An Assessment of SMS and AI-Driven Citizen Engagement in U.S. Political Decision-Making

I. Introduction: Reimagining Citizen Engagement in the Digital Age

A. Overview of the Proposed SMS and AI-based Citizen Engagement System

The system under consideration proposes a novel mechanism for citizen engagement in the political decision-making process within the United States. At its core, the system envisions leveraging two ubiquitous technologies: Short Message Service (SMS) and Artificial Intelligence (AI). The process would involve citizens receiving SMS notifications regarding specific pieces of legislation currently under consideration. Via return SMS, citizens could cast a simple "yes/no" vote on the legislation and, optionally, provide more detailed textual comments expressing their opinions, concerns, or suggestions. Subsequently, AI algorithms would be employed to process this influx of citizen feedback. The AI's role would be multifaceted: to summarize the textual comments into coherent and digestible reports, to filter out or flag comments deemed "extreme," and ultimately to present this synthesized feedback to policymakers and their staff.

The fundamental premise of this system is to establish a more direct, continuous, and responsive communication channel between the American citizenry and their elected representatives. By utilizing the widespread accessibility of mobile phones and the analytical power of modern AI, the system aims to democratize access to the policymaking process and provide a scalable method for gathering and understanding public sentiment on an ongoing basis.

B. Purpose and Scope of the Assessment

This report offers a critical evaluation of the proposed SMS and AI-based citizen engagement system. It aims to dissect both its transformative potential for American democracy and the inherent challenges and risks associated with its design and implementation. The assessment will encompass a thorough analysis of its technological feasibility, examining the capabilities and limitations of SMS infrastructure and AI algorithms in fulfilling their designated roles. It will also delve into the potential democratic impact, considering how such a system might alter the dynamics of representation, accountability, and political participation. Ethical considerations, including issues of bias in AI, data privacy, the digital divide, and the potential for manipulation, will be scrutinized. Furthermore, the report will explore the complex governance requirements necessary for such a system to operate legitimately and effectively. A central focus will be its overall viability and its specific capacity to address or ameliorate systemic issues within the U.S. political landscape, such as the frequently cited problem of a

"broken" or dysfunctional Congress.

C. The Allure of Tech-Driven Democracy

The proposal for an SMS and AI-driven engagement system taps into a long-standing aspiration for more direct and participatory forms of democracy, a pursuit with historical roots.[1] Modern technology continuously offers new avenues to realize these ideals, and this system represents a contemporary iteration of that quest. There is a burgeoning interest globally in civic technology (CivicTech) designed to enhance citizen engagement, improve government transparency, and make public services more responsive to citizen needs.[3]

The allure of such a technological solution is particularly potent in contexts where traditional democratic institutions are perceived as unresponsive or mired in gridlock. The idea of empowering individual citizens with a direct line to policymakers, and of providing those policymakers with a clear, aggregated view of public opinion, is undeniably attractive. However, the successful implementation of such a system is not merely a technical challenge. It requires a nuanced understanding of how technology interacts with entrenched political structures, existing power dynamics, diverse political cultures, and fundamental aspects of human behavior. The promise of a technological fix for complex political problems must be tempered by a realistic appraisal of these interactions. The history of direct democracy initiatives and the adoption of civic technologies reveals a landscape of both successes and significant hurdles [7], underscoring that the transformative potential of any such system lies not just in its technological sophistication, but in its careful and considered integration into the intricate fabric of the U.S. socio-political environment.

II. The "Game Changer" Potential: A New Dawn for Deliberative Democracy?

The proposed system, leveraging SMS and AI, presents several avenues through which it could be considered a "game changer" for citizen engagement and democratic responsiveness in the United States. Its potential lies in its capacity to amplify citizen voices, potentially alleviate political gridlock, and enhance the overall accountability and legitimacy of the policy-making process.

A. Amplifying Citizen Voice and Broadening Participation

A primary strength of the proposed system is its reliance on SMS as the main communication channel. Mobile phone penetration in the U.S. is exceptionally high across most demographic groups, and SMS is a near-ubiquitous feature of mobile phone ownership.[9] This widespread accessibility could significantly lower traditional barriers to civic participation. Unlike town hall meetings, which require physical presence and time commitment, or formal written submissions, which can be daunting, sending an SMS is a relatively low-effort activity.[9] This ease of use could attract citizens who are typically less engaged in political processes, thereby broadening the base of participation. Studies on SMS-based voter engagement highlight high open rates and the ability to reach individuals directly, bypassing traditional media filters.[9]

However, while SMS itself is widely accessible, a critical nuance lies in the digital divide

concerning *access to linked web content*.[12] If the initial SMS about legislation contains links to more detailed information online (which would be almost essential for informed feedback on complex bills), then disparities in smartphone ownership, data plans, and home broadband access become significant barriers.[12] Pew Research Center data from late 2023 indicates that while 90% of U.S. adults own a smartphone, ownership and home broadband access still vary by income, age, education, and urban/rural location.[12] For instance, 79% of those in households earning less than $30,000 per year own a smartphone, compared to 98% in households earning $100,000 or more.[12] Similarly, home broadband adoption is 57% for the lowest income bracket versus 95% for the highest.[12] This implies that relying on linked web content could inadvertently disenfranchise the very populations whose voices are often underrepresented.

