

Chapter 1 : Reading Russia, Rewiring the West | openDemocracy

*We are your source for news on the all important effort to establish and strengthen democracy across the globe. Our international team with dozens of independent authors are your gateway into the raging struggle for free and fair elections on every continent with a focus on election reform in the United States.*

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. The top Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator Dianne Feinstein, is calling for the immediate postponement of the nomination proceedings of Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh after a second woman has come forward alleging sexual assault by the judge. This comes as Dr. Christine Blasey Ford has agreed to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee, that will be on Thursday, about her allegations that Kavanaugh attempted to rape her when she was 15 years old, and he Kavanaugh has denied both accusations. On Friday, President Trump openly questioned Dr. Ford was as bad as she says, charges would have been immediately filed with local Law Enforcement Authorities by either her or her loving parents. Thank you for having me. But talk about the latest New Yorker piece about the second woman who has come out, after Dr. Blasey Ford accused Judge Kavanaugh of attempting to rape her. So, as you mentioned earlier, Deborah Ramirez talked to both Jane Mayer and Ronan Farrow at The New Yorker to tell them her story of having been at a party where there was a lot of drinking and where, during that party, she remembers having someone take down their pants, put their penis in her face and force her to touch it. And she could not remember exactlyâ€”she had taken some time to talk with other people before she came forward to make sure that her memories coordinatedâ€”or not coordinated, but corroborated with theirs. And when she did come forward, she said that she rememberedâ€”one flash of memory was that Brett Kavanaugh was pulling his pants up, as he was laughing at her after having thrust his penis in her face. If you made clear that sexual assault and sexual harassment were serious crimes that you took seriously, you would do an FBI investigation. She lives in Colorado. Christine Blasey Ford, very hesitant to come forward. Very hesitant to come forward, as would anyone be, right? Blasey Fordâ€”he floated that on Twitter and later apologized. This guy Garrett Ventry is associated with Ed Whelan and their firm, and he was found to have sexually harassed someone and was fired from his previous job. And explain who he was working for. He was a consultant with the Senate Judiciary Committee. And Garrett Ventry had been himself fired from his previous job due to sexual harassment. And explain who Mike Davis is. He was going to send staffers, his staffers, out there to interview her in private, and then come back with a judgment on whether or not she was saying something that wasâ€”you know, saying whether or not she could be credible. So what he was doing, effectively, was suggesting he would send his chief counsel out to California to privately interview Dr. Blasey Ford and come back with whatever he decided. We will confirm Kavanaugh. Again, if you want to know what happened, if you care about sexual assault and sexual harassment, you have an impartial hearing and an impartial investigation. Christine Blasey Ford, what she has agreed to and what the Senate Republican leadershipâ€”Senator Chuck Grassley and the other Republican senatorsâ€”have not yet agreed to? She will be there with security. She says she wants the senators to question her. This is a problem for the Republican senators on the Judiciary Committee. It is said that they want a female lawyer to question them. And she is saying she does not accept that. And watching those tapes is gut-wrenching. And they think, somehow, in some twisted analysis, that this makes them look better. It makes them look afraid. There will be major protests around the country today, a kind of walkout, and she will be protesting at the Supreme Court. Jodi Jacobson will stay with us. Please attribute legal copies of this work to democracynow. Some of the works that this program incorporates, however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us. Next story from this daily show.

