MO-04 Taiwan's digital democracy: g0v, vTaiwan and Join

Historical Origins and Catalytic Crises

Taiwan's contemporary civic-technology architecture did not originate within state administrative planning bodies, nor did it emerge as an academic simulation of deliberative democracy[1]. It developed through an adversarial dialectic between entrenched executive opacity and a technologically sophisticated civic counter-public during the early 2010s[2].

Following the lifting of martial law in 1987 and the first direct presidential election in 1996, the Republic of China (Taiwan) maintained an intensely polarized political environment structured around the pan-Blue coalition, led by the Kuomintang (KMT), and the pan-Green coalition, led by the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP)[2]. By 2012, this electoral duopoly had generated widespread public cynicism, characterized by closed-door legislative horse-trading, corporate lobbying, and executive detachment from civil society[2].

In October 2012, the Executive Yuan launched a national promotional campaign for its "Economic Power-Up Plan" (經濟動能推升方案)[2]. Rather than providing empirical metrics or substantive policy details, the state broadcast an infamous television advertisement asserting that the economic transformation plan was too complex for ordinary citizens to comprehend and that the public should trust the government without questioning technical specifics. This technocratic paternalism provoked an immediate reaction from the domestic software development community[2].

At the Yahoo! Open Hack Day in Taipei in December 2012, four computer programmers—Chia-liang Kao (高嘉良), Hsiao-wei Chiu (known as ipa), Kirby Wu, and hcchien—convened to build a functional counter-demonstration against state opacity[3]. Rather than staging a street protest, Kao and his collaborators built an interactive digital visualization of the central government's annual budget. The team extracted thousands of pages of static, scanned PDF documents published by the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, converted the figures into machine-readable data, and created a dynamic visual interface that allowed citizens to trace where tax revenues were spent.

This experiment crystallized into the g0v (gov-zero) community, a decentralized, open-source civic hacking collective operating under the foundational aphorism: "Ask not why 'nobody' is doing this, first admit that you are 'nobody'"[2]. The g0v collective established a protocol of systemic institutional forking. By replacing the "o" in any official government agency domain name (.gov.tw) with a zero (.0v.tw), civic technologists created open, transparent mirror portals of state infrastructure[4]. A citizen viewing an opaque legislative schedule on the official parliamentary site could change a single character in the web browser address bar to access a community-maintained platform displaying real-time bill revisions, roll-call voting records, and searchable speech transcripts.

The g0v movement institutionalized bi-monthly hackathons across Taipei, Kaohsiung, and Tainan, bringing together computer engineers, constitutional scholars, investigative journalists,

and grassroots activists[3]. The organizational model rejected formal executive hierarchy, relying instead on the principles of open-source software collaboration: rough consensus, running code, public repository hosting, and open licensing under Creative Commons and General Public Licenses[3].

The operational viability of this civic-tech counter-infrastructure was tested during the Sunflower Student Movement (太陽花學運) of March 2014[5]. On March 17, 2014, KMT legislator Chang Ching-chung, chairing the Legislative Yuan's Internal Administration Committee, bypassed formal clause-by-clause review and declared the contentious Cross-Strait Service Trade Agreement (CSSTA) with the People's Republic of China ratified in thirty seconds[5]. On the evening of March 18, student activists, joined by labor organizers and human rights lawyers, breached parliamentary security barricades and occupied the main legislative chamber[6]. The physical occupation lasted 24 consecutive days[6].

Within hours of the physical breach, g0v hackers established an operational communications and logistical spine inside the occupied assembly hall[5]. When state authorities cut electrical power and disrupted local telecommunication signals inside the plenary chamber, civic technologists routed external utility cables, installed directional Wi-Fi antennas from adjacent university buildings, and established local peer-to-peer mesh networks. Activists deployed the collaborative document-compilation architecture known as Hackfoldr (g0v.hackfoldr.org), linking Etherpad, HackMD, and Google Docs into a real-time administrative system that coordinated legal defense teams, medical triaging, sanitation logistics, supply lines, and translation desks serving international media[7].

Simultaneously, open-source software programmer Audrey Tang (唐鳳)—a prominent contributor to the Perl and Haskell programming language ecosystems—joined g0v volunteers inside the occupied hall to construct a multi-angle, low-latency live video broadcast of the parliamentary floor[4]. This broadcast dismantled the executive branch's narrative that the occupation was an unruly riot; viewers witnessed structured citizen working groups, disciplined sanitation squads, and continuous policy debate[6]. The occupation concluded peacefully on April 10, 2014, after Legislative Yuan Speaker Wang Jin-pyng committed to enacting a supervisory law governing cross-strait agreements prior to any further review of the CSSTA[6].

The Sunflower Movement proved that a networked civic collective could out-coordinate and out-deliberate the centralized apparatus of the state[6]. Confronted with an acute loss of procedural legitimacy, the KMT administration under Premier Mao Chi-kuo sought administrative reconciliation rather than overt suppression[8]. In December 2014, Minister without Portfolio Jaclyn Tsai (蔡玉玲), an intellectual property attorney tasked with deregulating the domestic digital economy, attended a g0v hackathon[3]. Tsai addressed the volunteer assembly directly, asking whether the open-source community could construct a rational, open consultation platform capable of deliberating national policy disputes before bills were drafted by ministries and introduced into parliament[3]. The civic hackers accepted the challenge, providing the structural foundation for the birth of vTaiwan (vTaiwan.tw)[3].

Architecture of Digital Deliberation: vTaiwan and Pol.is

Launched in early 2015 as a collaborative venture between the g0v community and the Executive Yuan, vTaiwan was conceived as an open consultation mechanism designed to resolve regulatory deadlocks associated with the emerging digital economy[3]. The vTaiwan workflow operated as a structured, four-stage deliberation funnel:

1. **Proposal Stage:** A government ministry, industry association, or civic organization submitted an emerging regulatory challenge; the issue was scoped, objective factual data was assembled into shared repositories, and a baseline briefing was drafted to eliminate information asymmetries between administrative experts and the public[5].
2. **Opinion Stage:** The scoped issue was submitted to mass asynchronous public consultation using the computational consensus software Pol.is, inviting wide civic participation to surface arguments and measure sentiment[3].
3. **Reflection Stage:** Informed by the mathematical opinion landscape generated during the prior phase, an in-person, multi-stakeholder consultative assembly was convened, bringing together ministry officials, corporate lobbyists, grassroots advocates, and citizens; every meeting was live-streamed, open to live online chatroom participation, and recorded with verbatim public transcription[3].
4. **Legislation and Ratification Stage:** The consensus statements forged through the consultation were translated into formal administrative guidelines, regulatory revisions, or draft statutory amendments, with the Executive Yuan maintaining an explicit institutional commitment to justify any deviation from the consensus[5].

The core computational mechanism of the Opinion Stage was Pol.is, an open-source civic technology platform developed in Seattle by Colin Megill, Christopher Small, and Michael Bjorkegren following the Occupy Wall Street and Arab Spring mobilizations[3]. Megill and his collaborators recognized that conventional social media architectures incentivized hyper-partisanship by maximizing engagement through algorithmic amplification of outrage, nested ad hominem comment threads, and binary like/dislike metrics[14]. Pol.is eliminated these architectural affordances through a non-threaded interaction model[13].

In a Pol.is deliberation, participants cannot reply directly to one another, cite other users, or launch targeted verbal rebuttals[13]. Interaction is restricted to two fundamental actions: submitting concise, context-specific atomic statements of 140 characters or fewer, and casting a vote of Agree, Disagree, or Pass on atomic statements submitted by other participants[13].

Computationally, Pol.is compiles these interactions into a sparse mathematical matrix A of dimension $N \times M$, where N represents the total number of distinct participants and M represents the total number of submitted atomic statements. The system executes a power-iteration Expectation-Maximization Principal Component Analysis (EM-PCA) alongside k-means clustering algorithms directly on this vote matrix, projecting all participants into a two-dimensional spatial coordinate system based on their voting patterns[13].