The system also holds the potential for creating real-time, or near real-time, feedback loops between constituents and policymakers.[16] If legislators can receive timely, aggregated sentiment on bills as they are being debated and amended, it could lead to more dynamic and responsive governance.

B. Potential for Addressing Political Gridlock and a 'Broken Congress'

A key aspiration behind such a system is its potential to address the entrenched political gridlock often characterizing the U.S. Congress. By providing a clear and public signal of constituent preferences on specific legislative items, the system could, in theory, alter the political calculus for elected officials. If a significant majority of a legislator's constituents express a clear preference via this system, it might become politically more costly to vote against that sentiment purely along party lines or due to special interest pressure. This aligns with findings that suggest transparency and accountability mechanisms, like "accountability report cards" for politicians, can influence behavior by highlighting discrepancies between actions and public interest.[17] This system could function as a continuously updated, issue-specific report card.

Furthermore, by providing legislators with data-driven insights into public opinion, synthesized by AI, the system could offer a common factual basis for discussion and negotiation, potentially highlighting areas of unexpected consensus or clarifying the true extent of disagreement.[19] This could help bypass traditional bottlenecks where policy debates are dominated by highly organized and vocal minorities or by partisan talking points that may not reflect broader public sentiment.

A crucial factor here is how policymakers perceive and value this new stream of information. Research indicates that elected officials often discount low-effort online communication, such as social media messages, when compared to higher-effort forms like in-person meetings.[21] An individual SMS vote is a low-effort action. The "game-changer" potential hinges on whether the AI-driven aggregation and summarization can transform millions of these low-effort individual inputs into a collective signal that is perceived by policymakers as credible, representative, and carrying significant political weight. If the AI can demonstrably achieve neutrality and the sampling is seen as robust, this aggregated feedback might attain an influence surpassing current forms of mass digital communication.

C. Enhancing Policy Responsiveness, Legitimacy, and Accountability

The proposed system incorporates elements of direct democracy by allowing citizens to vote on specific pieces of legislation.[1] Historically, direct democratic mechanisms like referenda and initiatives have been used to give citizens a more direct say in policy, with the potential to enrich the political agenda and provide additional instruments of political control.[7] However, these mechanisms are not without pitfalls, including the risk of manipulation by well-resourced groups and the challenge of ensuring voters are adequately informed on complex issues.[7] The design of the SMS/AI system must learn from these historical precedents.

By fostering a more direct and continuous dialogue, the system aligns with the broader trend of GovTech initiatives that aim to create more citizen-centric public services and increase participation in policy decision-making.[4] Cross-country analyses by the World Bank suggest that GovTech platforms enabling citizen participation in policy and feedback on services have a positive impact on citizen engagement, particularly in contexts with efficient governance and low institutional fragility.[6] The U.S. context, with its specific political dynamics and levels of public trust, would need careful assessment against these findings.

A potential consequence, however, is that such a system could inadvertently shift the nature of political representation. Traditionally, representative democracy involves legislators exercising their judgment, informed by a variety of inputs including, but not limited to, constituent opinion. A system providing constant, direct feedback on specific legislation might pressure legislators to act more as "delegates," directly mirroring polled sentiment on every issue, rather than as "trustees" who exercise independent judgment based on a broader understanding of the public good and long-term consequences. While this might appear more "democratic" in a direct sense, it could undermine the deliberative aspects of legislative work, making governance more susceptible to transient public moods or well-orchestrated public relations campaigns, a concern noted in some analyses of direct democracy.[7] The potential impact on the quality of legislation and the capacity for long-term, strategic policymaking warrants careful consideration.

III. Technological Framework: Capabilities and Hurdles

The proposed citizen engagement system rests on two technological pillars: SMS for communication and voting, and AI for analysis and summarization. Each presents a unique set of capabilities, limitations, and inherent challenges that must be addressed for the system to be viable, secure, and trustworthy.

A. SMS as the Backbone: Scalability, Security, and Accessibility

1. Capabilities of Modern SMS Infrastructure (e.g., 10DLC)

SMS technology, particularly with advancements like 10-Digit Long Code (10DLC) designed for application-to-person (A2P) messaging, offers several advantages for a national engagement platform. Its primary strength is its ubiquity; a vast majority of the U.S. population owns a mobile phone capable of sending and receiving SMS messages, and open rates for SMS are exceptionally high, often exceeding 90%.9 This ensures a broad potential reach. Modern SMS infrastructure supports two-way communication, essential for receiving votes and comments.9 Furthermore, messages can be personalized to some extent, and campaigns

can be agile, adapting to evolving legislative schedules.9 Systems for large-scale voter communication via SMS already exist, demonstrating its capacity for mass outbound messaging.9

2. Limitations and Challenges

Despite these capabilities, significant limitations exist. While SMS is effective for outbound mass messaging, the capacity of current networks to handle potentially millions of simultaneous inbound SMS responses (yes/no votes and free-text comments) within a short timeframe, such as a 24-hour voting window, requires rigorous stress-testing and validation. The character limit of standard SMS (160 characters) severely constrains the depth of textual comments citizens can provide. While concatenated SMS allows for longer messages, this can be a clunky user experience and may deter more thoughtful, nuanced feedback, which is a critical component of the system's purported value.