## Chapter 2 : How Social Media is Rewiring Democracy

*A central strand of "Rewiring Public Services" is an acknowledgement of the need to rejuvenate local democracy and redesign the democratic relationship between citizens and their elected representatives.*

SUBSCRIBE Muslim women throughout the United States, and from as far away as London and Toronto, are reaching out to their Jewish sisters and bringing them meals, reciting prayer together, sending cards and email messages, calling on the phone to check in, and just sitting together and holding hands. Because these are the sisters of the Sisterhood of Salaam Shalom and when one of us is hurt, we are all hurt. These women know that the same people who hate Jews often hate Muslims, and vice versa. The Sisterhood of Salaam Shalom is the first and only North American grassroots organization of Muslim and Jewish women dedicated to relationship building and fighting hate toward one another. What began after an emotionally overwhelming trip to Poland in has turned into a movement of others who want to ensure that history does not repeat itself. The existence of the Sisterhood signals that the Muslim and Jewish communities are officially joining together to fight our common enemies of hate, racism, and bigotry. Get the facts, direct to your inbox. Subscribe to our daily or weekly digest. The swelling of the MeToo movement calling attention to sexual misconduct has been concurrent with a rise in religious bigotry and hate that is endorsed at the highest levels of the federal government. We are motivated to vote more than ever before because of the misogyny, Islamophobia, and anti-Semitism plaguing our nation. We will defend our bodies and our rightful place in the religious fabric of the United States. This fall, our chapters have focused on voter registration drives and are now mobilizing to make sure everyone turns out to vote. Some focused on helping new citizens, for whom this may have been their first opportunity to vote; others set up weekly registration drives at mosques, churches, synagogues, grocery stores and farmers markets. Never before, to our knowledge, has there been an organized national voter registration effort by Muslim and Jewish women. Beyond our own efforts, we rejoice at the historic number of women and Muslim candidates running for office. More than 90 Muslims have run for office during this election cycle, according to NBC News , and women ran in Democratic or Republican primaries for Congress. Some of the most high-profile races in the country have involved Muslim and Jewish women running for office. Hernandez would be the first Mexican-American Jewish woman to hold elected office in the state. Hernandez was recently featured in InStyle magazine for being one of the ten worthy candidates who are seeking to effect change and advance bipartisanship progress. This election means much more to Muslim and Jewish women than just doing our civic duty. And, after this past weekend, it takes on even more meaning. We face two open questions: Will America continue to welcome people of all religious backgrounds? We answer these questions with definitive affirmation and we will raise our voice louder than ever and pray with our feet to cast our votes accordingly. This Sunday, we will gather outside Philadelphia for our fifth annual conference. Muslim and Jewish women from across the country will come together for fellowship and strategic planning for our movement. We will not ignore or erase our differences, but instead embrace the richness found in them and claim our spot in our society to live safely and proudly as Muslims and Jews. We have created a movement that is coming out strong to crush the hate that surrounds us. Then we will return home and do the same at the ballot box.

### Chapter 3 : Is the BBC biased?: Newsnight's Rewiring of Democracy

*Rewiring Democracy is a national consultation organised by Anja Kovacs, the Internet Democracy Project and Geeta Seshu, Journalist and Consulting Editor, the Free Speech Hub of The Hoot.*

Bringing together activists concerned with giving marginalised people a voice or with demanding transparency and accountability from government and corporations through technology or otherwise, this day-long meeting aims to think through the implications of technology for democracy at national and global levels with some of the people who have been and are most directly affected by the changes technology has wrought, for better or for worse. Over the same period, a number of events and processes are also specifically devoted to the future of the global Internet governance ecosystem – including the NETmundial , a global multistakeholder meeting on this issue to take place in Brazil, in April But the links between the Internet and democracy are by no means as evident, as several recent events have made clear. Moreover, the double-sided impact of the Internet on democracy is not only felt online. It is true that activists have, for example, used the Internet to force greater transparency on our government. But as ambitious projects such as the UID make clear, the Internet and related technologies have spawned a new imagination of the practice of governance among those governing as much as those being governed, with important and at times deeply troubling ramifications, including for those crores of Indians who are still lacking Internet access. And the governance of the Internet itself has become a contentious issue as well. Some of the institutions responsible for Internet governance, such as many of the organisations that are responsible for the technical coordination of the Internet, arose and continue to function with only limited government involvement, giving rise to what is referred to as the multistakeholder model in Internet governance. But some, including the Indian government, feel that far more government involvement in Internet public policy making is now required and are propagating a government-led model instead, among other things because the current model – in practice, if not in theory - disproportionately favours Western governments as well as big business, overwhelmingly based in the US. This gives rise to fundamental questions. How can multistakeholderism be salvaged? What would need to change to make this possible? And there are broader questions as well. How does the Internet, with all its possibilities affect democracy as a structure and a practice? Which conditions need to be in place for the Internet to retain its potential to democratise both communications and governance? And how do we need to reimagine democratic governance arrangements in general if they are to fully live upto their democratic and empowering potential in the digital age? The outcome of discussions on these and other questions are likely to shape the future of the Internet for years to come and we believe that it is crucial for activists from a wide range of backgrounds to bring to bear their tremendous knowledge and experience and exert their influence on these processes. This day-long meeting seeks to bring together activists and scholars concerned with giving marginalised people a voice or with demanding transparency and accountability from government and corporations, through technology or otherwise, to start finding answers to these questions in a people-centred, progressive, pro-democracy politics. This meeting is by invitation only. Governments have indeed been trying to establish greater control over the Internet, both domestically and internationally. But need this necessarily be a bad thing, as it is often made out to be?

