DEMOS

THE GOOD WEB PROJECT

RECOGNISING AND REALISING DIGITAL DEMOCRATIC INFRASTRUCTURE

ALEX KRASODOMSKI-JONES
PETER POMERANTZEV
HARVEY MCGUINNESS
ELLEN JUDSON

JUNE 2022

Published by Demos June 2022

15 Whitehall, London, SW1A 2DD
T: 020 3878 3955
hello@demos.co.uk
www.demos.co.uk

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Demos would like to thank Capita for their generous support for our Relational Public Services We started writing this piece before the pandemic. It felt like a useful thing to do back then: to purchase a high definition webcam and shout "what does Good look like?" at whoever would listen. Chloe and Henry at the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, Peter, and the team at the German Marshall Fund - Lindsay, Amber, Laura and Ishmael - turned it into a real thing. Thanks also to Chris Beall for his thoughtful comments. Enormous thank you to everyone from around the globe who attended one of our workshops, and for taking on some enormous questions.

I'm a bit more hopeful now. The Biden administration's Declaration for the Future of the Internet is an enormous step forward. The UN's Roadmap for Digital Cooperation is another. The centrality to these pledges of human rights, the importance of multistakeholder governance and access, and the language of infrastructure will, I hope, fill the many brilliant people worrying about these things with a degree of cautious optimism. It does me.

This is my last report after seven years at Demos and at the Centre for the Analysis of Social Media there. I'm immensely proud of the work we've done here in that time, particularly around the question of what a Good Internet might look like: from design to regulation, moderation to business models. So one last round of thank yous: my brilliant co-conspirator Josh, the team at CASM led by Ellen, and to Jamie Bartlett and Carl Miller who gave me a shot at this in the first place.

Alex Krasodomski

June 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Good Web is a public infrastructure project.

All too frequently, liberal societies struggle to articulate what a good Internet would look like.

Some of it is hubris, a hangover from the days we celebrated the sight of smartphones in Tahrir Square and thought Twitter would be the vanguard of democracy as the world moved online.

Some of it is plain short-sightedness. While the architects of the Internet were thinking about tomorrow, we were worrying about yesterday. We are obsessed with problems and short on solutions. We see digital technology as something that happens to us, something to react to, to clean up, rather than something to steer. Our political leaders are far more adept at identifying what they don't like about the Internet than identifying what they do.

More dangerous still are blueprints for a future Internet that fail to challenge the most important paradigms. These tend to look like calls for better, safer, more palatable platforms, but the same platforms, still built on data monopolies, attention economies and shareholder demands.

Some of it is down to a language gap. We are trapped in a lexicon that from the start was too broad, too diffuse: words like safe, community, and platform, or ancient metaphors like the Public Square. This vocabulary is further twisted by millions of dollars of public relations money, and deceptive labels like sharing or reach or influence which all obscure the ways in which global technology companies have rewritten the language that underpins our societies, media and politics.

Some of it is plain old disagreement. No two democracies are alike. There are things we agree on, and things we don't. Since the turn of the millennium, new democracies have sprung up, bringing their own hopes and fears and values, while old democracies have found their institutions to be built on foundations less solid than they might have hoped. From the US to Taiwan, from India to Germany, there is no true consensus on what liberal democratic values ought to be, less still consensus on how to realise these values online.

To realise a Good Web, we need to flip the script, and challenge the status quo with proactive plans. We must understand that democracies need things to work: things like public space, private space, access to good quality information, freedom of expression, and protections for human rights. We have tried outsourcing them, mostly to the private sector: that experiment must now end.

Changes to the Internet happen when people do things. Developers build stuff, and that stuff forms the bedrock of digital society. It's here where we need change: in development, not in production, to borrow a phrase from programming. Tacking a fact-checking service or 'redirect method' onto the side of a freewheeling technology like Facebook is a waste of time, and twenty years too late anyway. Demanding platforms protect "democratically important content" while stamping out "misinformation" is wishful thinking that fails to tackle how and why monopoly tech platforms are designed. We need to affect the ways in which the Internet is being built, from top to toe.