The cost implications are also substantial. Even with per-message costs as low as $0.01 to $0.05 for outbound SMS in the U.S. and $0.01 for received messages [23], a nationwide system engaging millions of citizens on multiple pieces of legislation would incur significant operational expenses for messaging alone. These costs compound when considering the AI processing required for the received comments.

3. Authentication, Fraud Prevention, and Anonymity

This is arguably the Achilles' heel of an SMS-based system for a function as sensitive as influencing legislation.

- **Authentication:** Basic SMS authenticates based on possession of a device linked to a phone number, which is a relatively weak form of authentication. NIST guidance (SP 800-63-4) generally classifies SMS as a less secure authenticator compared to other multi-factor authentication (MFA) methods.[25] While stronger MFA is desirable for critical systems, implementing it seamlessly within a universally accessible SMS-based voting paradigm is extremely challenging.
- **SIM Swap Fraud:** This is a well-documented and growing threat where attackers fraudulently transfer a victim's phone number to a SIM card under their control.[27] This would allow them to intercept voting prompts and cast fraudulent votes or submit comments. While services like Plivo's Lookup API can help detect recent SIM swaps by checking network information and risk scores [27], this is a detection, not a prevention, mechanism and may not be foolproof or instantaneous.
- **Botnets and Coordinated Inauthentic Behavior (CIB):** The system would be a prime target for automated botnets or human-operated CIB campaigns designed to flood it with inauthentic votes or comments, thereby skewing the perceived public sentiment.[29] Preventing this requires sophisticated detection mechanisms that go beyond simple CAPTCHAs, which are not typically used in SMS interactions.
- **Preventing Multiple Votes:** Ensuring "one person, one vote" is a fundamental requirement for any legitimate voting system. With SMS, linking a vote to an individual while preserving anonymity is difficult. Advanced e-voting systems often employ cryptographic techniques like hashes and smart contracts on a blockchain to ensure vote integrity and prevent double voting [31], but the current proposal is SMS-centric.

Without a robust, prior voter registration system linked to unique identifiers (which itself introduces PII challenges), preventing individuals from voting multiple times using different SIM cards or spoofed numbers would be a major hurdle.

- **Anonymity:** The system aims for anonymity in the AI analysis stage. However, the initial SMS message inherently links a vote and comment to a specific phone number, which is Personally Identifiable Information (PII). While this PII would be stripped before AI analysis, the initial linkage exists. True anonymity in voting systems is a complex ideal.[32] The system must ensure not only that PII is effectively stripped but also that the anonymized data cannot be re-identified, and that the act of participation itself does not expose individuals to risks.

The inherent tension in using basic SMS is clear: its strength is accessibility, but this comes at a significant cost to security and the verifiability of authenticity. For a system intended to carry the weight of national public opinion and influence democratic outcomes, these vulnerabilities are profound.

B. The Role of Artificial Intelligence: Summarization, Filtering, and Analysis

AI is tasked with several critical functions: neutrally summarizing legislation and public comments, ensuring accuracy and mitigating bias, filtering "extreme" comments, and potentially identifying novel ideas.

1. AI for Neutral Summarization of Legislative Texts and Public Comments

Large Language Models (LLMs) like GPT-4 have demonstrated capabilities in summarizing complex texts.34 Indeed, legislative staff are already using AI tools for tasks including creating summaries.35 More specialized AI frameworks are also emerging. For instance, the MoDS (Moderating a Mixture of Document Speakers) framework aims to produce balanced summaries of debatable topics from multiple source documents by assigning each document a "speaker" role and using a "moderator" LLM to guide the summarization, thereby representing diverse perspectives more equally.37 The NeuS (Neutral Multi-News Summarization) framework leverages news titles and hierarchical learning to mitigate framing bias when summarizing multiple news articles of varying political leanings.38 Mixture of Experts (MoE) LLMs, which combine multiple specialized models orchestrated by a gating network, can also enhance performance on complex tasks like summarization.39

However, summarizing legislative text for a lay audience via a brief SMS presents unique challenges. Legal documents are notoriously complex, filled with jargon, nuanced phrasing, and conditional clauses that AI can misinterpret.[34] AI models may struggle to distinguish legally binding provisions from advisory language or to grasp subtle variations in how laws apply across different jurisdictions.[34] A key strategy noted in legal AI summarization is to break down lengthy documents into smaller, manageable chunks before processing to maintain quality and avoid overlooking details.[34] The proposed system's initial SMS summary of a bill, constrained to 2-3 sentences, would require an extraordinary level of accurate compression, a task that current AI may find difficult without significant human oversight and validation, especially given the potential for misinterpretation by the public.

