

What he then goes on to state refers directly to the liberal contradiction and the question of the position of the state, but also unfolds a clarification and possible solution to the dilemma in drawing a line for state intervention:

“This is how we generate to stay in power to get right way down the rest of the path and build what we all want, which is essentially a world in which we’ve got non-state public goods which cover the needs that humanity has and that the states have never been able to fulfill. And maybe in the long run, we’ll find more efficient ways of doing a lot of the jobs that the state currently does, so that we can leave the state to do the hard work that no one else seems to know how to do, like running public health systems efficiently, but get it out of areas where it consistently underperforms, which is pretty much everything else” (Gupta 2016: 00:00:29:17 – 00:00:29:50).

When the internet was first conceived, internet services were built on open protocols that were controlled by the internet community. The common assumption back then was that the rules would not change with time, which insinuated that people and organizations could grow their online presence leaning on this assumption. As the internet moved on to its second phase, “for-profit tech companies built software and services that rapidly outpaced the capabilities of open protocols” (Dixon 2018). The outcome of this transformation had both good and bad sides. While people were in this way able to access a large number of – mostly free – technologies, it also manifested itself in the form of monopolized decision-making authority on the part of central entities. Consequently “centralization has also created broader societal tensions, which we see in the debates over subjects like fake news, state sponsored bots, “no platforming” of users, EU privacy laws, and algorithmic biases” (Dixon 2018).