### Chapter 4 : How Jewish and Muslim Women Are Working to Save Our Democracy - racedaydvl.com

*Our Democracy. Our democracy is ever-changing. When you find yourself passionate about something, how do you turn that passion into action? This content collection was built with you in mind.*

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Political parties and the mass media are crucial instruments of democracy. Although both have contributed to the decline of the deliberative nature of such gatherings, the solution to the problem can be found at its source: Parties in the United States also took on a decentralized character. Achieving these goals requires that parties successfully manage elections, guide public policy, build grassroots membership, and encourage voter support. Key scholars argue that democracy would be impossible without parties even though the U. Similarly, the mass media play a critical role in a democracy because they can provide the public with information about the government to which it would otherwise have no immediate access. The mass media support a key democratic role by serving as public watchdogs. The media enhance public knowledge by cultivating an informed electorate capable of making choices based on more, rather than less, information. Parties engage in interest aggregation and interest articulation. They facilitate interest aggregation by bringing public voices together in a manner clarifying policy preferences and political views. By communicating public views to the government through their members, parties perform interest aggregation. Party conventions have the structures in place encouraging interest articulation through coalition building and caucuses as well as interest aggregation through the platform writing and adoption processes. The mass media promotes party accountability of these processes because they report on party principles and issue positions while they also research and reveal to the public whether party members are adhering to formal party stances. Such accountability encourages party leaders to take those positions that they are willing to support and follow. Nominating conventions provide party elites with the opportunity to develop consensus among mass-level adherents through the mass media. Their nominating conventions function as their quadrennial meeting. These principles can be considered within the context of three dimensions of democratic theory: You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

**Chapter 5 : Podcast: Rewiring democracy for disadvantaged communities | HUMANERIGHTSEUROPE**

*Powerful tech companies rule our communications today, and shocking stories are coming out about how they're silencing the worldviews of millions of Christian and conservative Americans, censoring.*