Summarizing a vast corpus of diverse, unstructured public comments into neutral and representative overviews is an equally daunting task. The AI must identify common themes,

quantify sentiment accurately, and present a balanced picture that reflects the spectrum of opinions without oversimplifying or misrepresenting them.

2. Ensuring Accuracy, Neutrality, and Mitigating Bias/Hallucination

A significant concern with AI summarizers, particularly abstractive models, is their propensity to "hallucinate" – generating information that is factually incorrect or not present in the source text, especially if trained on poor-quality data.34 While advanced LLMs like GPT-4 have improved accuracy, they are not infallible and require human oversight for critical applications.34 Techniques such as employing a Mixture of Layer Experts (MoLE), which uses different layers of an LVLM as distinct experts (Final Expert, Second Opinion Expert, Prompt Retention Expert) during the decoding process, have been proposed to reduce hallucinations.41 Careful prompt engineering, breaking text into appropriate chunks, and using Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) – grounding AI responses in external, verified sources – can also enhance accuracy.40

Achieving true neutrality in AI outputs is a complex, perhaps even elusive, goal. "Neutrality" itself can be a subjective concept, and AI models inevitably inherit biases from the vast datasets they are trained on.[43] Best practices for striving towards neutrality include:

- **Explicit AI Persona and Goal Definition:** Strictly defining the AI's role as an objective, impartial summarizer focused on verifiable facts and excluding opinion or emotionally charged language.[43]
- **Strong Constraints and Guardrails:** Implementing rules that enforce attribution of viewpoints and forbid the AI from inferring motives or making predictions not explicitly in the source text.[43]
- **Diverse Input Data:** When summarizing public opinion, using diverse sources or ensuring the AI is trained on a wide spectrum of language and viewpoints is crucial.
- **Structured Output Formats:** Requesting summaries in neutral formats (e.g., bullet points of key facts) can help constrain the output and reduce interpretative language.[43]
- **Advanced Techniques:** Employing chain-of-thought prompting or self-critique mechanisms where the AI first identifies potential biases in the source or its own draft summary and then revises it.[43] Comparing outputs from multiple LLMs or different AI models can also help identify and mitigate idiosyncratic biases and improve coverage of perspectives.[44]
- **"Maximum Equal Approval":** Proposed by Jonathan Stray, this concept suggests that a neutral AI answer to a controversial topic is one that the highest possible percentage of people from *each side* of a debate would agree fairly includes their perspective.[44] This provides an empirical metric for neutrality.

Bias mitigation is an ongoing challenge. AI models can inadvertently perpetuate systemic biases related to race, gender, or socioeconomic status if these biases are present in their training data.[45] Addressing this requires meticulous attention to training data diversity, the use of bias detection tools, implementing fairness constraints during model training, and continuous post-deployment monitoring.[46]

Crucially, human oversight remains indispensable, especially for complex and sensitive tasks like summarizing legislation or public political discourse.[34] Human experts are needed to

interpret nuances, assess contextual relevance, make judgment calls that AI cannot, and ultimately validate the accuracy and fairness of AI-generated outputs. AI should be viewed as a powerful tool to augment human capabilities, not replace them entirely in such critical domains.

The pursuit of AI neutrality in this context is better understood as an ongoing aspiration requiring continuous, multi-faceted effort, rather than a purely technical problem with a definitive solution. Given the inherent subjectivity in interpreting "neutrality" and "fairness," especially concerning legislative language and diverse public comments, any AI system will reflect certain underlying assumptions. The focus, therefore, must be on establishing a transparent, auditable, and contestable *process* of AI-assisted summarization and filtering, underpinned by robust human oversight and clear mechanisms for redress if biases or errors are identified.

3. AI for Filtering 'Extreme' Comments

The proposal includes using AI to filter "extreme" comments. This is perhaps the most ethically fraught aspect of the system.

- **Defining 'Extreme':** The very definition of "extreme" is highly subjective, culturally contingent, and politically charged.[46] AI models struggle profoundly with the nuance, context, intent, and human emotions necessary to make such judgments accurately.[47] What one group considers extreme, another might see as legitimate dissent or strongly held belief. The AI4Dignity project attempts to address this by defining extreme speech along axes of truth/falsity and civility/incivility, while heavily emphasizing the importance of context (speaker, target, history, technology).[48]
- **Ethical Considerations:** The primary risks are censorship, the suppression of unpopular but legitimate viewpoints, and a chilling effect on free speech.[47] If the AI's training data is biased, it could disproportionately flag comments from certain demographic groups or those expressing particular political ideologies as "extreme".[45] The "black box" nature of many AI algorithms—where the reasoning behind a decision is opaque—makes it difficult to scrutinize and challenge filtering decisions.[45]
- **Role of Human Review:** Given these risks, mandatory human review is essential for any comments flagged by AI as potentially "extreme," especially in high-risk scenarios like political discourse.[47] AI can serve as a first-pass filter to flag content, but final decisions on removal or suppression must rest with human moderators operating under clear, transparent, and democratically legitimized guidelines. The AI4Dignity framework, for example, proposes a hybrid human-machine model involving fact-checkers, ethnographers, and AI developers to bring cultural contextualization to the process.[48]