This is a call for innovation and support and celebration: sluggish, iterative changes to platforms fundamentally designed to resist them and beholden to profit or entrenched political power is getting us nowhere. We can cautiously applaud positive changes as damage control, but enough with the PR-exercise 'solutions' that cling to the side of platforms like limpets on a tanker: celebrating this nonsense does nothing but dig us deeper into a hole. Enough with the democratic experiments that amount to little more than opinion polling. Pour that money into people, businesses and civil society that are trying something new. Celebrate them, fund them, but guide them: help them listen to the demands and responsibilities of democracy, and feed those demands into the lines of code and the standards and protocols and infrastructure they sit on.

Whether they are the goals of Internet design, the

goals of regulation, or the expectations of Internet users, we demand three principles be adhered to: powerful citizens, a digital commons, and a commitment to openness that ensures it is safe, what we call securitized openness. Without strong citizens, a functioning commons and security, a democracy would be considered in crisis: the digital revolution changes nothing about this.

The case is a simple one: democracies demand democratic infrastructure, and provision of that infrastructure should be public, transparent and equitable.

This is not a call simply for greater state funding and control, but for the development and support of digital technology that distributes power securely and lowers barriers to active participation. From top to bottom, across the entire digital technology stack. This means international cooperation on digital infrastructure, an embrace of protocols over platforms, provision over profit, and defence of open standards. It means an end to relentless, permission-lite data extraction. It means redesigning our online tools to empower citizens not indenture serfs. All this while ensuring the system as a whole is safe, secure, and robust in the face of authoritarian assault.

Routes towards this kind of Internet are plentiful and varied. Some will be big, requiring enormous investment and international agreement. Others may require little, by surgically targeting critical weak points in the status quo. By way of illustration, it is probable that the vocabulary of a good web will include:

- **Values** - multistakeholderism, interdependence, human rights
- **Frameworks** - common good theory, public ownership models
- **Means to ends**: tax, government procurement, interoperability

This is a look back as much as a look forward: many of the hopes of the Internet's early architects were for a just, free and egalitarian online world. Its early voices warned states - weary giants of flesh and steel - from trying to interfere, but it wasn't just the state they should have worried about: it is private corporations who are for the most part responsible for today's Internet.

Below, we ask some questions we hope test some key requirements of democratic systems, and ask if they can currently be met by anyone except private companies?

Can I carry out essential activities outside of a commercial space? Or is my access to information, or my ability to organise or communicate, subject to the decisions made by private corporations or used for profit making?

It is our argument that the development of the Internet has left some critical democratic functions in the hands of non-democratic actors, and that those functions should be moved into the layer of democratic infrastructure.

The Good Web is a public infrastructure project.

THE GOOD WEB

The Good Web identifies critical democratic activities failed by current provision, most often by private corporations, and plots a path towards provisioning those activities as infrastructure.

This provocation sets out three key ways in which a Good Web represents a step forward from the status quo: powerful citizens, a digital commons and securitized openness. We present questions that we believe cannot be solely answered by private corporations.

We choose these stories to illustrate how democracy suffers when each is badly supported. *There are many others.*

THE POWERFUL CITIZEN

Can I prove who I am online?

Can I vote, volunteer or carry out pro-social labour online?

Am I recognised as a citizen online?

A good web turns subjects into citizens and serfs into owners. This means infrastructural provision of identity, design and regulation of the web that empowers individuals to feel confident in exercising control over the spaces they participate in, and users to experience the social contract online.

PERSONHOOD AND IDENTITY

A Good Web allows us to prove we are human, and manage multiple identities, at an infrastructural level.

CIVIC LABOUR AND PROTECTIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTIVITY

A Good Web provides a layer of society outside of private corporations in service of democracy.

DIGITAL RIGHTS

A Good Web respects the rights of individuals, and protects users from arbitrary interference or discrimination

THE DIGITAL COMMONS

Can I access high-quality information?

Can I form opinions and speak freely?

Can I organise with others?

A good web promotes rights to access information and education and to speak and organise freely. It sustains public service media.

PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA

A good web sustains public service media and journalism.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

A good web empowers users and communities to exercise power over the spaces they participate in.

SEARCH

A good web surfaces high quality information first.

SECURITIZED OPENNESS

Is the Internet I use vulnerable to hostile threats?

Can I be secure online?