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. Brett Kavanaugh was sworn in Saturday as an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, just hours after the Senate voted to confirm him amidst massive protests outside the Capitol. Kavanaugh will begin hearing cases Tuesday and could vote as early as Tuesday or Wednesday on a case that tests how much power courts would wield over the executive branch. His nomination came under intense public scrutiny after accusations of attempted rape and sexual assault surfaced. One of his accusers, Dr. Blasey Ford is still living in hiding after her testimony. This has been terrifying. Her family has been through a lot. They are not living at home. The threats have been unending. But these threats are extremely distressing. Brett Kavanaugh has denied allegations of sexual assault made by Dr. Blasey Ford, as well as two more women: Julie Swetnick and his former Yale classmate Deborah Ramirez, who said Kavanaugh exposed himself to her during a party. Vice President Pence was in the Senate gallery to oversee the vote as protesters shouted their opposition. Sergeant-at-arms will restore order in the gallery. I do not consent! Where is my representation? Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll. I am a mother, and I am a patriot! I will not be silent! The sergeant-at-arms will restore order in the gallery. Despite the turbulent, bitter fight surrounding his nomination, my fervent hope is that Brett Kavanaugh will work to lessen the divisions in the Supreme Court, so that we have far fewer decisions and so that public confidence in our judiciary and our highest court is restored. President, I will vote to confirm Judge Kavanaugh. We stood up for the presumption of innocence. We refused to be intimidated by the mob of people that were coming after Republican members at their homes, in the halls. The other side did it. Also with us, Jodi Jacobson, president and editor-in-chief of Rewire. We welcome you all back to Democracy Now! So, that moment, at 3: Talk about the significance of this. But Senator Collins, Jodi, why do you call her a fraud? Well, Senator Collins has often been portrayed as a moderate, but that portrayal is really an inside-the-Beltway portrayal. But Susan Collins is not a moderate. She went on the floor of the Senate to literally gaslight the entire nation about both the process and about the nominee himself. She took Republican talking points about the process of the FBI investigation, for example, which was far from complete and far from thorough and did not even include an interview with either Brett Kavanaugh or Dr. Blasey Ford, and called it a complete investigation. It was really the epitome of window dressing. So she tried to tell us that a full investigation had been carried out, that she had, you know, examined his record and found it to be far more centrist or liberal than other peopleâ€™mostly all of usâ€™have deemed it to be, or have read it to be, rather. And then, also, she then went on to tell Dr. Blasey Ford that she did not know what she was talking about. It was deeply, deeply painful, really. I mean that [inaudible]. I want to turn to the fact that neither Blasey Ford or Kavanaugh was interviewed by the FBIâ€™a very different situation than being questioned at the Senate Judiciary Committee. This is what Dr. Blasey Ford had called for, an FBI investigation. He wouldâ€™having to directly answer FBI questions. And literally, there were people that wereâ€™that the FBI was not allowed to interview, and among those were Kavanaugh and Dr. So, you have a situation where Kavanaugh, who lied under oath numerous times outside the scope of this issue of the sexual assault, but on many other issues, was not being put under oath by the FBI. So he clearly did not want to be put under oath, and he did not want other people to be interviewed. I think the key thing here to realize is, if you wanted justice and if you wanted to really understand if Dr. Blasey Ford had merit and credibility and her claims were credible, then you would want to do a thorough investigation, and you would want to remove any question. But the reality we have to grapple with is they did not care, and they did not want to understand. Well, clearly, clearly, they deeply cared about putting him on the Supreme Court. I wanted to bring in Democratic Senator Elizabeth Warren, who spoke on Thursday, making a new claim about the contents of the FBI documents on Kavanaugh that were reviewed by senators in the Senate basement, one after another, not being able to bring in a pen, not being able to take out any notes. This is what she said. Senators have been muzzled. So, I will

now say three things that committee staff has explained are permissible to say without violating committee rules, statements that I have also independently verified as accurate. One, this was not a full and fair investigation. It was sharply limited in scope and did not explore the relevant confirming facts. Two, the available documents do not exonerate Mr. And three, the available documents contradict statements Mr. Kavanaugh made under oath. Jodi Jacobson, president and editor of Rewire. Four million dollars was immediately raised for whoever her opponent will be in Maine. Among the names that were bandied about was Susan Rice and Cecile Richards. This is Democracy Now! Please attribute legal copies of this work to democracynow. Some of the work s that this program incorporates, however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us. Next story from this daily show.