If not governed with exceptional care, transparency, and robust due process, the AI's role in filtering "extreme" comments could easily transform from a tool for managing harmful content into an instrument of political censorship or the systematic marginalization of dissenting, albeit non-violent and constitutionally protected, viewpoints. In a polarized political climate, the definition of "extreme" can become a weapon. The system must guard against this by ensuring that any filtering criteria are narrowly defined, publicly debated, and consistently applied, with accessible avenues for appeal.

4. AI for Anomaly Detection: Identifying Novel Ideas from Public Comments

Beyond summarizing common themes, AI can also be used for anomaly detection—identifying rare data points or patterns that deviate significantly from the norm.49 In the context of public comments, this could potentially be used to surface unique, innovative, or outlier suggestions and concerns that might be missed in a standard thematic summarization focused on majority opinions. This could add significant value by ensuring that less common but potentially insightful perspectives are brought to policymakers' attention.53

- **Scalability and Techniques:** Anomaly detection can be computationally demanding, especially for vast datasets like millions of textual comments.[49] Scalable AI techniques for this include statistical methods, unsupervised machine learning algorithms like Isolation Forest, MiniBatch K-Means, and incremental Principal Component Analysis (PCA), as well as deep learning approaches like autoencoders.[49] For text, NLP would first be used to convert comments into numerical representations (embeddings) that these algorithms can process.
- **Challenges:** The primary challenge lies in defining what constitutes a "novel idea" versus an irrelevant, nonsensical, or simply poorly expressed comment. The AI must be tuned to identify substantively unique contributions rather than just statistical outliers in language use. There's also the risk of amplifying fringe ideas that are not constructive or representative. Human review of flagged "anomalies" would be essential to determine their actual value and relevance.

C. Data Security, PII Protection, and Anonymity

Protecting citizens' Personally Identifiable Information (PII) and ensuring the anonymity of their feedback are paramount for the trustworthiness and ethical operation of the proposed system.

1. Mechanisms for PII Stripping from SMS Data

The core PII involved is the citizen's phone number, and potentially any names, locations, or other identifying details mentioned within the text of their comments. A robust PII stripping process is essential before any data is passed to AI systems for analysis.

- **Identification and Classification:** The first step is to accurately identify all PII within the incoming SMS data.[57] This involves recognizing phone numbers and using Natural Language Processing (NLP) techniques like Named Entity Recognition (NER) to find names, specific addresses, etc., within the comment text.
- **Automated PII Redaction/Masking:** Once identified, PII must be permanently obscured or removed. Data masking techniques can replace real data with fictional but realistic values (though for comments, simple redaction is more likely), while redaction aims to permanently black out or delete the sensitive information.[57] Regular expressions can be effective for phone number patterns, while NER outputs can guide the redaction of other PII in text.
- **Two-Server Architecture (Conceptual):** A secure architectural design would involve at least two distinct server environments. An "Intake Server" would receive the raw SMS messages containing PII. This server would be responsible for performing the PII stripping and potentially generating a unique, anonymized identifier for each comment

(if needed for linking votes to comments without PII). Only the anonymized data (e.g., yes/no vote, the redacted comment, and the anonymous ID) would then be transmitted to a separate "Analysis Server" where the AI processing occurs.[57] This segregation minimizes the exposure of PII to the analytical components and personnel. Enterprise-grade Customer Identity Access Management (CIAM) systems and API Gateways can offer secure, pre-built functionalities for PII management, including masking and anonymization before data is relayed to downstream systems.[59]

2. Ensuring Constituent Anonymity while Maintaining Data Integrity

While PII stripping is a technical process, ensuring genuine anonymity and maintaining the integrity of the collected data requires a broader set of safeguards:

- **Cryptographic Techniques:** For the voting component, even if not a full blockchain implementation, principles from secure e-voting could be adapted. For instance, once a vote is received and PII stripped, a cryptographic hash could be associated with the anonymized vote to help ensure its integrity and detect tampering, without revealing the source.
- **Data Minimization:** The system should only collect the data absolutely necessary for its function. If demographic analysis of comments is desired (e.g., to see if different groups have different concerns), this should be strictly opt-in, and extreme care must be taken to prevent re-identification from combined data points.
- **Robust Key Management:** If encryption is used for data at rest (e.g., on the intake server before PII stripping is complete, or for the anonymized data store) or in transit between servers, industry-standard encryption algorithms (e.g., AES-256) and robust key management systems with proper lifecycle management are crucial.[57]
- **Strict Access Controls:** Role-Based Access Controls (RBAC) and the Principle of Least Privilege (PoLP) must be rigorously enforced to limit who can access raw data (containing PII) on the intake server and the anonymized data on the analysis server.[57] Access should be logged and regularly audited.
- **Auditing and Continuous Monitoring:** Implement real-time monitoring for data access patterns, anomalies, and potential security breaches using tools like Security Information and Event Management (SIEM) systems.[54]
- **Secure Data Retention and Deletion Policies:** Clear, publicly stated policies must define how long raw SMS data (containing PII) is stored on the intake server before it is securely and irretrievably deleted. Anonymized data retention also needs a policy.
- **Data Integrity Checks:** Methods such as hashing can be used to ensure that the content of an anonymized comment sent for AI analysis accurately reflects the original comment (minus PII) and has not been altered during the stripping or transmission process.