A good web recognises threats from states and non-state actors. It ensures its infrastructure is sound and well-maintained, and empowers its users to protect themselves where necessary.

USER PRIVACY

A good web offers its citizens privacy, a fundamental human right and a critical tool for online safety.

OPEN STANDARDS

A good web prioritises interoperability and is resilient to authoritarian, monopoly and corporate capture.

OPEN SOFTWARE ECOSYSTEM

A good web runs on good software and hardware, and the development and maintenance of that software and hardware is sustainable.

THE POWERFUL CITIZEN

A Good Web turns subjects into citizens and serfs into owners. This means infrastructural provision of identity, design and regulation of the web that empowers individuals to feel confident in exercising control over the spaces they participate in, and users to experience the social contract online.

PERSONHOOD AND IDENTITY

A good web allows us to prove we are human, and manage multiple identities, at an infrastructural level.

Social media has created a marketplace for human futures, a thriving economy of surveillance capitalism. By and large, identity online remains heavily centralised in and monopolised by private companies. Facebook, Amazon, Google. Each has privatised, predictive systems dedicated to creating a mock profile of who we are. That our identities are first and foremost profit markers is incompatible with democracy.

And as elements in a system monopolising the creation and protection of profiles for profit, we lack the power to control our identities online: to be anonymous to who we choose. The capacity to behave differently across digital spaces is not a weakness to be rooted out in the Good Web, but a key aspect of expression to be protected and celebrated.

User identity is treated as two things: a danger to be tightly controlled, through increasingly intrusive surveillance of users' data and behaviour, or an opportunity to monetise privacy for profit. What is missing are online environments where users are in control of their own identities - where people can validate their personhood without having to surrender vast swathes of data; and where our identities can be multiple, fluid, forgotten and recreated as suits us, rather than as suits the bottom line.

In creating this environment, we can look towards Estonia's eID system for inspiration. This is a government backed identification system which provides access to a swath of digitised government services. As it stands, this assures the personhood question for matters of personal affairs - banking, voting, health insurance, etc. It also solves the for-profit problem: in the private system, companies like Google manage user identities while trading behavioural futures based on those profiles. Under the eID system, the primary provider for digital identification manages identification credentials but does not profit from the potential to alter the behaviour of those who are identified.

Alternatively, self sovereign identity reduces individual reliance on both state and, in theory, monopoly corporations. This system relies on peer to peer computing in order to decentralise identification. As opposed to a private firm maintaining an individual's identification credentials and associated data, all of this information can be stored in a digital cryptographic address without the need of third parties.

CIVIC LABOUR AND PROTECTIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTIVITY

A Good Web provides a layer of society outside of private corporations in service of democracy.

In practising politics on platforms, we carry out democratic activity near-exclusively in spaces that are built to maximise profit. This is incompatible with democracy. For broader digital society, by communicating, sharing information, moderating or cultivating a space online, more often than not, that activity is shaped by the platform's profit motive. This is incompatible with democracy, and likely incompatible with building strong, engaged citizens.

Without power over our public digital arenas, we will never move beyond sharecropping: our attempts

to cultivate and maintain online spaces will be tolerated as far as they contribute to a platform's profits, and dissuaded if they do not. We recognise the importance of being able to participate in democracy and in our communities without doing so on terms set by private entities: it's vital we are able to do that online.

In practice, this means channels for communication and information, and ways for participating in politics online, that are set up to protect and promote the ability of people to participate in them. It means economic systems that reward pro-social activity and community-building, rather than rewarding behaviour that benefits companies by increasing their revenues.

This is not an either/or, but guided by these principles we see concrete changes are required to ensure that certain categories of data go uncollected and that certain channels go unmonetised. We need systems that reward and recognise those that contribute to them, both reputationally and financially.

Steps by platforms to address these problems are welcome, but it is doubtful that the platform model will be a long-term solution here. Here we look for development of new protocols - an update to email, for instance - that sustains the kinds of communication and activity we currently do online without centralising it under a single profit incentive. It's barely an exaggeration to describe email as one of the last vestiges of the early, open source, free internet.

DIGITAL RIGHTS

A Good Web respects the rights of individuals, and protects users from arbitrary interference or discrimination

In a world where online spaces are privately owned and governed as such, individual rights are largely irrelevant - spaces can be designed, built and deployed to promote the interests of an oligarchy with little regard for how vulnerable users or marginalised groups might be affected.