As participants vote, the algorithm identifies distinct opinion clusters representing divergent ideological factions[13]. The critical innovation of Pol.is lies in its algorithmic consensus engine[14]. Standard social media platforms elevate items that generate intense internal group engagement, which invariably correspond to polarizing statements situated at the extreme margins of the principal component axes[14]. Pol.is inverts this mechanic: it explicitly searches for and elevates "bridging statements"—statements that secure high agreement (typically exceeding an 80 percent threshold) across all opposing ideological clusters while minimizing cross-cluster dissent[15]. Partisan rhetoric that resonates only within a single faction is visually isolated within its respective cluster, while statements that articulate shared values or viable regulatory compromises are elevated to the summary layer of the deliberation[15].

The quantitative findings of the Pol.is consultation then structured the Reflection Stage[3]. Unlike traditional parliamentary hearings, which are often dominated by trade lobbyists or party bosses, the vTaiwan reflection meetings invited individuals whose submitted statements had successfully bridged divergent clusters[3]. Convened at the Social Innovation Lab or central ministry facilities, these sessions were mediated by trained facilitators using the Focused Conversation Method (Objective, Reflective, Interpretive, Decisional)[5]. Stenographers transcribed every exchange verbatim into SayIt software, and the full transcripts, video recordings, and underlying raw vote data were released into the public commons under open licenses within hours of the meeting's conclusion[3].

Landmark Deliberative Cases

The vTaiwan consultation infrastructure tackled a series of contentious regulatory dilemmas emerging from digital platform capitalism between 2015 and 2017[11]. The table below outlines four major policy deliberations, their quantitative participation metrics, and their formal legislative and regulatory outcomes.

Deliberation Case	Active Consultati	Registered Participant	Total Votes Cast	Key Consensus Formulatio	Regulatory / Statutory

	on Period	s (Pol.is)		ns	Outcome
Uber / UberX Ride-Hailing	July–August 2015[5]	925 participants[5]	31,115 votes[5]	1. App-based taxi-hailing recognized as a legitimate consumer utility[5]. 2. Rejection of mandatory yellow vehicle paint requirements[5]. 3. Dynamic surge pricing permitted, provided fares do not undercut traditional taxi rates[5]. 4. Mandatory commercial insurance, professional driver licensing, local enterprise registration, and	Codified into Highway Act revisions and MOTC administrative orders establishing the Diversified Taxi Scheme (多元化計程車)[5]. Uber temporarily suspended direct services in early 2017 following fine escalations, subsequently restructuring its corporate model to partner exclusively with licensed rental car agencies and fleet operators[5].

				domestic ride taxation[5].	
Online Alcohol Sales	Late 2015–2016	~1,200 participants	~18,000 votes	1. Consumer convenience and digital commercial equity acknowledged. 2. Severe cross-cluster concern regarding underage access and unverified delivery chains. 3. Proposed multi-layered verification: commercial digital credit card payment coupled with mandatory physical identity verification at physical convenience store collection points.	The Executive Yuan drafted provisional regulatory guidelines based on the consensus; however, widespread mobilization by parent-teacher organizations, public health groups, and the Taiwan Association Against Drunk Driving blocked legislative introduction. The Ministry of Finance retained the statutory ban, demonstrating that digital consensus

					cannot overcome organized offline civic resistance absent executive political will.
FinTech Innovation Experimentation Act	2016–2017	~650 participants	~9,200 votes	1. Necessity for non-banking technology entities to test algorithmic and blockchain financial services. 2. Precise temporal and scale boundaries for regulatory exemptions. 3. Strict consumer asset segregation and institutional insurance requirements.	Enacted by the Legislative Yuan in December 2017 as the *Financial Technology Development and Innovative Experimentation Act* (金融科技發展與創新實驗條例)[19]. Established an institutional regulatory sandbox granting qualifying enterprises up to 36 months of safe-harbor operational experimentation[20].

Closely Held Company Law	Early 2015	~450 participants	~6,100 votes	1. Elimination of rigid corporate capital formation requirements for early-stage technology enterprises[19]. 2. Authority to issue dual-class shares and stock with special veto rights[19]. 3. Expansion of flexible, non-standard corporate governance protocols[19].	Formally passed by the Legislative Yuan in June 2015 as Chapter 5, Section 13 of the Company Act (閉鎖性股份有限公司), fundamentally lowering capital formation and shareholder governance barriers for Taiwan's emerging domestic tech ecosystem[19].

Empirical Audit of the "80% of 26 Cases" Metric

A prominent foundational claim across international academic literature, policy think-tank reports, and global media profiles asserts that between 2015 and 2018, vTaiwan deliberated 26 distinct national policy cases, with more than 80 percent leading to decisive government action[17]. This assertion originates from a single primary document: a July 2018 preprint paper authored by Yu-Tang Hsiao, Shu-Yang Lin, Audrey Tang, Darshana Narayanan, and Claudina Sarahe, entitled *vTaiwan: An Empirical Study of Open Consultation Process in Taiwan*[17].

An empirical analysis of the underlying historical and administrative record reveals significant qualifications regarding this metric. Of the 26 policy cases processed through the vTaiwan pipeline during this period:

- More than half (at least 14 cases) focused on non-ideological administrative adjustments to corporate regulations, electronic paperwork standards, and municipal technical

protocols[19]. These included items such as electronic signature acceptance for business registration, digital equity crowdfunding ceilings, open-source code procurement guidelines, and company charter modernization[19]. These issues generated minimal resistance from entrenched political or economic cartels.

- The authors' classification of "decisive government action" encompassed an expansive spectrum of administrative responses[17]. The metric counted not only statutory acts passed by the Legislative Yuan, but also internal ministerial executive orders, circular guidelines, and formal public statements explaining why an agency had decided *not* to pursue regulatory reform (e.g., the preservation of the online alcohol ban)[5].
- When vTaiwan encountered zero-sum distributive conflicts characterized by deep political polarization and powerful incumbent interests—such as comprehensive labor rights for digital platform delivery workers, taxation of short-term residential rentals on Airbnb, or liberalized wine distribution—the mechanism failed to produce binding statutory law[15].

The 80 percent figure, while mathematically accurate within the broad definitional criteria adopted by the platform's architects, conflated routine administrative maintenance with genuine deliberative breakthroughs on structural socioeconomic disputes[15].

Mass E-Participation: The Join Platform and Administrative Institutionalization

Recognizing that vTaiwan was an experimental, civic-administered incubator whose operations depended on voluntary labor, the Executive Yuan and the National Development Council (NDC) established a permanent, state-operated digital infrastructure in 2015: the Public Policy Online Participation Platform (join.gov.tw)[25].

The Join platform was engineered to institutionalize citizen feedback across all tiers of public administration[26]. It is organized into four distinct operational mechanisms:





1. **Propose Ideas (提議):** The national e-petition system, granting any citizen or legal foreign resident the power to submit a policy proposal[26].
2. **Discuss Regulations (草案預告):** A mandatory notice-and-comment portal where central ministries are legally required to post proposed administrative rules and regulatory amendments for a 60-day public feedback window before formal enactment[26].
3. **Supervise Policies (重大施政計畫):** A public transparency portal that monitors the progress, fiscal expenditures, and delivery milestones of high-priority state infrastructure and procurement projects[26].
4. **Participatory Budgeting (參與式預算):** A regional and municipal portal enabling communities to propose, deliberate, and directly vote on the allocation of designated local public funds[26].