It is critical to recognize that achieving absolute, unbreakable anonymity is exceptionally difficult if any link, however temporary or indirect, exists between the PII (phone number) and the submitted vote or comment. The initial SMS is, by nature, tied to a phone number. Therefore, the system's design should focus on *strong pseudonymization and robust de-identification protocols*, coupled with strict data governance, legal safeguards, and

transparency about these processes. The goal is to make re-identification computationally infeasible and legally prohibited, with severe penalties for any breaches. Public trust will hinge on the perceived strength and transparency of these safeguards.[57]

To enhance transparency and accountability in this critical PII handling process, the following workflow table is proposed:

Table 1: PII Stripping and Anonymization Workflow

Step	Description	Technology/Method	Security Considerations	Responsible Entity (Example)
SMS Reception	Citizen sends SMS vote/comment to a designated short/long code.	SMS Gateway, Secure Intake Server	Encrypted transmission (TLS to gateway), secure server environment, access controls.	System Operator
Initial PII ID	System automatically identifies phone number (sender ID) and scans comment text for other potential PII.	Phone number parsing, NER tools for names, locations, etc.	Accuracy of NER, handling of ambiguous PII.	System Operator (Automated)
PII Redaction/Masking	Phone number is dissociated. Identified PII in comment text is redacted or masked.	Redaction algorithms, masking techniques.	Irreversibility of redaction, ensuring no residual PII. Regular expression validation for phone number removal.	System Operator (Automated)
Anonymous ID Gen.	(Optional) A unique, non-identifiable token is generated and associated with the vote/anonymized comment.	Cryptographic hash function or random ID generator.	Ensuring token is not linkable back to PII. Collision resistance if used for vote integrity.	System Operator (Automated)
Data Transmission	Anonymized vote and/or comment (with anonymous ID if used) is sent	Secure, encrypted channel (e.g., VPN, TLS).	Protection against man-in-the-middle attacks, data integrity checks	System Operator

	to the AI Analysis Server.		(e.g., checksums).	
AI Processing	AI models summarize comments, filter for extremism, perform anomaly detection on anonymized data.	LLMs, classification models, anomaly detection algorithms.	AI models should not have access to any PII. Processing logs should be anonymized.	System Operator (AI System)
Data Storage (Anon.)	Anonymized data, AI summaries, and metadata are stored securely.	Encrypted databases, access controls, audit logs.	Regular security audits, vulnerability assessments.	System Operator
Data Deletion (Raw)	Raw SMS data containing PII on the Intake Server is securely deleted according to a defined retention policy.	Secure data wiping utilities, cryptographic erasure.	Verification of deletion, compliance with data disposal regulations. Short retention period for raw PII data.	System Operator

Sources for Table 1 elements: [57]

IV. Critical Assessment: Assumptions, Feasibility, and Potential Pushback

The proposal for an SMS and AI-driven citizen engagement system, while innovative, rests on several core assumptions and faces significant feasibility challenges. Its implementation would also likely encounter various forms of pushback.

A. Examining Core Assumptions

1. Citizen Willingness and Capacity for Sustained Engagement

The system assumes that a large number of citizens will not only be willing to participate initially but will also sustain this engagement over time, across numerous pieces of legislation. While the novelty of such a system might drive initial interest 8, maintaining long-term participation is a well-documented challenge for civic tech platforms.61

A primary concern is *voter fatigue*. Frequent requests for input, especially on complex legislative matters, can lead to declining response rates and a reduction in the quality of feedback provided.[63] Research indicates that a high frequency of elections or voting opportunities can depress overall participation and increase the social acceptability of abstention, even among politically engaged citizens.[64] If citizens are asked to weigh in too often, the perceived importance of each individual call to participate may diminish.

The system also assumes a certain capacity among citizens to understand and form opinions

on potentially intricate legislative proposals based on very brief SMS summaries. The quality and neutrality of these initial AI-generated summaries are therefore paramount. If summaries are perceived as inadequate or biased, or if the legislation itself is too complex to be meaningfully condensed, informed participation becomes difficult.