Platforms use the language of 'freedom' to disguise the fact that what happens online - to people's speech, to their labour, to their personal data - is controlled and dictated by inscrutable corporate structures. Spaces designed in these ways can never treat user rights and non-discrimination as the fundamental principles they are.

This means changing who is setting the terms of engagement in our online spaces: and who has the ability to change them at will. User empowerment needs to be demanded, not requested: either through political means, by regulating what companies are able to do, by investing in building the alternatives ourselves, or by demanding public oversight or even ownership. We must be cautious about replacing corporate control with state control, rather than empowering citizens.

We need to invest in decentralised models - support in online communities, not online platforms; fund developers and maintainers who build things for everyone to use, no strings attached.

We need human rights advocates who understand technology; and technologists who understand human rights, involved as central parts of the development of open standards.

We need strong regulation and democratic oversight of the systems that companies have in place, from oversight of data profiling practices to meaningful algorithmic audit.

And we need constraints, embedded in human rights principles, on the development and deployment of new technologies, rather than waiting for them to become widespread and then trying to bolt-on some user protections afterwards. Social Media councils may offer a route forward here.

THE DIGITAL COMMONS

A good web promotes rights to access information and education and to speak and organise freely. It sustains public service media.

A healthy digital commons provides citizens with a shared reality in which disagreements can be resolved and compromise can be reached. It sustains a patchwork of multiple, overlapping commons. It sustains good information, contributing to education and capacity building among citizens. Being a democratic citizen is hard work: our current online environment makes it close to impossible.

PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA

A good web sustains public service media and journalism.

The modern public sphere - the spaces where information is shared, debate is held and opinions are formed - is not designed with democracy in mind.

Information is curated across online media in line with economic incentives. Current systems serve to maintain an attention economy wherein user engagement, regardless of type or quality, is pursued for profit.

This system is failing us. The ideal of the commons is corrupted, and replaced with a mix of hyper personalised realities and enormous, purposeless click-farms trying to be everything to everyone, all of the time.

Media that serves public interest before commercial or political interest is a cornerstone of democratic life. The last decades have seen the proportion of information sustained by advertising increase enormously. Public service media and forms of journalism and information less able to compete in a market crushed. We must recognise a free and sustainable media as democratic infrastructure.

This report focuses on the web, but it is worth noting that governments must double-down in protecting media freedom full stop. If we are living through an age of democratic backsliding, it is more important than ever that states and international bodies take seriously their commitments to the protection of journalists and the genuine independence of media and regulators.

Sustainable media means paying for it. Recognising the centrality of the public commons to democracy should put investment in public media as a central pillar in development funding. Recent estimates of development funding going to public service media put the figure at just 0.2%. BBC Media Action and Luminate's efforts to establish an International Fund for Public Interest Media is a model for boosting sustainability here, with a focus on developing democracies.

Where public service media is provided by commercial entities, setting standards and rewarding broadcasters and content producers with public goods can be effective. OFCOM, the UK's media regulator, can assign high-profile slots to public service content, for instance. Independently setting similar standards empower technology companies to quickly and efficiently identify public interest media and boost its prominence online. Similarly, technology platforms can be encouraged to dedicate some proportion of their output and revenue: the EU's Audiovisual Media Services Directive (AVMS) has led to France compelling platforms like Amazon and Netflix to dedicate a proportion of annual revenue to locally made content. A similar model could work for public interest media.

Finally, we must celebrate and support innovations targeting the stranglehold of advertising as a model for media delivery. From sponsorship to subscriptions by content producers, to regulation that evens the playing field and pressurises targeted advertising, ensuring that newsworthiness is no longer measured

in clicks is critical.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES

A good web empowers users and communities to exercise power over the spaces they participate in.

A Good Web is a global one, and must therefore respect the enormous diversity different spaces and communities demand.

Neither the Internet nor the world is a single, vanilla experience, where the only place to eat is a McDonald's and there's a McDonald's on every street corner. A Good Web sustains communities of all types and purposes in their diversity and not in spite of it.