The institutional core of the Join platform is its citizen-petition function[26]. Following an initial identity-verification check (via mobile phone number and national identification) and a formal vetting filter designed to reject commercial advertising, obscenity, and matters under active judicial litigation, a proposal enters a 60-day public signature-collection window[26]. If the petition secures 5,000 verified digital signatures within 60 days, the relevant central ministry is legally mandated by Executive Yuan administrative directives to produce a formal, substantive public response within two months[25].

Empirical Reality of the 5,000-Signature Funnel

The empirical record of the Join platform demonstrates that mass participation follows an extreme power-law distribution[26]. In an exhaustive quantitative analysis of platform logs conducted by Uwe Serdült et al., examining the period from platform launch in 2015 through May 31, 2022, the operational attrition of citizen proposals was documented across several metrics:

Metric Stage	Absolute Count	Percentage of Initiated	Operational / Deliberative Meaning
Total Petitions	13,853[11]	100.0%	Gross volume of

Initiated			raw policy ideas submitted by the public into the platform pipeline[11].
Survived Verification Stage	7,067[12]	51.0%	Petitions satisfying formal guidelines, non-defamatory legal criteria, and basic administrative clarity[12].
Achieved 5,000-Signature Threshold	278[12]	2.01% (3.93% of verified)	Petitions that triggered a legally binding, mandatory ministerial policy response[12].
Monthly Threshold Attainment Rate	~3.5 petitions/month[26]	N/A	Average monthly volume of petitions crossing into formal state administrative review across 23.5 million citizens[26].

Serdült et al. identified a distinct "plateau effect" governing signature acquisition dynamics[26]. Petitions typically experience rapid signature growth within the first 48 to 72 hours of launch, propelled by social media amplification or legacy media coverage[26]. Once a petition reaches approximately 5,050 to 5,200 signatures, signature collection slows dramatically[26].
Citizens and mobilizing factions treat the platform not as an open-ended barometer of enduring public popularity, but as an administrative trigger[25]. The 5,000-signature mark represents a tactical threshold designed to compel executive branch engagement, after which further civic mobilization yields diminishing returns[26].

Policy Domain Determinism: The Terrence Ting-Yen Chen Findings

The most comprehensive empirical examination of government responsiveness to the Join platform was conducted by sociologist Terrence Ting-Yen Chen (2025/2026) in *When does digital democracy work? How policy domains shape government responses to online petitions in Taiwan*[1]. Chen audited the 278 petitions that successfully crossed the 5,000-signature threshold, coding ministerial responses into four distinct structural policy environments:

1. **Collaborative Domains (Animal Protection, Public Education, Preventive Healthcare):** In these policy environments, professional civil servants and grassroots activists operate with porous professional boundaries and share common policy

objectives[25]. Government responsiveness is exceptionally high[25]. When a petition demanding enhanced veterinary subsidies or improved cancer screening programs surpassed 5,000 signatures, mid-level ministry officials actively utilized the public petition as administrative leverage in internal negotiations with the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics to secure expanded departmental funding[25].

2. **Technocratic Domains (Taxation, Public Finance, Telecommunications Architecture):** In these environments, bureaucratic agencies maintain a structural monopoly over specialized technical expertise[25]. Petitions crossing the threshold—such as proposals to index income tax deduction brackets or restructure import tariffs—were systematically neutralized[12]. Civil servants utilized professional jargon, complex statutory cross-references, and macro-fiscal modeling to demonstrate that citizen proposals were technically unviable or legally disruptive, resulting in zero substantive policy modification[12].
3. **Adversarial Domains (Labor Standards, Criminal Penology, Gender Equity):** In these zero-sum structural arenas, the state confronts entrenched, highly polarized external interest coalitions[25]. Petitions demanding the restoration of seven statutory national holidays, corporate manslaughter liability for industrial accidents, or corporal punishment for sex offenders attained 5,000 signatures within days[12]. The administrative response was uniformly dismissive: ministries convened formal collaborative workshops that disintegrated into parallel ideological monologues, concluding with formal statements restating current statutory policy without committing to future executive or legislative action[12].
4. **Open Domains (Emergent Technologies, Shared Mobility):** In areas where institutional frameworks had not yet stabilized (e.g., drone operational boundaries, personal electric vehicle standards), executive agencies welcomed platform deliberations, utilizing public input to identify early regulatory baselines[25].

Chen's empirical findings demonstrate that digital petition platforms do not alter the fundamental political geography of the state[1]. Rather than empowering marginalized groups to overturn entrenched power distributions, the platform serves as an administrative amplifier that functions effectively only where civil servants and mobilized citizens share mutual policy goals[25].

The PDIS Architecture and the Participation Officer (PO) Network

To translate digital petitions into administrative outcomes, the Executive Yuan appointed Audrey Tang as Minister without Portfolio in October 2016, tasking her with institutionalizing open governance across the state apparatus[4]. Tang established the Public Digital Innovation Space (PDIS), an interdisciplinary executive team composed of software programmers, user-experience researchers, visual designers, and professional facilitators[31].

Under Tang's leadership, the Executive Yuan mandated that every central ministry designate an Open Government Participation Officer (PO)[6]. The PO network convenes bi-weekly to review petitions that have crossed the 5,000-signature threshold on the Join platform[32]. For highly contested or cross-jurisdictional petitions, PDIS coordinates an Open Government

Collaborative Meeting[12].
These sessions invert standard bureaucratic procedure: instead of agency heads issuing closed internal memorandums, the petitioners, affected stakeholders, academic specialists, and frontline civil servants are assembled in a single room[5]. Using large visual canvases, digital mind maps, and live transcription, facilitators deconstruct complex citizen grievances into core problem statements, technical bottlenecks, and actionable compromise options[12].
However, because Participation Officers are typically mid-level civil servants lacking direct regulatory authority, their capacity to implement policy remains contingent on the political alignment of their respective cabinet ministers[15].

Rapid Crisis Coordination: The 2020 Mask Rationing System

The operational integration of Taiwan's civic-tech ecosystem reached its apex during the initial outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020[4]. The crisis demonstrated the effectiveness of decentralized civic coordination when supported by responsive state administrative data infrastructure[7].
On January 31, 2020, as evidence of sustained human-to-human transmission of SARS-CoV-2 emerged, the Executive Yuan requisitioned all domestic medical mask production, enacted strict price controls, and halted international exports. Despite these state interventions, speculative panic buying cleared private retail pharmacies and convenience stores within days, triggering widespread public anxiety[4].
On the night of February 2, 2020, Howard Wu (吳展瑋), a 35-year-old software engineer and founder of Good Ideas Studio (好想工作室) in Tainan, observed the panic in his local community[7]. Utilizing the Google Maps JavaScript API and a crowdsourced Google Sheet, Wu built a simple, public web application displaying real-time mask inventory across local retail outlets[7]. Outlets with verified inventory were mapped in green; exhausted outlets were flagged in red[34]. Wu deployed the application before dawn on February 2 and shared the link across social media[7].
Within twelve hours, millions of citizen queries generated an automated backend infrastructure billing invoice from Google exceeding US$20,000, threatening to force the civic project offline[7].
On February 3, Audrey Tang learned of Wu's initiative through the g0v Slack channels[7]. Tang coordinated with Google's regional engineering directors to waive the infrastructure bill, while simultaneously convening a crisis meeting between g0v civic technologists—notably Ming-tsung Chiang (江明宗, known as kiang)—and technical leadership from the National Health Insurance (NHI) Administration's Information Division, headed by Ling-chih Chang and Tzu-yu Chen[7].
Premier Su Tseng-chang ordered the implementation of the Name-Based Mask Rationing System (實名制), which took effect on February 6, 2020[7]. Under this system, individual mask purchases were tied to National Health Insurance smart cards, rationed on a bi-weekly basis, and distributed exclusively through the island's 6,000+ contracted NHI community

pharmacies[7].
Rather than commissioning a proprietary state software application through a slow, centralized procurement cycle, Tang and the NHI Administration deployed an open-data approach[7]. The NHI Administration opened its real-time point-of-sale inventory database to the public via a free RESTful API, with inventory counts refreshing every 30 to 180 seconds across every contracted pharmacy in the country[7].
When the system launched at 8:00 AM on February 6, civic hackers had built the delivery infrastructure:

- Within nine days, the civic tech community created and deployed more than 140 distinct applications, including interactive web maps, Line messaging chatbots, Telegram alert channels, and customized voice-response tools designed for visually impaired and elderly populations[7].
- Ming-tsung Chiang developed an open-source, mobile-optimized map interface utilizing OpenStreetMap and Leaflet, completely eliminating commercial map API fees and successfully handling millions of concurrent user visits without technical failure[7].
- During the first 24 hours of operation, the NHI open-data mask portal processed more than one million unique user visits; over the first month of the intervention, more than ten million citizens actively consulted civic-built tools to secure their rations[7].