**Chapter 6 : Pia Mancini: How to upgrade democracy for the Internet era | TED Talk**

*In November , Cat is attending the World Forum for Democracy in Strasbourg. Participants at the Forum will examine and analyse initiatives that promote participation and re-connect citizens and democratic institutions.*

He now works as a consultant, principally advising businesses on Russia and the CIS. Old hearts - or new heads? This is the key question: Or rather two questions: We are coming towards the end of the crisis-management phase. No one has emerged from the conflict between Russia and Georgia with credit or with substantive gains. Inevitably, there has been over the past six weeks a surfeit of emotion, anger and hyperbole. The thesis that the Cold War has come back is untenable as even Edward Lucas pointed out in his book. Emotion stirred by half-truths, ancient prejudice, spin and counter-spin makes bad policy. As the embers begin to cool in the villages of South Ossetia, all sides will need to ask themselves where the conflict has left us, and where we go from here. This requires calmer calculation than has been possible up to now. Where does Russia go from here? Does the Russian leadership have a strategy of confronting the West which would require a countervailing strategy from the West? Does it have a strategy at all? We too easily overlook the fact that the Russian Federation is still in transition, not the finished article. How could it be otherwise, a mere seventeen years after the collapse of the Soviet Union? It is not surprising that most Russians still struggle with the idea that Ukraine is a foreign country. How long did it take Britain to adjust to the loss of empire while walking out of the founding negotiations of the European Economic Community and mounting the Suez adventure? Why did France cling on to Algeria? Why do some Japanese still pay homage at the Yasukuni shrine? We would do better to remember another of his remarks borrowed, I believe from Grigory Yavlinsky: In the Russian elite, the heart and the head are in conflict. The Russian "political class" is not monolithic. It is, quite naturally, pro-Russian: Across the spectrum, the elite is highly critical of the West, and has no trust in the United States. But it divides between those whose feelings might be termed atavistic or revanchist and those who make a reasoned critique, in sorrow as much as anger, of Western policies - especially the Iraq war, the Kosovo affair from onwards, United States plans for theatre missile-defence, and, not least, the expansion of NATO. There is no shortage of people in Russia, especially in the military and security orbits, who are itching to confront the West in a serious way, and sincerely believe that the West is bent on undermining Russia. But the leadership has spent the past eight years avoiding direct confrontation with the United States and the West, perceiving, I think, that Russia is not strong enough to do so and would be greatly damaged - again - by an all-out confrontation; and that the main threats to its security come in the short term from its southern border and in the long term from China, whose growing might is a source of deep discomfort. There is also a clear division over the right way to handle the "post-Soviet space". But the "Rose" and the "Orange" revolutions both of which were felt as painful defeats by the Russian leadership: Former Soviet states were continuing to thumb their noses at Russia and move closer to the West. Voices from the "head" argued that coercion was counterproductive: Russia should instead use its new-found wealth to try to attract these states. That was how Russia should use its strength. As Georgia has shown, the "head" did not win this argument. For the two years up to 8 August , Russia and Georgia were coming ever closer to conflict - a conflict which was both avoidable had either side pursued more rational policies and seemingly inevitable. But if it fails to reach such an agreement, the inertia of diplomacy based on force and the heat of anti-Western rhetoric will push Russia in a direction it has no wish to take - towards the confrontation that both President Putin and Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov have resolutely rejected in their declarations. To the extent that Russia has a strategy, it is self-contradictory. On the one hand, Russia wishes to be part of the international status quo. It has preached international law at the West over Iraq and Kosovo. It has felt threatened by the exercise of power unilaterally by the United States. Through modernisation, diversification, and moving up the value chain, Russia wants to join the ranks of the most advanced economies. Another key goal has therefore been to seek closer integration into the world economy, by joining the World Trade Organisation WTO and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD , encouraging Russian companies to go overseas, and accepting the need for foreign investment while also seeking to control it. On the other hand,