In the offline world, we decide these together: democratic processes enable us to agree on the broadest social contract, while social norms are established in other spaces through other practices: clapping at the end of a theatre show, swearing at home, taking minutes at a community group meeting or not shouting rude things at each other in the street.

These are not things we are compelled by a state authority to do - but things we agree to do because of the social value we see that they bring. We recognise that what might be appropriate in one place isn't elsewhere, and understand we can work to shape the places we spend our time to be better aligned with what we think is good.

By contrast, the overwhelming majority of online spaces are places users are powerless to affect the terms of engagement. We cannot affect the rules. We have no idea how they are enforced. We have no idea if what we're saying is being monitored, or know who is even likely to see what we share.

And without this investment, we are without debt to the stability of the community - we gain no benefit and see no results from investing time or effort trying to make the space healthier. I cannot possibly make Twitter or Facebook better on my own, though I might be able to shape a subreddit or a private WhatsApp group.

Offline, we recognise that the fabric of society is held together by more than just law enforcement - the rules! - but by a constellation of actors from healthcare to family, work and community. We need a similar diversity of actors to support healthy online spaces.

A Good Digital Commons encourages bottom-up governance. It empowers and rewards those who want to make some bit of it better, it supports discussion about what change might look like, and it provides defences against spoilers.

It is designed for multistakeholderism and interdependence: people who rely on one another for something working together to set and enforce the rules. It allows for civic labour in maintaining its rules, culture and the behaviour of its participants. Spaces where users need each other tend to be far more successful online than those that don't: think tech support forums, for instance, or discussion forums for hobbyists.

SEARCH

A Good Web surfaces high quality information first.

Free access to information is a fundamental cornerstone of an internet that supports democratic discourse and powerful citizens who can collaborate and communicate with each other. Search and ranking are key functions that determine what information is seen and by whom.

The cataloguing of digital content by technology companies has been an enormous benefit to society. But it has always been a balancing act between relevance and quality and the profits of its providers. Whether it's Amazon promoting sponsored products, YouTube promoting attention-grabbing content, or Google using search behaviour for profiling its users, distortions to search have created enormous markets for low-quality information and spawned a SEO industry valued at tens of billions of dollars. Anyone reading this who has searched for a recipe online, or for trustworthy reviews of a product, or tips to complete a particularly difficult level in a video game, will have felt this first hand.

Solutions under a platform model demand technology companies weight search and discovery in favour of high quality information at the cost of profit, either through breaking up current monopolies to introduce competition in search and discovery, or by setting rules. Alternatively, stochastic recommendation algorithms would allow for breaks in the query process and provide opportunities for users to go beyond what may be immediately relevant to the search at hand. While search results would still be tuned enough to exclude completely irrelevant results, there would be opportunities to escape the whirlpool of targeted information which forms while browsing the web.

A good web balances openness with security.

Openness is a core value of a Good Web that must be defended. Authoritarian regimes and private corporations are fine-tuning and rolling out technologies that challenge the principle and practice of a free and open Internet. Sophisticated systems of censorship and crude Internet blackouts restrict who can use the internet and what they can use it for. This must be resisted.

SECURITIZED OPENNESS

Open infrastructure carries risks. Openness can be exploited, and current models for open standards and software are unsustainable. Security remains a major challenge as crime and information operations challenge states' ability to protect their citizens and societies.

A good web is a bastion and a front line in the fight for democracy and human rights around the world rather than a threat to both.

USER PRIVACY

A good web offers its citizens privacy, a fundamental human right and a critical tool for online safety.

Those in power have no interest in the privacy of users. Platforms sell users superficial promises of 'private communication' while obscuring the ways they extract and monetise the most personal of information - often defending it as 'personalisation'.

Authoritarianism, whether corporate or state, sees user privacy as a threat to how effectively they can exert its power - if spaces online are too private, the argument goes, they become no more than hiding places for criminals. Anonymity as a cause of harm online is a line trotted out time and again, including by politicians, civil society members and journalists who might think of themselves as advocates or stewards of democracy.

Privacy is about power, and it is about agency. Information asymmetries - where I know less about you than you do about me - are visible everywhere in the online world. Advertising companies, election software and social platforms are all in the business of knowing as much about us as possible, and accurately guessing the bits they don't know for sure. All this information can be used against us arbitrarily, from a targeted advert to a personalised political slogan at its most benign to surveillance that is much more sinister.