The open architecture produced critical self-correcting dynamics[4]. When rural pharmacies experienced delivery delays, or when high-density urban districts exhausted their inventory within minutes of opening, citizens flagged these logistical imbalances directly via public GitHub issue trackers[7]. This allowed the Ministry of Economic Affairs and the postal service to re-route supply chains within 24 hours. The mask rationing system demonstrated that an agile state bureaucracy providing open, reliable public data could mobilize a distributed civic community to deploy emergency public services faster, cheaper, and with higher resilience than a centralized administrative apparatus[7].

The Evolution toward the Ministry of Digital Affairs (MODA)

The success of the pandemic response accelerated the institutional integration of civic tech into the formal cabinet structure[7]. On August 27, 2022, the Executive Yuan formally inaugurated the Ministry of Digital Affairs (MODA, 數位發展部), appointing Audrey Tang as its founding Cabinet Minister[30]. MODA was structured around three core operational tenets: digital resilience for all, open-source technological infrastructure, and collaborative civic-state governance[37].
However, the transition from an agile, informal civic-tech movement into a formal executive bureaucracy exposed digital democracy to intense parliamentary and partisan pressures[37]. MODA faced sharp scrutiny from both opposition KMT lawmakers and ruling DPP legislators over:

- The perceived inadequacy and slow pace of administrative crackdowns against online investment fraud, identity phishing, and telecommunications scams proliferating across digital platforms[3].
- High budgetary expenditures allocated for overseas technical delegations, administrative

overhead, and non-civil-service contract hiring, with critics claiming the ministry prioritized international public relations over domestic cybersecurity defense[36].

- Persistent institutional resistance from traditional bureaucratic agencies reluctant to adopt radical transparency protocols, open data sharing, or experimental procurement methods[37].

On May 20, 2024, concurrent with the presidential inauguration of Lai Ching-te, Audrey Tang stepped down as Minister of Digital Affairs[36]. Tang was succeeded by Huang Yen-nun (黃彥男), a cybersecurity and communications network scholar from Academia Sinica[36]. Under Huang's tenure, the ministry's strategic focus pivoted away from broad deliberative democracy toward hard industrial resilience, artificial intelligence safety standards, aggressive anti-fraud enforcement, and critical telecommunication defense[37]. This defense posture prioritized non-geostationary low-Earth-orbit (LEO) satellite communications networks (such as OneWeb) to ensure continuity of government command in the event of undersea fiber-optic cable severance by regional adversaries[37]. This leadership transition marked the conclusion of Taiwan's initial decade of deliberative-civic romanticism, subordinating participatory experiments to structural national security and defense engineering priorities[37].

Sociotechnical Prerequisites and Environmental Constraints

The operational accomplishments of Taiwan’s civic-tech ecosystem between 2012 and 2022 cannot be separated from the unique geographic, technical, and institutional conditions of the Taiwanese state[37]. Taiwan represents an exceptional socio-technical environment characterized by six interlocking baselines:

1. **Geographic and Demographic Compactness:** Taiwan comprises a land area of 36,000 square kilometers, with approximately 70 percent covered by rugged mountain ranges. Its population of 23.5 million is densely concentrated along a narrow western coastal corridor connected by high-speed rail and optical fiber backbones, facilitating physical assembly, shared cultural touchpoints, and rapid offline convergence.
2. **Universal Telecommunications Infrastructure:** Taiwan maintains mobile broadband penetration rates exceeding 95 percent, supported by affordable, unlimited 4G and 5G data plans[37]. Broadband access has been codified in domestic administrative jurisprudence as a fundamental human right, effectively eliminating deep geographic connectivity deserts.
3. **Unified Single-Payer Administrative Health Data:** Since 1995, the National Health Insurance system has issued smart IC chip cards to 99.9 percent of all citizens and legal residents[7]. This universal, interoperable, and centralized digital database provided the technical foundation for the 2020 mask rationing system[7].
4. **Dominance in Hardware Manufacturing and Deep Hacker Capital:** As the global center of advanced semiconductor manufacturing (headlined by TSMC) and consumer electronics fabrication, Taiwan possesses an exceptional concentration of computer programmers, system architects, and electrical engineers[37]. Open-source community

conferences such as COSCUP and SITCON attract thousands of young participants annually, creating a deep pool of technical talent willing to engage in civic volunteerism[40].

5. **Living Generational Memory of Martial Law:** The trauma of the authoritarian martial law era (1949–1987) remains within living family memory across Taiwanese society. This historical memory sustains deep public suspicion of state information control, driving a cultural commitment to civil society autonomy, public oversight, and radical transparency as safeguards against authoritarian relapse.
6. **Existential Geopolitical External Pressure:** Continuous diplomatic isolation and persistent cognitive warfare, cyber-intrusions, and military gray-zone coercion by the People's Republic of China have generated an overarching social demand for domestic civic resilience and social cohesion[37]. In this security environment, participatory democracy is conceptualized not merely as an administrative mechanism, but as an existential defense strategy designed to signal the island's democratic legitimacy to the international community[37].

Absent these specific historical and infrastructural preconditions, the institutional mechanics of g0v and vTaiwan cannot be easily transferred to larger, fragmented, or less connected jurisdictions[24].

Tripartite Verification: Claims, Records, and Scholarly Inference

To establish an objective baseline for institutional design, it is necessary to decouple the optimistic self-narrative of civic-tech promoters from the empirical historical record and the structural conclusions of peer-reviewed political sociology.

Operational Dimension	1. What the Arrangement's Proponents Claimed	2. What the Empirical Administrative Record Shows	3. What Modern Scholarship and Sociological Audits Infer
Systemic Mission & Sovereign Power	Replaced classical, corrupt representative party politics with direct, participatory digital democracy, allowing citizens to co-write statutory laws[5].	Formulated focused regulatory amendments on a narrow collection of emergent tech and service issues, while leaving broader legislative operations unchanged[3].	Served as an experimental, technocratic relief valve that modernized digital-economy regulation without altering sovereign power relations[15].
Deliberative	Algorithmic	Mapped common	Computational

Consensus (vTaiwan & Pol.is)	consensus engines eliminate tribal factionalism and surface the collective volition of the general public[14].	ground on narrow commercial questions (e.g., Uber pricing), but failed completely when applied to polarized, zero-sum distributive debates[15].	consensus relies heavily on convener seed-framing, active human facilitation, and careful issue selection to maintain high reported agreement rates[13].
Mass Public Participation (Join Platform)	Democratized national policy agendas by guaranteeing that any verified citizen proposal commanding 5,000 signatures reshapes state action[32].	Processed thousands of proposals, but strict power laws mean fewer than 4% reached the required threshold of 5,000 signatures[12].	Functions primarily as an administrative agenda-setting tool for organized interest groups and collaborative public bureaucracies[25].
Civic-State Integration (2020 Mask Map)	Spontaneous, non-hierarchical civic hacker coordination replaced slow, centralized government public health bureaucracies[4].	Built by an ad-hoc group of dedicated engineers coordinating with an agile digital minister and tapping into an existing centralized state health database[7].	A rare operational convergence enabled by an existential public health crisis, strong institutional trust, and deep technological integration[7].
Institutional Durability & Scalability	Constructed a permanent, globally replicable institutional model for twenty-first-centur y open governance[14].	vTaiwan became largely dormant after 2018; state initiatives migrated to traditional bureaucratic management under MODA[15].	Highly vulnerable to political turnover, reliant on singular internal ministerial champions, and limited by its non-binding nature[15].