Motivation for continued engagement is another critical factor. What will incentivize citizens to keep participating? Is it the intrinsic belief that their voice is being heard and is influential? Or will extrinsic motivators, such as gamification elements or clear feedback loops demonstrating the impact of their participation, be necessary to sustain interest over the long term?[65]

2. Impact of AI-Summarized Peer Opinions on Individual Decision-Making

The system proposes to provide AI-synthesized feedback to policymakers, and potentially back to the public in some form. If summaries of overall public sentiment or common comment themes are disseminated, this introduces the psychological phenomenon of social proof. When individuals are uncertain or faced with ambiguous situations, they often look to the actions and opinions of others as a guide for their own behavior and beliefs.68 Exposure to AI-summarized peer opinions could lead to conformity, where individuals align their views with the perceived majority, particularly if they are less informed or engaged on the issue.

Conversely, in a polarized environment, such summaries could exacerbate *polarization*. If the AI summaries inadvertently highlight divisive aspects, or if individuals selectively focus on elements that confirm their pre-existing biases, the system could reinforce partisan divides rather than fostering common ground.[70] Experimental studies have shown that interaction with biased AI language models can indeed shift users' political opinions and decision-making to align with the AI's bias, irrespective of the users' own initial partisanship.[71]

The question then becomes whether this system promotes more informed decision-making or encourages reliance on cognitive shortcuts. Will citizens delve deeper into issues, or will AI summaries become a simplified proxy for public opinion, potentially masking the complexity and diversity of views? The persuasive power of AI is also a factor; research indicates that AI-generated persuasive messages can be as effective as those written by humans in swaying opinions on controversial political topics.[73] This capability, if applied to summarizing peer opinions, needs careful ethical management to avoid undue influence.

3. Legislator Responsiveness to AI-Synthesized Feedback

A fundamental assumption is that legislators will find the AI-synthesized feedback credible and will be responsive to it. However, studies on legislator communication show that policymakers often discount low-effort forms of online constituent communication, such as social media messages or emails, when compared to higher-effort interactions like in-person meetings or personalized letters.21 An SMS vote is a low-effort action for the citizen. For this system to have an impact, the aggregated and AI-analyzed feedback must be perceived by legislators as a highly credible, representative, and politically salient signal of district-wide opinion.

Even if the feedback is perceived as credible, its actual influence on legislative behavior is not guaranteed. Legislators weigh multiple factors when making decisions, including party discipline, lobbying efforts, expert testimony, personal ideology, and re-election concerns.[75] Research suggests that a legislator's own ideological preference often trumps district opinion

when the two conflict.[76] Therefore, the AI-generated summaries must be presented in a compelling and actionable format to cut through the noise of competing influences.[19] While some legislative offices are already using AI for tasks like summarization and research [35], this system proposes a more direct and potentially more influential public-to-legislator pipeline. The system appears to assume a model of direct, almost plebiscitary, influence on legislators. This may not align with the intricate realities of legislative decision-making in a representative democracy, which involves negotiation, compromise, and the balancing of diverse and often conflicting interests. The system's impact will depend on its ability to become a trusted and salient input within this complex ecosystem. If it is seen as easily manipulated, unrepresentative, or simply another source of pressure, it risks being ignored. Conversely, if it becomes too dominant, it could lead to a form of governance by constant polling, potentially undermining deliberative processes and long-term policy considerations.

B. Feasibility Challenges

1. The Digital Divide: Ensuring Equitable Access and Participation

While SMS is widespread, its use as a gateway to civic participation is not immune to the digital divide.

- **Device Access:** As of early 2024, Pew Research Center data indicates that 90% of U.S. adults own a smartphone.[10] However, this still means a segment of the population, often correlated with lower income, older age, and lower educational attainment, may lack the primary device needed to participate.[12] For example, smartphone ownership is 79% among those in households earning less than $30,000 annually, compared to 98% for those earning $100,000 or more.[12]
- **Digital Literacy:** Understanding SMS prompts, interpreting even AI-simplified legislative summaries, and grasping the implications of a "vote" requires a baseline of digital and civic literacy.[8] Older Americans and those with lower levels of education report lower confidence in their digital skills and are more likely to need help with new devices.[14]
- **Access to Linked Web Content:** If initial SMS summaries must, for brevity, link to more detailed legislative information online, disparities in home broadband access become a critical barrier.[12] In 2023, 80% of U.S. adults had home broadband, but this figure drops to 57% for households earning less than $30,000.[12] A significant portion of lower-income individuals are "smartphone-dependent" for internet access [12], which may involve data caps or less stable connections, making extensive online research difficult.
- **Language Barriers:** To be truly inclusive, the system would need to provide summaries and prompts in multiple languages, adding to its complexity and cost.[13]
- **Implications of the Divide:** Without proactive measures to address these disparities, the system risks amplifying the voices of those already digitally proficient and civically engaged, thereby skewing the "public opinion" presented to legislators and potentially deepening existing inequalities in political representation.[8]

2. Voter Fatigue and Maintaining Long-Term Engagement

As previously discussed, maintaining citizen engagement in a system that frequently polls on legislation is a major hurdle.64

- **Strategies for Sustained Engagement:** Success will depend on clearly defined objectives, user-friendly platform design, demonstrable impact of participation, and fostering a safe and transparent environment.[62] Showing citizens how their collective input influences policy (feedback loops) is crucial.[67] Gamification techniques (points, badges for participation) and personalized messaging could also play a role in maintaining interest.[65] However, these must be carefully designed to avoid trivializing the civic process.