It's also about agency. Democracy is a process, and being a democratic citizen means making mistakes and, through trial and error, coming to a set of beliefs. Private spaces allow us to do this, and to do this freely. People who are at risk of discrimination of persecution feel these needs most strongly, but these are basic requirements for democratic participation.

Privacy has always been a highly politicised topic in tech, and there are large communities of privacy advocates developing tools and technologies aimed at protecting our privacy, from Apple to Signal and Protonmail. We reject the notion that wholescale intrusions on privacy are the only way to finance technology development. Alternative technologies to the major platforms - themselves under pressure to remove privacy-protecting features - tend to boast improved privacy protection measures, most often through decentralisation.

Users need to have the knowledge and understanding, and the ability to control who has information about them and their activities online. Other fundamental freedoms - of information, of expression, of association, and opinion - cannot be realised without a robust right to privacy.

This requires technical protections: end-to-end encrypted channels, data localisation, access to VPNs and so on. It also requires political protections, from the right to be forgotten to subject access data requests that enable people to discover and control their online identities. Defending citizens' privacy from corporate overreach should be a priority of the state, not something they are complicit in.

OPEN STANDARDS

A good web prioritises interoperability and is resilient to monopoly and corporate capture.

Protocols, and the Internet more broadly, are developed and governed by a handful of acronym-friendly groups - the IETF, the ITU, the IGF - among others. Many operate on the principles of 'multistakeholderism' - a form of democratic governance which helps groups of organisations to work on common problems, spreading power and decision-making out across stakeholders. This ideal is worth protecting, and it will require concerted effort from their members to do so - as well as to defend these groups from capture by the powerful, and from closing themselves off to outside ideas.

Technology companies and states both wield outsized influence over the Internet. Their power is exerted both over the organisations which develop protocols, and over how and whether their recommendations are implemented. Those able to control a country's communications infrastructure, or change the settings in web browsers used by millions, can unilaterally affect the protocols used by customers and citizens, changing the types of data sent by their computers and the actors to which that data is sent - often without their knowledge.

Under this trajectory, openness looks under threat. If openness cannot be sustained, its death will be slow and imperceptible. Development will take place in ever more privatised spaces. Licensing will gradually become less permissive. Entry for new participants will get gradually more difficult. The ramifications of this would be enormous: a fractured web controlled by a handful of competing states and corporations under whom individual power and agency to shape the digital landscape will be a distant memory. A balkanised digital world, where decisions about the future of technology are made in boardrooms, and universal rights and liberties come second to state or corporate powers bent on raising the walls around their domains ever higher.

Liberal protocols need people who understand how to write them. To ensure protocol development is open to those besides corporations and states, it's crucial that as wide a range of people as possible have the freedom and tools to develop and experiment. Standards bodies must redouble their commitment to multistakeholderism and address issues such as lack of diversity and linguistic and financial barriers to participation. Siloing non-technical stakeholder input to protocol design - as has occurred in attempts to promote consideration of human rights considerations in the IETF's routine work - must be reversed. With a couple of exceptions, civil society organisations struggle to engage in these spaces: funding to boost sector engagement here is urgently needed.

OPEN SOFTWARE ECOSYSTEM

A good web runs on good software and hardware, and the development and maintenance of that software and hardware is values-driven and sustainable.

Over the past decades, open source and open standards have emerged as the de facto way digital technologies are created. The open ecosystem builds a better digital future by placing more value in individuals' ability to understand and shape its fundamental technologies. It allows smaller, less powerful stakeholders to advocate for ideas that don't align with the dominant interests. And it means that nations have common interests in maintaining the stability of global digital infrastructure that we rely on every day.

Open infrastructure technologies have low barriers to access, interconnection, and innovation; more transparency and scrutiny (and therefore fewer overlooked security vulnerabilities); and better user choice. As such, the impacts of protecting and promoting open digital infrastructure are more inclusiveness, resilience, stability, and respect for fundamental rights for the people that rely on this infrastructure every day, around the world. This is why we need to prioritise the open infrastructure ecosystem.