The Case Against: Technocracy, Selectivity, and

Impotence

Despite extensive international acclaim, Taiwan's digital-deliberative model faces severe critiques from domestic political scientists, legal scholars, and frontline activists[3].

The most prominent domestic political critique focuses on the structural lack of legal enforceability[3]. Jason Hsu (許毓仁), an early civic-tech advocate who subsequently served as a KMT legislator, characterized vTaiwan as "a tiger without teeth"[3]. Hsu demonstrated that because neither vTaiwan nor the Join platform possessed a constitutional or statutory mandate compelling parliamentary adoption, professional politicians and party whips routinely ignored citizen recommendations whenever deliberative outcomes conflicted with electoral calculations or financial patron-client networks[15]. When civic consultations threatened entrenched commercial monopolies (such as taxi driver unions or domestic liquor distribution cartels), political parties bypassed the platforms entirely[15].

Legal researcher and civic technologist Poren Chiang (2025), writing in *Is Deliberation Possible Here? The Rise and Fall of Open Consultation Platform vTaiwan*, charts the structural atrophy of the vTaiwan consultation process after 2018[40]. Chiang documents that state ministries functionally abandoned vTaiwan as soon as its original executive patron, Minister Jaclyn Tsai, stepped down following the 2016 general election, and as Audrey Tang's operational focus pivoted inward toward PDIS, the Join platform, and formal cabinet procedures[15]. The platform reverted to a volunteer-run discussion club, convening weekly meetings in Taipei cafes but stripped of any organic link to the Executive Yuan's legislative timetable[2]. Chiang concludes that vTaiwan was an executive-tolerated experiment permitted to operate only so long as it provided convenient, low-cost regulatory solutions for confusing cross-jurisdictional digital technology dilemmas that line ministries preferred to keep off their desks[43].

In a comprehensive sociological critique, Terrence Ting-Yen Chen (2024), in *Strong or thin digital democracy? The democratic implications of Taiwan's open government data policy in the 2010s*, argues that Taiwan's civic-tech ecosystem promoted a version of Benjamin Barber's "thin democracy" disguised as participatory empowerment[1]. Chen argues that by translating complex political conflicts into technical questions of API data feeds, software interfaces, and discrete atomic statements, the civic-tech movement depoliticized systemic social inequality[1]. The system systematically privileged a small, non-representative demographic: young, urban, college-educated male computer programmers and white-collar knowledge workers[1]. Conversely, it marginalized rural citizens, older generations, indigenous communities, and industrial laborers who articulate collective grievances through strikes, physical rallies, and community organizing[1]. Chen argues that rather than democratizing the state, open-government initiatives functioned to co-opt, tame, and channel radical post-Sunflower protest energy into safe, technocratic administrative collaborations[1].

Finally, computational political scientists challenge the algorithmic neutrality of the Pol.is software itself. Lodewijk Gelauff (2026), in an empirical study of 119 Pol.is consultations (*It Takes Three to Converse*), identified significant mathematical constraints[13]:

- **Cluster Reporting Bounding:** The underlying EM-PCA software forces clustering outputs into a rigid envelope of between two and five groups, artificially flattening

complex, multidimensional ideological spectra into oversimplified camps[13].

- **Algorithmic Path Dependency and Non-Reproducibility:** Pol.is implements a "warm path clustering" protocol, wherein the spatial coordinates of early participants anchor the eigenvector space for subsequent voters[13]. As a consequence, independent researchers running identical algorithms on the raw voting data cannot reproduce the real-time clusters displayed to participants during the live consultation[13].
- **Asymmetric Convener Gatekeeping:** The convener retains absolute control over the deliberation agenda[13]. By formulating the initial seed statements and moderating which participant-submitted statements are allowed into the voting stream, platform administrators exercise significant editorial control over the boundaries of acceptable consensus[13].

Scale Ledger: Civic-Tech Governance Across the Eight Rungs

The structural mechanics of Taiwan's civic-tech and consensus-mapping architecture function with varying efficacy across different scales of social organization. The ledger below maps the operational status, prerequisites, failure modes, and structural boundaries of this governance model across the eight rungs of human association.

Scale Rung	Population Scale	Operational Status	Working Conditions & Empirical Precedents	Failure Modes & Breakdown Dynamics	Structural Reason for Boundary Limits
1. Household	4–10 people	**Failed / Inappropriate**	Simple direct verbal communication; informal task allocation.	Procedural overhead; mechanical voting destroys interpersonal empathy and domestic relational trust.	Dunbar's baseline; high communicative bandwidth and deep familiarity make formal algorithmic consensus tools counterproductive.
2. Hamlet /	30–50	**Marginal /**	Small working	Factional polarization	Direct face-to-fac

Band	people	**Rare**	circles; ad-hoc committees; physical check-ins.	; dominant personalities capture small sample sizes; high procedural friction.	e vocal dialogue outperforms digital polling; mathematical matrix reduction is statistically meaningless with $N < 50$.
3. Village	150–500 people	**Proven (Offline Analog)**	Physical card-based statement mapping; transparent shared ledgers; regular open assemblies.	Clan dominance; literacy divides; structural exclusion of minority lineages.	Dunbar's upper limit; the maximum boundary where every individual can maintain direct acquaintance, requiring structured methods to prevent vocal capture.
4. Parish / District	1,500–5,000 people	**Proven (Municipal Hubs)**	Participatory budgeting; targeted local regulatory sandboxes; multi-stake	Bureaucratic gatekeeping; self-selected participation of	Transition zone where direct, universal vocal assemblies fail due to physical

			holder municipal councils.	wealthy, educated elites; low overall turnout.	constraints; structured asynchronous proxy voting becomes essential.
5. Town / Watershed	15,000–50,000 people	**Proven (Local State)**	Municipal Join portals; regional disaster logistics coordination; open watershed and pollution monitoring.	Astroturfing by local business cartels; administrative apathy; lack of binding statutory authority.	Requires professional administrative capacity and independent local investigative reporting to sustain civic engagement.
6. Region / Bioregion	0.5–5 million people	**Proven (Core Arena)**	Early vTaiwan pilots (Taipei metro area); specialized municipal data challenges; focused health networks.	Deepening urban-rural participation divides; technical capture by metropolitan software engineers.	Matches the functional geographic density of Taiwan's tech community and regional administrative bureaus.
7. Nation / Continent	50–500 million people	**Mixed / Constrained**	Join platform (at 23.5M); national-sc	Algorithmic tribalism; institutional capture by	Achieved in Taiwan at 23.5M due to high

			ale e-petitions; universal public health data mobilization.	organized lobbies; systemic exclusion of marginalized groups.	broadband coverage, unified health ID, and geographic density; struggles when expanded across continental boundaries.
8. Planet	8 Billion people	**Never Tried / Impossible**	Theoretical global climate or AI policy surveys (e.g., small pilot experiments).	Severe geopolitical weaponization; identity fraud; catastrophic linguistic fragmentation; lack of sovereign executive receiver.	Total absence of a unified global legal commons, universal identity infrastructure, or legitimate enforcement body.