Russia resents the obligations of the status quo and, now that it is relatively wealthy, wishes to be free of them. In pursuit of this goal, Russia has been prepared to contravene international law, damage its hard-won international position and risk confrontation with the West. Within that space, Ukraine is of cardinal importance vastly more so than Georgia. It is so by virtue of its large, partly Russian population; its strong personal, economic and cultural ties to Russia; and its history save for western Ukraine as an integral part of the historic Russian motherland. We must assume that Russia would exert itself mightily, risk a great deal and pay a high price to prevent Ukraine from becoming, as Russians would see it, a platform for American power. I have yet to meet a Russian of any stripe who thinks that acquiescence in Ukrainian membership of Nato - at this juncture - is sellable within Russia. President Medvedev has recently enunciated five principles of Russian foreign policy. A number of contradictions are built into them. The first and third principles are compliance with international law, and "full and friendly relations" with all countries; but the fourth principle stresses the "indisputable priority" of "protecting the lives and dignity of Russian citizens, wherever they may be", while the fifth asserts a right to give "special attention" to particular regions in which Russia has "privileged interests". The president does not say whether the "indisputable priority" and "privileged interests" of the last two principles would override the first and third. An omission from his list is any direct reference to the maintenance of international peace and security. What lessons will the leadership draw from the Georgia crisis? Liberal commentators in Russia have tended to take a gloomy view: But when the Kremlin reviews the balance-sheet, how will it add up? Might it privately agree with the commentator Alexander Golts that "a successful military campaign ended up being a political catastrophe for Russia"? If the point had simply been to retaliate for Kosovo, it has been made - but at the cost of a precedent in the recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia which breaches a long-held Russian policy and will come back to haunt Russia. A publicly stated Russian ambition has been to oust Saakashvili: Moreover, the costs to Russia have been high: Certainly those who seek the modernisation of the economy and the success of Russian business will not be keen on a repetition. There could be an interesting debate, behind closed doors. The generals have the bit between their teeth, and the "Crimea next" party will be in full cry. But it is not impossible that wiser counsel will prevail at the top, and that the leadership will start looking for a way of climbing down the tree rather than crawling further along a fragile branch. We should be ready to help them to do so. The not-the-new Cold War Towards a Western strategy Trying to work out what animates Russian behaviour should not be considered a treasonable offence. If our analysis is inaccurate, our policies will be wrong. We may not like the present phase of the Russian transition, but we are going to have to live through it. We may not like the present Russian leadership, but we cannot change it. It is strongly entrenched, enjoys wide popular support, and we must assume it will remain in power for many years to come. So what should the West do? Not, I submit, fall back on containment and isolation. If it turns out over time that Russia has become very strong and is pursuing a strategy of reasserting sovereignty over neighbouring states and of deliberately and aggressively infringing international law and the legitimate rights and interests of others, the West will have no choice but to react vigorously. The apostles of "containment" will have their day. As Boris Dolgin aptly comments: Isolation would consolidate power in the hands of the most unreconstructed elements in Russia; deprive the West of leverage; create a pressure-cooker in a huge and heavily-armed country; and drive us ever further away from the goal of a stable and cooperative relationship with Russia. It is a measure of last resort, not a sensible objective. Equally we need to make clear that the world of Yalta ended in the 1990s; that the coercion and bullying of sovereign, independent United Nations and in some cases European Union member-states is unacceptable; that we shall not acquiesce in the enforced recreation of the "zone of influence" of which Russian generals dream. Russia is as free as anyone else to try to exercise influence peacefully and legitimately through the power of attraction. We need a strategy designed to: How can this be brought about? If the West is to steer a sensible course between outright confrontation, on the one hand, and passive acquiescence on the other, there are five steps that we need to get right. First, we need coherence, within the European Union, Nato and the G7 therefore bridging the Atlantic. Western divisions have encouraged Russian opportunism. No EU state is strong enough to be effective on its own. When the EU has succeeded in acting together as over Kaliningrad and the enlargement, its solidarity has impressed the Russians. There has been an appropriately firm Western