Despite this, the ecosystem as a whole faces a sustainability crisis. There is a major gap in funding, a gap felt most acutely at the foundations and by open source communities outside the digital limelight. For some developers, upskilling, economic security and a love for coding covers the costs of participation, but for many potential participants the barriers remain high.

But money isn't everything. We need to defend the open infrastructure ecosystem from state and corporate capture, inadvertent or otherwise. We need to support its maintenance. We need to incentivise participation from a diverse group of participants. And we need to talk about why this all matters to a non-technical audience, be they corporate budget holders or government decision makers.

This is where fundamental change to the web will have to originate. A good web is one that promotes and protects human rights, from liberty and security, to freedom of expression and opinion, to privacy. The current market model will never deliver this: it perpetuates internet technologies designed and developed to a commercial imperative, and corporations with the time and money to capture standards-setting processes which are meant to

constrain them. The result is the domination of the view that sees rights protections as an annoying constraint on innovation and efficacy, rather than as the key metric of a technology's success. And protection of rights has to rely on continual pushback on their steady erosion - identifying and calling out inevitable abuses, rather than being able to invest fully in building alternatives.

We need human rights embedded in technologies by design: and for this, we need buy-in from every stakeholder that can change the incentives for corporations and demand openness. Governments and regulators are a crucial first line of defence against the proliferation of dangerous new technologies. Investors and advertisers hold critical power that can be used to promote diversity and safety of development. And we need consumers to champion and use technologies which protect their rights.

Licence to publish

Demos – Licence to Publish

The work (as defined below) is provided under the terms of this licence ('licence'). The work is protected by copyright and/or other applicable law. Any use of the work other than as authorized under this licence is prohibited. By exercising any rights to the work provided here, you accept and agree to be bound by the terms of this licence. Demos grants you the rights contained here in consideration of your acceptance of such terms and conditions.

1 Definitions

a 'Collective Work' means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Work in its entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole. A work that constitutes a Collective Work will not be considered a Derivative Work (as defined below) for the purposes of this Licence.

b 'Derivative Work' means a work based upon the Work or upon the Work and other pre-existing works, such as a musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Work may be recast, transformed, or adapted, except that a work that constitutes a Collective Work or a translation from English into another language will not be considered a Derivative Work for the purpose of this Licence.

c 'Licensor' means the individual or entity that offers the Work under the terms of this Licence.

d 'Original Author' means the individual or entity who created the Work.

e 'Work' means the copyrightable work of authorship offered under the terms of this Licence.

f 'You' means an individual or entity exercising rights under this Licence who has not previously violated the terms of this Licence with respect to the Work, or who has received express permission from Demos to exercise rights under this Licence despite a previous violation.

2 Fair Use Rights

Nothing in this licence is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any rights arising from fair use, first sale or other limitations on the exclusive rights of the copyright owner under copyright law or other applicable laws.

3 Licence Grant

Subject to the terms and conditions of this Licence, Licensor hereby grants You a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright) licence to exercise the rights in the Work as stated below:

a to reproduce the Work, to incorporate the Work into one or more Collective Works, and to reproduce the Work as incorporated in the Collective Works;

b to distribute copies or phono-records of, display publicly, perform publicly, and perform publicly by means of a digital audio transmission the Work including as incorporated in Collective Works; The above rights may be exercised in all media and formats whether now known or hereafter devised. The above rights include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. All rights not expressly granted by Licensor are hereby reserved.

4 Restrictions

The licence granted in Section 3 above is expressly made subject to and limited by the following restrictions:

a You may distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work only under the terms of this Licence, and You must include a copy of, or the Uniform Resource Identifier for, this Licence with every copy or phono-record of the Work You distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform. You may not offer or impose any terms on the Work that alter or restrict the terms of this Licence or the recipients' exercise of the rights granted hereunder. You may not sublicence the Work. You must keep intact all notices that refer to this Licence and to the disclaimer of warranties. You may not distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work with any technological measures that control access or use of the Work in a manner inconsistent with the terms of this Licence Agreement. The above applies to the Work as incorporated in a Collective Work, but this does not require the Collective Work apart from the Work itself to be made subject to the terms of this Licence. If You create a Collective Work, upon notice from any Licensor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Collective Work any reference to such Licensor or the Original Author, as requested.