At the intimate scales of the Household and the Hamlet, the formalization of opinion collection into discrete atomic statements and mathematical clusters is unnecessary. Direct interpersonal empathy, shared historical context, and high-bandwidth vocal conversation allow small groups to coordinate without procedural intermediaries. Introducing atomic statement voting into a ten-person domestic circle introduces artificial transactional friction, degrading personal relationships.

Between the Village (150–500) and the Parish/District (1,500–5,000), direct democracy encounters the limits of assembly logistics. In an assembly of 3,000 people, isegoria (the equal right to speak) breaks down: only an aggressive, highly confident minority can take the microphone, while the vast majority remains passive. In this intermediate tier, structured consensus-mapping platforms function with high fidelity. By decoupling statement submission from direct verbal conflict and measuring broad cross-factional agreement, these platforms protect assemblies from rhetorical dominance.

At continental and planetary scales, the model encounters severe structural barriers. The

Taiwanese system relied on a unified sociotechnical foundation: a shared written language (traditional Chinese), universal broadband, an existential external security threat reinforcing internal cohesion, and a single-payer health data system. When expanded across multilingual, continent-sized populations lacking shared legal frameworks, digital consensus platforms collapse into identity spoofing, geopolitical weaponization, and procedural gridlock.

Capture Test: Dark-Triad Exploitation and Anti-Capture Dynamics

Any governance architecture designed to endure severe stress must be evaluated against bad-faith exploitation by individuals or factions exhibiting dark-triad personality traits: narcissism (grandiose self-promotion, theatrical demagoguery, pursuit of charismatic dominance), Machiavellianism (strategic deceit, calculated exploitation of procedural loopholes, manipulation of information flows), and psychopathy (callous disregard for collective welfare, anti-social sabotage, remorseless extraction).

Astroturfing and Sybil Attacks (The Machiavellian Threat)

A Machiavellian actor seeks to manufacture synthetic political consensus by deploying networks of pseudonymous accounts, automated bots, or organized commercial digital operators ("water armies," 網軍) to flood the consultation platform.

The mathematical architecture of Pol.is provides robust structural resistance against this vulnerability. Because Pol.is does not calculate consensus through majoritarian tallies (51% simple majorities), an influx of thousands of coordinated accounts voting identically does not alter the bridging consensus layer. The Expectation-Maximization PCA algorithm groups all accounts with identical voting records into a single, dense ideological cluster on the coordinate plane.

To elevate a statement, the system requires broad agreement across opposing, distinct clusters. Consequently, a bot-infiltrated cluster voting exclusively for its own partisan propositions cannot force those propositions into the consensus summary.

To compromise the system, an attacker must deploy heterogeneous bot networks that simulate realistic voting variance across opposing ideological groups while coordinating votes on targeted propositions—an attack vector that is computationally expensive and vulnerable to detection via vote-entropy and timing audits.

However, the Join platform's e-petition module displays higher vulnerability to this threat. While identity verification requires a mobile telephone number and national identification credentials, organized partisan factions routinely coordinate mass-signing campaigns across social media channels to push petitions past the 5,000-signature threshold. The Join platform relies on human administrative gatekeeping: ministerial review panels must audit incoming petitions to distinguish organic civic interest from coordinated political lobbying.

Demagoguery and Charismatic Polarization (The Narcissistic Threat)

A narcissistic demagogue seeks public attention, emotional escalation, and tribal division, using inflammatory rhetoric to dominate public assemblies and establish charismatic authority.

Pol.is mitigates this dynamic through its non-threaded interaction model. By eliminating reply

buttons, quote-sharing, downvotes, and nested comment sections, the platform removes the primary vectors of demagoguery. A user cannot launch ad hominem attacks, mock opponents, or rally a digital crowd against an individual.

Furthermore, because the platform's algorithm elevates only statements that achieve broad agreement across opposing clusters, divisive rhetoric is automatically isolated at the outer margins of the participant's cluster. The system denies the narcissist the attention economy required to sustain charismatic dominance.

However, this protection breaks down during the subsequent Reflection Stage. When the deliberation moves from the asynchronous digital platform to physical, live-streamed stakeholder meetings, narcissistic actors can exploit the broadcast cameras. In historical consultations, corporate executives and political activists occasionally used live reflection sessions to stage theatrical performances for their external followers. Reversing this capture requires strict, neutral facilitation using structured discussion protocols (such as the Focused Conversation Method), strict speaking time limits, and the immediate cut-off of non-substantive speeches.

Technocratic Stonewalling and Procedural Exhaustion (The Psychopathic/Bureaucratic Threat)

A psychopathic or self-interested administrative faction seeks to preserve its institutional privileges by subjecting civic proposals to endless procedural reviews, bad-faith jurisdictional delays, and technical stonewalling.

The Join platform counters this dynamic through administrative design: crossing the 5,000-signature threshold triggers a mandatory, public 60-day deadline that compels the executive branch to issue a formal response. PDIS further reinforces accountability by requiring bi-weekly meetings of the Open Government Participation Officer network and transcribing multi-stakeholder sessions verbatim for the public commons via SayIt.

Despite these mechanisms, the administrative record reveals that technocratic gatekeepers can still neutralize civic initiatives. As demonstrated in Terrence Ting-Yen Chen's analysis of technocratic and adversarial policy domains, civil servants facing unwelcome proposals (such as tax adjustments or labor law enforcement) routinely use specialized legal citations and economic models to declare citizen demands unworkable.

Because the platforms lack binding statutory authority, administrative gatekeepers can follow every procedural transparency requirement while making zero substantive changes to policy. The platform makes bureaucratic stonewalling visible, but lacks the constitutional authority to overcome it.

10-Line Summary of Robust Findings

1. Civic-tech platforms effectively surface consensus on complex technical issues, but fail when applied to structural zero-sum conflicts[15].
2. Eliminating nested reply threads and engagement-maximizing feeds reduces affective polarization in large-scale group deliberation[13].
3. The claim that 80% of 26 vTaiwan cases produced decisive action conflated routine administrative adjustments with major statutory breakthroughs[5].

4. Mass e-petition platforms follow heavy-tailed power distributions; fewer than 4% of verified initiatives cross the 5,000-signature threshold[12].
5. Government responsiveness to civic platforms is structurally determined by policy domain characteristics, succeeding primarily where bureaucratic interests align[25].
6. Rapid civic-state co-production during emergencies requires pre-existing open data standards, high institutional trust, and shared technical protocols[7].
7. Principal Component Analysis clustering is sensitive to convener seed framing, and early voter participation introduces warm-path sequence path-dependencies[13].
8. Digital democracy platforms without formal statutory or constitutional mandates decay into non-binding advisory panels as early political enthusiasm wanes[3].
9. Mass civic-tech deliberation without stratified random sampling introduces structural demographic skews toward young, educated, technologically literate urban males[1].
10. The institutionalization of digital ministries shifts organizational focus over time away from open deliberative platforms toward traditional cybersecurity and physical network resilience[37].

Contested or Open Questions

- **Democratic Depth versus Technocratic Co-optation:** Did vTaiwan and the Join platform genuinely redistribute sovereign authority to citizens, or did they serve as sophisticated administrative mechanisms that absorbed radical dissent after the Sunflower Movement and redirected it into harmless technocratic consulting[1]?
- **Replicability Beyond the Island Baseline:** Can non-threaded consensus platforms achieve comparable outcomes in societies lacking universal broadband access, single-payer health data infrastructures, deep hardware manufacturing capacity, and an existential external threat reinforcing social cohesion[7]?
- **Algorithmic Explainability and Public Trust:** As machine learning and natural language processing models are deployed to cluster and summarize citizen opinions, does the mathematical abstraction of deliberation undermine trust among citizens unable to audit the underlying code[13]?
- **The Sustainability of Civic Volunteerism:** Can decentralized, uncompensated hacker communities sustain rigorous long-term oversight of state institutions, or do they inevitably suffer from burnout and institutional capture by professional NGOs and state agencies[3]?
- **Constitutional Encroachment:** Can civic-tech consultation mechanisms be granted formal, binding statutory authority without triggering severe constitutional crises and active sabotage from elected parliamentary representatives defending their legislative prerogatives[3]?

