Just as the 20th-century social contract was underpinned by mass literacy and civic education, the 21st-century one needs **digital literacy and participatory education**. The result should be a populace that not only demands transparency and participation but can meaningfully engage with them.

Feasibility and Momentum: The new social contract outlined by the pyramid is **credible precisely because each part has momentum**. We've highlighted numerous empirical achievements: *a country with fully digital*

governance and blockchain-secured data (Estonia) [2] [1] ; *a billion-people economy with an open payment platform that did 10× more transactions than credit cards (India's UPI)* [4] ; *a major democracy that successfully used a sci-fi voting method to set budgets (Colorado's QV)* [16] ; *cities on different continents collaboratively writing open-source code for democracy (Decidim, CONSUL)* [18] ; and *a global digital community funding public goods with novel economics (Gitcoin QF)* [17] . These are not isolated incidents but part of a discernible trend toward more open, digital, and participatory governance. Furthermore, crises like the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital service delivery and may have permanently raised citizens' expectations for what governments can do digitally (e.g., stimulus payments in hours, consultations in days, not years).

Critique exists for each component – e.g., privacy advocates worry about pervasive digital ID, traditionalists worry about populism in direct democracy, etc. These critiques are being addressed in design: *self-sovereign ID* emphasizes privacy-by-design, *deliberation platforms* emphasize consensus over divisiveness, *transparency initiatives* carve out personal privacy. It's an evolving balance, but with democratic oversight (which the pyramid ensures via citizen voice at every layer), the system can self-correct. Importantly, the **collective coherence** of the pyramid's layers means they mitigate each other's risks: transparency (Layer 3) can catch abuses of a digital ID system (Layer 1); direct democracy (Layer 4) can correct course if a CBDC (Layer 2) policy is flawed; multiple governance options (Layer 5) prevent entrenchment if one regime goes bad.

A Credible New Social Contract: Ultimately, if implemented, these layers redefine the social contract such that:

- Citizens are **empowered as never before** – they hold cryptographic keys to their identity and assets, they can see and influence government actions in real time, and they can directly participate in or even initiate collective decisions. They are not just voters every few years, but active stakeholders continuously.

- Governments become more like **platform providers and custodians** – their role shifts to providing infrastructure (digital and legal), safeguarding rights (especially digital rights), and arbitrating when needed, but much of the initiative and innovation can come from the citizenry itself (for example, citizens propose policies on platforms, or third-party developers build civic apps that plug into official systems). Governments that excel will be those that enable the most productive collaborations with their citizens (analogous to open-source project maintainers fostering a contributor community).

- The relationship between the individual and the collective is mediated by **data and code** in transparent ways. This potentially rebuilds trust: when you can audit the code that governs you and the data it's based on, "trust" is replaced by verifiable confidence [2] [85] . We move from *"trust us, we're the authority"* to *"verify it yourself, we have nothing to hide"*. That is a profound shift in the social contract ethos.

- Power dynamics in society could rebalance: large corporations and governments currently wield massive data and AI power over individuals. But under this new contract, **algorithms are accountable to the people** [11] [95] , and economic power can be checked by public protocols (for instance, if big tech platforms have to expose algorithms or contribute to public goods funding via mechanisms decided by citizens). It echoes the goals of 20th-century labor movements (to check corporate power and ensure fair distribution), but with updated tools.

In conclusion, the “pyramid of power” framework offers a **strategic blueprint** for systematically upgrading governance to meet the challenges of the 21st century. It is not a utopia; it’s built on existing pieces that are **empirically validated** across the globe. Each layer on its own delivers improvements – together, they have the potential to create a *holistically different paradigm* of state-society relation. This paradigm is one where **citizens enjoy a new kind of agency**: one founded on secure digital identity and rights, exercised through open financial and informational networks, amplified by direct participation channels, and backed by the ultimate option to seek or create better governance if the current one fails them. In a future where traditional labor may no longer guarantee dignity or bargaining power, these mechanisms collectively function as a **new form of bargaining power** – digital, data-driven, and democratic. They constitute a credible new social contract for the digital age, one that takes the Enlightenment ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity and reinterprets them through technology: *digital liberty* (self-sovereign identity), *algorithmic equality* (transparent & accountable systems), and *global fraternity* (interoperable, forkable communities). The task now for strategists and policymakers is to **chart the transition**, learning from the rich array of deployments and scaling them in an interoperable, inclusive way. By doing so, we can move from the fading social contracts of the 20th century to a resilient, empowering social contract of the 21st century – one built not on the bargaining power of unions, but on the bargaining power of **united networks of citizens**.