reaction which needs to be sustained. Full coherence with the United States will have to await the new administration, but will be easier to achieve if the EU uses the remaining months of to agree on clear principles for the future handling of Russia. Second, we need clear signals. It must now be made unambiguously clear to the Georgian leadership as should have happened before that the Western support now rightly being given to Georgia does not mean that the West is prepared to be drawn into a conflict by reckless behaviour. In practice there is now only one way forward for Georgia, and only one course which the West should underwrite. Over time, it must seek to make Georgia attractive to Abkhazians and South Ossetians, and to heal the wounds not just of 8 August but of the entire period since the early s. It should also seek, in time, to improve its relationship with Russia; geography, if nothing else, dictates this. That may open the way to an eventual negotiation over the two territories, though the conflict has inevitably set the prospect back a long way. It should be made equally clear to the Russian leadership that any further encroachment on the sovereignty of independent states would meet a united Western response and bring cooperation to an end. Third, we need to think harder about how the sovereignty of the vulnerable states is best protected. It is little comfort to say that we should not be starting from here. NATO enlargement has been a mistake from the beginning.

## Chapter 7 : Project MUSE - Rewiring Politics

*Evidence-based journalism is the foundation of democracy. racedaydvl.com, is devoted to evidence-based reporting on reproductive and sexual health, rights and justice and the intersections of race, environmental, immigration, and economic justice.*

Not for many international media, however, which quickly shifted gear to their other favourite frames. But the biggest loser was actually the centre-left Social Democrats SPD , who, as in France and the Netherlands before, dropped into the single digits 9. Few party systems still have one, let alone two, parties that gain more than a third of the vote. Against these big losses stood major gains. While falling well below the poll scores that made international news a few months ago, the AfD was still the biggest winner in their first Bavarian elections. They were followed closely by the Greens who, like sister parties in Belgium and Luxembourg last weekend, made big gains. In fact, the Greens more than doubled their votes, coming second with 23.5%. But, as the political scientists Stefano Bartolini and Peter Mair observed with regard to electoral changes in the 2017 elections, underlying these big gains and losses at the party level is a relative stability at the bloc level. In fact, the biggest gains were in the centre, or better centre-right, where two smaller parties the Free Democratic party and Free Voters won, collectively, 23.5%. Does this mean little changed? We have seen this across western Europe, with not just radical right parties gaining, but also mainstream parties moving further to the right. Similarly, in many countries, including Belgium and the Netherlands, we see social democratic parties lose big and Green parties, and sometimes the radical left, win big. In these cases, the bloc moves somewhat to the left. Second, the party system, including the left and right blocs, has become more fragmented. Not only in terms of the number of parties that gain entry into the parliament, but particularly in terms of their relative size. Few party systems still have one, let alone two, parties that gain more than a third of the vote. Most parties today are medium-sized, which means the blocs no longer consist of a big social democratic party and a small Green party, but two near equal-sized parties. This changes the power dynamics both between and within the blocs. Similarly, in the most recent Swedish elections, which saw relatively modest changes in party success, and virtually none in terms of blocs, a record number of voters switched party. While it is true that populist parties, and more specifically populist radical right parties, have been on the rise in the 21st century, this is only one part of a bigger, and more important story: This transformation affects all parties, not just the populist ones. Centre-left parties are the main losers, greens and radical right parties the main winners, while centre-right parties survive, and sometimes prosper at least in the short term , by moving sharply right. In addition to the Rechtsruck political swing to the right , primarily in socio-cultural terms notably immigration and integration , it has also led to more problematic and prolonged coalition formation processes, from Germany to Sweden, and more vulnerable coalition governments.

## Chapter 8 : Amy Littlefield

*Whether the group, DemocracyOS, really are communists is something I've not been able to determine for myself, but they do seem to have grown out of the #Occupy movement, which supports them.*

## Chapter 9 : Can technology rewire democracy? - BBC News

*the negative aspects of liberal democracy such as the public's freedom to not participate. It is incumbent upon the parties, as conduits serving the interests of the public and government, to motivate public participation.*