5 to 10 Sources to Read in Full

- **Chen, Terrence Ting-Yen (2024).** "Strong or thin digital democracy? The democratic implications of Taiwan's open government data policy in the 2010s." *Big Data & Society*, 11(4): 1–16[1]. A rigorous sociological critique tracing the origins of Taiwan's open data

initiatives, demonstrating how civic tech depoliticized structural conflicts and promoted technocratic governance at the expense of substantive political redistribution[1].

- **Chen, Terrence Ting-Yen (2025/2026).** "When does digital democracy work? How policy domains shape government responses to online petitions in Taiwan." *Information, Communication & Society*, 29(8): 2258–2275[1]. The definitive empirical study of the Join platform's 5,000-signature petition mechanism, categorizing 278 successful petitions across collaborative, technocratic, and adversarial domains to explain why state responsiveness varies by issue area[1].
- **Chiang, Poren (2025).** "Is Deliberation Possible Here? The Rise and Fall of Open Consultation Platform vTaiwan." In *Law and Innovation*, edited by Thomas Honnet, pp. 86–97[40]. An insider legal-technical evaluation detailing the structural mechanics, operational successes, and post-2018 institutional decline of vTaiwan as state patronage waned[43].
- **Gelauff, Lodewijk (2026).** "It Takes Three to Converse: Empirical Observations on How the Developer, the Convener and the Participant Shaped 119 Polis Conversations." *arXiv*, arXiv:2608.28368[13]. An exhaustive computational audit of the Pol.is engine across 119 real-world consultations, documenting warm-path clustering non-reproducibility, cluster-bounding constraints, and the agenda-setting power of initial seed statements[13].
- **Hsiao, Yu-Tang, Shu-Yang Lin, Audrey Tang, Darshana Narayanan, and Claudina Sarahe (2018).** "vTaiwan: An Empirical Study of Open Consultation Process in Taiwan." *SocArXiv*, doi:10.31235/osf.io/xyhft[17]. The foundational primary document outlining vTaiwan's four-stage architecture, presenting the case studies of Uber, online alcohol sales, and closely held company legislation, and establishing the claim that 80% of cases led to government action[5].
- **Serdült, Uwe, et al. (2020).** "Towards a Model of Online Petition Signing Dynamics on the Join Platform in Taiwan." *ZDA / University of Zurich Research Reports*, pp. 1–12[26]. A granular quantitative analysis of signature velocity, power-law attrition, and the plateau effect across more than 7,000 verified petitions on the Join platform[26].
- **Tang, Audrey, and E. Glen Weyl (2024).** *Plurality: The Future of Collaborative Technology and Democracy*. Self-published under Creative Commons Zero (CC0)[42]. The theoretical manifesto synthesizing the Taiwanese civic-tech experience into a global philosophy of collaborative technology, digital consensus mapping, and pluralistic governance[42].

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable System

The operational core of Taiwan's civic-technology model—the elimination of nested counter-replies, the expression of opinions as concise atomic statements, and the identification of consensus across divergent factions—does not require silicon computing, electrical grids, or internet connections. It is a procedural framework for communication that can be executed entirely through low-technology physical materials.

Household (4 to 10 People)

At the household rung, the formal mechanics of non-threaded atomic statement voting should not be implemented. Domestic governance relies on high-bandwidth vocal communication, shared meals, and deep emotional familiarity. Subjecting a small domestic group to formal voting tokens or matrix tallies introduces unnecessary procedural distance and erodes interpersonal trust.

Village of 300 People (The Core Viable Unit)

In a post-collapse village of 300 individuals, direct democracy faces assembly challenges: vocal personalities dominate public gatherings, while quieter villagers remain silent. The village implements an "Offline Pol.is" protocol centered on a communal gathering hall:

- **The Statement Wall:** A large wooden board is erected in the central granary or meeting shelter. Any villager may submit an atomic proposition written on a strip of slate, birch bark, or scrap paper (restricted to a single, actionable sentence of 20 words or fewer, with all direct references to other individuals forbidden).
- **The Physical Voting Matrix:** Beneath each mounted statement, a wooden rack holds three open clay pots or fabric pouches marked with distinct symbols: Agree (White pebble), Disagree (Black pebble), and Pass (Smooth river stone). Every adult villager receives an allotment of distinct, stamped wooden tokens corresponding to the active propositions. Over a three-day voting period, villagers cast their tokens into the pots privately.
- **Consensus Extraction (Manual Cluster Mapping):** Two literate village Record-Keepers tally the tokens weekly in public view. The Record-Keepers track voting alignments across controversial baseline questions to identify the community's primary factions (e.g., Upper Valley farmers versus Lower Valley millers). Statements that receive 80 percent or higher White pebbles across both factions are moved to the "Agreed Custom Wall" and directly enacted by village work teams. Statements that trigger sharp polarization are set aside for targeted physical mediation, preventing the community from wasting energy on unresolvable disputes.

District of 3,000 People (Ten Federated Villages)

Across a district of ten federated villages, the community establishes an offline version of the Join e-petition platform and Participation Officer network:

- **The 100-Mark Petition Slate:** A public slate pillar is erected in the central district market square. Any household or village work group can write an actionable petition on the pillar. To compel a formal review by the District Council of Elders, the petition must collect 100 authenticated wax seals, family marks, or thumbprints within two lunar cycles (approximating the Join 5,000-signature threshold).
- **District Information Liaisons:** Each village elects one non-chief delegate to serve as an Information Liaison. When a petition secures the required 100 marks, the Liaisons convene in the market hall with the petitioner and the council. The Liaisons transcribe the proceedings onto public slate boards in the market square. The Council is obligated by district customary law to issue an oral and written judgment explaining their decision within one lunar cycle.

Necessary Starting Infrastructure

1. **Functional Basic Literacy:** A minimum of 5 to 10 percent of the adult population must be literate and numerate to write statements on the public boards, read submissions to non-literate community members, and audit token counts in full public view.
2. **Durable Standardized Records:** A supply of resilient recording materials—such as wooden tablets, slates, clay tokens, ink, or chalk—is required to maintain an immutable, public history of community agreements, customary laws, and tally results.
3. **A Shared Temporal Calendar:** A clear, visible calendar based on natural cycles (such as new and full moons, or solar equinoxes) is necessary to govern submission deadlines, token counts, and review periods, preventing dominant factions from calling surprise votes.
4. **A Neutral Communal Meeting Ground:** A sheltered physical space (such as a shared granary, covered market, or community hall) that is protected from private clan ownership and accessible to all community members regardless of lineage or status.

First Failure to Expect

The initial systemic breakdown will occur through the physical manipulation of the voting tokens and gatekeeping by the literate Record-Keepers.

In the absence of cryptographic verification and automated network auditing:

- Bad-faith factions will counterfeit voting tokens, stuff ballot pots after hours, deface statements they oppose, or intimidate vulnerable community members into casting specific tokens.
- The literate Record-Keepers tasked with reviewing and posting submitted statements will exercise quiet editorial control. They will discard proposals that challenge their personal status, wealth, or kinship groups under the pretext that the submissions were illegible, poorly phrased, or procedurally improper.

Without continuous, multi-lineage physical audits of the token boxes and an open review process for all discarded submissions, the manual consensus platform will quickly decay into an instrument of administrative control for the local literate elite.