b You may not exercise any of the rights granted to You in Section 3 above in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation. The exchange of the Work for other copyrighted works by means of digital file sharing or otherwise shall not be considered to be intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation, provided there is no payment of any monetary compensation in connection with the exchange of copyrighted works.

c If you distribute, publicly display, publicly perform, or publicly digitally perform the Work or any Collective Works, you must keep intact all copyright notices for the Work and give the Original Author credit reasonable to the medium or means You are utilizing by conveying the name (or pseudonym if applicable) of the Original Author if supplied; the title of the Work if supplied. Such credit may be implemented in any reasonable manner; provided, however, that in the case of a Collective Work, at a minimum such credit will appear where any other comparable authorship credit appears and in a manner at least as prominent as such other comparable authorship credit.

5 Representations, Warranties and Disclaimer

a By offering the Work for public release under this Licence, Licensor represents and warrants that, to the best of Licensor's knowledge after reasonable inquiry:

i Licensor has secured all rights in the Work necessary to grant the licence rights hereunder and to permit the lawful exercise of the rights granted hereunder without You having any obligation to pay any royalties, compulsory licence fees, residuals or any other payments;

ii The Work does not infringe the copyright, trademark, publicity rights, common law rights or any other right of any third party or constitute defamation, invasion of privacy or other tortious injury to any third party.

b Except as expressly stated in this licence or otherwise agreed in writing or required by applicable law, the work is licenced on an 'as is' basis, without warranties of any kind, either express or implied including, without limitation, any warranties regarding the contents or accuracy of the work.

6 Limitation on Liability

Except to the extent required by applicable law, and except for damages arising from liability to a third party resulting from breach of the warranties in section 5, in no event will licensor be liable to you on any legal theory for any special, incidental, consequential, punitive or exemplary damages arising out of this licence or the use of the work, even if licensor has been advised of the possibility of such damages.

7 Termination

a This Licence and the rights granted hereunder will terminate automatically upon any breach by You of the terms of this Licence. Individuals or entities who have received Collective Works from You under this Licence, however, will not have their licences terminated provided such individuals or entities remain in full compliance with those licences. Sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will survive any termination of this Licence.

b Subject to the above terms and conditions, the licence granted here is perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright in the Work). Notwithstanding the above, Licensor reserves the right to release the Work under different licence terms or to stop distributing the Work at any time; provided, however that any such election will not serve to withdraw this Licence (or any other licence that has been, or is required to be, granted under the terms of this Licence), and this Licence will continue in full force and effect unless terminated as stated above.

8 Miscellaneous

a Each time You distribute or publicly digitally perform the Work or a Collective Work, Demos offers to the recipient a licence to the Work on the same terms and conditions as the licence granted to You under this Licence.

b If any provision of this Licence is invalid or unenforceable under applicable law, it shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the terms of this Licence, and without further action by the parties to this agreement, such provision shall be reformed to the minimum extent necessary to make such provision valid and enforceable.

c No term or provision of this Licence shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to unless such waiver or consent shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged with such waiver or consent.

d This Licence constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the Work licenced here. There are no understandings, agreements or representations with respect to the Work not specified here. Licensor shall not be bound by any additional provisions that may appear in any communication from You. This Licence may not be modified without the mutual written agreement of Demos and You.

DEMOS

Demos is a champion of people, ideas and democracy. We bring people together. We bridge divides. We listen and we understand. We are practical about the problems we face, but endlessly optimistic and ambitious about our capacity, together, to overcome them.

At a crossroads in Britain's history, we need ideas for renewal, reconnection and the restoration of hope. Challenges from populism to climate change remain unsolved, and a technological revolution dawns, but the centre of politics has been intellectually paralysed. Demos will change that. We can counter the impossible promises of the political extremes, and challenge despair – by bringing to life an aspirational narrative about the future of Britain that is rooted in the hopes and ambitions of people from across our country.

Demos is an independent, educational charity, registered in England and Wales. (Charity Registration no. 1042046)

Find out more at **www.demos.co.uk**

DEMOS

PUBLISHED BY DEMOS JUNE 2022

15 WHITEHALL, LONDON, SW1A 2DD
T: 020 3878 3955
HELLO@DEMOS.CO.UK
WWW.DEMOS.CO.UK