---

1 19 22 23 24 25 26 27 ID-card - e-Estonia
https://e-estonia.com/solutions/estonian-e-identity/id-card/

2 36 37 38 39 KSI blockchain - e-Estonia
https://e-estonia.com/solutions/cyber-security/ksi-blockchain/

3 Bitfury: Blockchain for Government - Case - Faculty & Research - Harvard Business School
https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=53445

4 42 43 44 45 The organisation of digital payments in India - lessons from the Unified Payments Interface (UPI)
https://www.bis.org/publ/bppdf/bispap152_e_rh.pdf

5 6 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 72 73 75 76 77 78 Pix: the latest updates on Brazil’s leading instant payment scheme | European Payments Council
https://www.europeanpaymentscouncil.eu/news-insights/insight/pix-latest-updates-brazils-leading-instant-payment-scheme

7 67 68 70 71 74 79 Central Bank Digital Currency Tracker - Atlantic Council
https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/cbdctracker/

8 9 28 40 41 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 Budgets on the Blockchain: Maximally Transparent Transactions
https://institute.global/insights/tech-and-digitalisation/budgets-blockchain-maximally-transparent-transactions

10 11 94 95 96 131 Amsterdam and Helsinki launch algorithm registries to bring transparency to public deployments of AI | VentureBeat
https://venturebeat.com/ai/amsterdam-and-helsinki-launch-algorithm-registries-to-bring-transparency-to-public-deployments-of-ai/

12 101 102 103 Estonia makes history with i-voting majority and record female presence in new parliament — Invest in Estonia
https://investinestonia.com/estonia-makes-history-with-i-voting-majority-and-record-female-presence-in-new-parliament/

13 14 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 Shortcut 8 - Trailblazers of digital participation: Taiwan’s Join platform and vTaiwan
https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en/our-projects/democracy-and-participation-in-europe/shortcut-archive/shortcut-8-trailblazers-of-digital-participation-taiwans-join-platform-and-vtaiwan

15 16 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 Quadratic Voting in Colorado - RadicalxChange
https://www.radicalxchange.org/wiki/colorado-qv/

17 A longitudinal assessment of Gitcoin Grants impact on open source developer activity | Open Source Observer
https://docs.opensource.observer/blog/gitcoin-grants-impact/

18 Spotlight: Global cities, building together — People Powered
https://www.peoplepowered.org/digital-guide/spotlight-global-cities-building-together

20 21 125 126 127 128 129 CivHub Protocol Registry
https://civic-protocol-registry.civhub.us/

29 30 31 32 33 34 35 Anti-corruption reforms have been successful in Georgia, but blockchain is stealing the limelight
https://www.u4.no/blog/anti-corruption-reforms-successful-in-georgia-blockchain-stealing-limelight

46 Pix is now the most used payment method in Brazil
https://cdn-www.bcb.gov.br/en/pressdetail/2588/nota

54 55 56 57 61 130 Global Digital Asset Adoption: Latin America | Milken Institute
https://milkeninstitute.org/article/global-digital-asset-adoption-latin-america

58 59 62 63 64 65 66 2024 LATAM Crypto Adoption: The Rise of Stablecoins
https://www.chainalysis.com/blog/2024-latin-america-crypto-adoption/

60 Global Money Flows Are Shifting in the Wake of Crypto Remittances
https://www.ccn.com/news/crypto/crypto-remittances-are-shifting-global-money-flows/

69 China's Digital Currency: The hopes and fears of the e-CNY
https://www.chinacenter.net/2023/china-currents/22-1/chinas-digital-currency-the-hopes-and-fears-of-the-e-cny/

97 Algorithmic Accountability: Moving Beyond Audits - AI Now Institute
https://ainowinstitute.org/publications/algorithmic-accountability

98 Algorithmic accountability: a practical route to applying AI ethics
https://www.technologyslegaledge.com/2022/04/algorithmic-accountability-a-practical-route-to-applying-ai-ethics/

99 Complying with New York City's Bias Audit Law | Nixon Peabody LLP
https://www.nixonpeabody.com/insights/alerts/2023/11/13/complying-with-new-york-city-bias-audit-law

100 NYC Bias Audit Law: A Comprehensive Guide
https://www.nycbiasaudit.com/

104 West Virginia Becomes First State to Test Mobile Voting ... - GovTech
https://www.govtech.com/biz/West-Virginia-Becomes-First-State-to-Test-Mobile-Voting-by-Blockchain-in-a-Federal-Election.html

105 West Virginia to offer mobile blockchain voting app for overseas ...
https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2018/08/10/west-virginia-pilots-mobile-blockchain-voting-app-overseas-voters-november-election/

106 107 Blockchain e-voting: Backed by US candidate, hacked in Moscow
https://www.smartcitiesworld.net/special-reports/blockchain-e-voting-backed-by-us-candidate-hacked-in-moscow

122 Lawmakers' use of anonymous 'quadratic voting' system violates ...
https://coloradofoic.org/lawmakers-use-of-anonymous-quadratic-voting-system-violates-colorados-open-meetings-law-judge-rules/

123 Colorado Democrats are eliminating secrecy from a survey they use ...
https://www.kunc.org/news/2024-04-02/colorado-democrats-are-eliminating-secrecy-from-a-survey-they-use-to-help-decide-the-fate-of-bills

124 Gitcoin: Impact Results
https://impact.gitcoin.co/

132 How Tech Tools Helped Taiwanese Activists Turn a Social ...
http://newamerica.org/weekly/how-tech-tools-helped-taiwanese-activists-turn-social-movement-real-policy-change/