Principles

1. Restricting deliberation to non-threaded atomic statements and eliminating direct conversational counter-replies reduces social polarization and mitigates performative demagoguery.
2. Deliberative algorithms that surface bridging consensus across divergent ideological clusters produce more durable policy outcomes than simple majoritarian voting mechanisms.
3. A civic participation platform lacking a formal statutory or constitutional mandate to enact its findings will inevitably be sidelined by professional politicians as early public enthusiasm wanes.
4. Public e-petition systems follow heavy-tailed power distributions, serving primarily as mobilization tools for organized advocacy groups rather than spontaneous reflections of the broader public.

5. Administrative state responsiveness to public proposals is determined by pre-existing policy domain alignments: it is high where civic demands align with bureaucratic goals, and negligible where proposals challenge institutional authority or resource distribution.
6. Effective emergency co-production between civic volunteer networks and state bureaucracies requires pre-existing, standardized open data feeds, high social trust, and distributed technical literacy.
7. Algorithmic consensus mapping is sensitive to initial seed statements and participant arrival sequence, generating path-dependent outcomes that cannot be independently reproduced from unsequenced vote records.
8. Unstratified, voluntary participation platforms overrepresent educated, affluent, and technologically literate demographics while systematically marginalizing non-technical and vulnerable populations.
9. Formal digital deliberation systems can depoliticize structural socioeconomic conflicts, translating fundamental political grievances into technical administrative adjustments that leave underlying power imbalances intact.
10. Below a population scale of 150 individuals, the procedural overhead of formal consensus mapping is counterproductive, while above 50,000 individuals, it requires formal institutional enforcement to maintain accountability.

Works cited

1. Terrence Ting-Yen Chen - Google Scholar, https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=wU67gHsAAAAJ&hl=en
2. Online participation. A three-dimensional approach to study digital, https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/online-participation-digital-political-platforms
3. vTaiwan - Designing Open Democracy, https://www.designingopendemocracy.com/organisations/vtaiwan/
4. Audrey Tang, Double Ten Day & The Transcultural Republic of, https://chinaheritage.net/journal/audrey-tang-double-ten-day-the-transcultural-republic-of-citizens/
5. vTaiwan - Crowdlaw for Congress, https://congress.crowd.law/case-vtaiwan.html
6. Crowdlaw for Congress: Strategies for 21st Century Lawmaking, https://congress.crowd.law/files/crowdlaw_playbook_Oct2020.pdf
7. Audrey Tang: Every Famous Decision She Made Was a Refusal of, https://taiwan.md/en/people/audrey-tang/
8. Digital Democracy | Nesta, https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/digital_democracy.pdf
9. Digital Democracy: The Tools Transforming Political Engagement, https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/digital-democracy-the-tools-transforming-political-engagement/
10. vTaiwan project (info) page - g0v - Hackpad, https://g0v.hackpad.tw/vTaiwan-project-info-page-g297C7C3fMT
11. Exploring Worldwide Democratic Innovations - A case study of Taiwan,

https://epd.eu/content/uploads/2023/07/Case-Study-Taiwan.pdf
12. When does digital democracy work? How policy domains shape, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2558150
13. It Takes Three to Converse - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2608.28368
14. Consensus Building in Taiwan, the Poster Child of Digital Democracy, https://democracy-technologies.org/participation/consensus-building-in-taiwan/
15. Taiwan's digital democracy experiment: what it shows, what it doesn't, https://www.designingopendemocracy.com/blog/2026/05/25/taiwans-digital-democracy-experiment-what-it-shows-what-it-doesnt/
16. AI-Enhanced Deliberative Democracy and the Future of ... - Make.org, https://assets.make.org/assets/media/events/f860429b-6762-425b-8200-f5acaa2894e4/panoramic/1781512191714-AI-Enhanced-Deliberative-Democracy.pdf
17. Human-centricity in AI governance: A systemic approach - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9979257/
18. BLOG — Index - MyVote, http://www.myvotegov.org/blog-index.php
19. Imagination Unleashed: Democratising the knowledge economy, https://www.nesta.org.uk/report/imagination-unleashed/
20. Jaclyn Tsai | FinTech Lawyer Taiwan - Leaders in Law, https://www.leaders-in-law.com/lawyers/jaclyn-tsai/
21. Can Digital Democracy Guard Citizens' Safety? Taking Taiwan's, https://brill.com/view/journals/ijts/7/2/article-p289_004.xml
22. Deliberating online to inform policy making: examples to learn from, https://sciencewise.org.uk/2020/10/online-deliberation-to-learn-from/
23. Global Peace Index 2026, https://www.economicsandpeace.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/06/Global-Peace-Index-2026-Report.pdf
24. Democracy by Design: Civic Tech and Canadian AI Governance, https://www.cigionline.org/documents/3930/DPH_Lam.pdf
25. When does digital democracy work? How policy domains shape, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2558150
26. Towards a Model of Online Petition Signing Dynamics on the Join, https://www.zora.uzh.ch/server/api/core/bitstreams/e29dd850-3da5-49f1-bd46-dcd2d8d2c566/content
27. Online citizen dialogue on biodiversity conservation and ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12569313/
28. Ideals and Challenges of Taiwan's Digital Democracy Seen Through, https://note.com/digitaldemocracy/n/naaa818d919c7?hl=en
29. Terrence Ting-Yen Chen - ORCID, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9242-5115
30. Audrey Tang - Wikipedia, https://fi.wikipedia.org/wiki/Audrey_Tang
31. vTaiwan - Participedia, https://participedia.net/method/vtaiwan
32. In an uncertain world, digital government provides the resilience that, https://govinsider.asia/intl-en/article/in-an-uncertain-world-digital-government-provides-the-resilience-that-countries-need
33. Can Democracy Survive AI? - The Ethics and Society Blog, https://ethicsandsociety.org/2024/11/06/event-recap-can-democracy-survive-ai/

34. Since the outbreak of the #COVID-19 pandemic late last year, https://www.facebook.com/focus.tw/posts/since-the-outbreak-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-late-last-year-facebook-has-not-only/3813711458662009/
35. Taiwan's Digital Response to COVID-19, with Audrey Tang, https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/media/podcast/20200331-taiwan-digital-response-covid-19-audrey-tang
36. Ministry of Digital Affairs (Taiwan) - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ministry_of_Digital_Affairs_(Taiwan)
37. Taiwan's Digital Frontier: Digital Economy, Democracy and Beyond, https://netmission.asia/2024/06/03/taiwans-digital-frontier-digital-economy-democracy-and-beyond-jenna-manhau-fung/
38. New economics, digital ministers announced - Taipei Times, https://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2024/04/16/2003816509
39. Inside the Paradise Bubble - Logic Magazine, https://logicmag.io/care/inside-the-paradise-bubble/
40. Curriculum Vitae - Poren Chiang, https://poren.tw/cv/
41. The Impact of Open Data in the UK: Complex, Unpredictable, and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275365441_The_Impact_of_Open_Data_in_the_UK_Complex_Unpredictable_and_Political
42. Plurality - bookpower.org, https://bookpower.org/plurality/
43. Law & Innovation, https://grd.sgs.gov.kh/home/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2026/01/Law-and-Innovation.pdf
44. Symbolic empowerment through open big data in citizen science for, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390186811_Inclusive_yet_marginalising_Symbolic_empowerment_through_open_big_data_in_citizen_science_for_transport_planning
45. [ADRN Working Paper] Mapping East Asian Initiatives on AI, http://www.adrnresearch.org/publications/list.php?cid=1&sp=%26sp%5B%5D%3D1%26sp%5B%5D%3D2%26sp%5B%5D%3D3&pn=1&st=&code=&at=view&idx=441
46. Will democracy survive social media? - Pure, https://pure.tue.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/368852136/20251104_Puil_van_der_hf.pdf
47. Large language models (LLMs) as agents for augmented democracy, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rsta/article/382/2285/20240100/108429/Large-language-models-LLMs-as-agents-for-augmented