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1. Intro
   1. Anecdote about the start of digital repression
   2. We know these practices are expanding, some about how they are used
   3. But none of this research demonstrates that machine-targeted repression works and what data it depends on, which are critical to forming a democratic response.
   4. Summarize conclusions
2. Methods
   1. Data sourcing
   2. Models
3. Results
   1. Model performance
      1. How much did the random forest outperform the logit model?
   2. Scenario: targeted repression 80% positive predictive value
      1. Suppose government wants to only target people such that 20% of targeted are innocent
      2. Breakdown by country
   3. Scenario: hiring discrimination, 20% positive predictive value
      1. Suppose the government wants to only hire people such that 80% or more will not have pro-democracy leanings
      2. Breakdown by country
   4. Most predictive information
      1. Social media and internet sources place highly
4. Discussion
   1. Viability of AR repression
      1. Compare to militaries drawn from isolated groups
      2. Compare to general internet shutdowns
   2. Explaining low predictive ability
      1. Are these beliefs really formed prior to the cascade
      2. Lack of internet data
      3. Lack of factional data – tribe, caste, party, company,
5. Implications for policy
   1. AI repression requires new data currently unavailable to states
      1. Degree of internet use
      2. Sites used
      3. Places or group membership
   2. AI discrimination what does it require
   3. Priorities for protection
      1. Help users
6. Surveillance – hiding arms race
   1. Because AI repression will depend on user generated social media data, its success depends on an arms race between states surveilling citizens digital lives and citizens evading surveillance. States who cannot control app usage, as China has done, are unlikely to prevent most revolutionary movements.
      1. “These findings thus clearly illustrate that the (govern-mental) actors that control the communication networks maintain strong positions of power (van Dijk, 2006) and are able to leverage those technologies to their gain. Governments remain the gatekeepers of the development of communication net-works in most, but not all nations. Therefore, maintaining the monopoly on the approval of the development of communication networks in countries empowers governments to use technologies to maintain the balance of power in societies. Media freedoms in democracies, however, do seem to be a deterrent against government repression, as media freedoms in this study were negatively related to purges.” – Christensen and Groshek
   2. Is the data usable
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