3. Risks of Disinformation, Manipulation, and Inauthentic Behavior

The system's reliance on SMS makes it vulnerable to various forms of manipulation:

- **Astroturfing and CIB:** Coordinated campaigns by domestic special interests, partisan groups, or even foreign entities could attempt to flood the system with inauthentic votes and comments to create a misleading picture of public sentiment.[30] The ease of acquiring SIM cards or using automated systems poses a threat.
- **Foreign Interference:** Beyond astroturfing, foreign actors could exploit system vulnerabilities to sow discord, spread disinformation within the comments, or attempt to influence policy perceptions on critical issues.[81]
- **Disinformation within Comments:** Even if "extreme" comments are filtered, subtle disinformation or propaganda within otherwise acceptable comments could be summarized by the AI and presented to legislators as genuine constituent feedback.
- **AI-Generated Attacks:** The system, while using AI for analysis, could itself be targeted by adversarial AI generating large volumes of seemingly authentic but manipulative comments or votes.[73]
- **Mitigation:** Robust authentication measures (though difficult with basic SMS), advanced bot detection, and potentially AI-powered systems to identify coordinated inauthentic behavior patterns will be essential but challenging to implement effectively at scale.[27]

4. Logistical and Financial Scalability

The operational costs of such a nationwide system would be immense.

- **SMS Costs:** Sending initial prompts and receiving potentially millions of votes and comments for each piece of "significant legislation" will incur substantial messaging fees.[9]
- **AI Processing Costs:** Sophisticated AI for summarization, neutrality assurance, extreme comment filtering, and anomaly detection, operating at scale with rapid turnaround times, requires significant and ongoing computational resources.[37] Cloud provider pricing for services like Azure AI Language shows that processing millions of text records for summarization or sentiment analysis can cost thousands of dollars per month, with additional costs for model training and hosting.[93] Anomaly detection also has per-transaction costs.[94]
- **Human Oversight Costs:** A considerable team of human reviewers and subject-matter experts would be necessary to validate AI-generated legislative summaries, oversee the fairness of comment filtering, handle appeals, and ensure the overall quality and integrity of the information provided to policymakers. This represents a significant and

ongoing labor cost.

The financial and logistical sustainability of this system is a critical, yet often underestimated, feasibility challenge. Without a clear, sustainable, and politically neutral funding model (e.g., public funding with stringent safeguards against partisan control, as private funding could introduce bias), the system's long-term operation is questionable. This financial architecture is deeply intertwined with issues of governance and public trust.

C. Ethical and Governance Dilemmas

1. Defining and Selecting 'Significant Legislation' for Public Input

A pivotal and politically sensitive decision is determining which legislative proposals are deemed "significant" enough to be put through this public feedback system.

- **Who Decides?** This process must be transparent and shielded from partisan manipulation. Options include an independent, non-partisan commission, a dedicated legislative committee with bipartisan representation, or a hybrid model.[95]
- **Criteria for 'Significance':** Establishing objective criteria is challenging. Should significance be based on budgetary impact, the number of citizens affected, the degree of public controversy, constitutional implications, or other factors?[98] Public consultation processes often struggle when the scope or criteria for inclusion are unclear or applied inconsistently.[98]
- **Risk of Overload vs. Tokenism:** Polling on too many bills could overwhelm citizens and lead to extreme fatigue. Polling on too few, or only on non-controversial items, could render the system a tokenistic exercise.

2. Ensuring Neutrality in AI Processes and Outputs

The credibility of the entire system hinges on the perceived and actual neutrality of the AI's outputs.

- **AI Governance Frameworks:** Robust AI governance frameworks are essential, emphasizing ethical oversight, regulatory compliance (e.g., aligning with NIST AI RMF, OECD AI Principles), risk management (especially for bias and security), transparency, and accountability.[100] AI Ethics Committees should play a central role in developing and overseeing these policies.[100]
- **Oversight of Summaries and Filtering:** A dedicated, independent body or a panel of diverse experts should review and approve AI-generated legislative summaries before dissemination via SMS to ensure accuracy, neutrality, and comprehensibility for a lay audience. Similarly, the criteria and application of AI for filtering "extreme" comments must be subject to stringent human oversight and regular audits.[77]
- **Algorithmic Transparency:** While full exposure of proprietary AI models may be unrealistic, the principles, criteria, and high-level logic used by the AI for summarization and filtering should be publicly understandable and documented.[44]

3. Establishing Robust, Trustworthy Governance and Oversight Mechanisms

The overall governance of the platform is as critical as its technological components.

- **Independent Body:** The most viable model for ensuring neutrality and public trust for sensitive functions like selecting legislation and overseeing AI outputs is likely an independent, non-partisan, professional body with diverse representation, including

technical experts, legal scholars, ethicists, and citizen representatives.[95] This body would set policy, audit performance, and handle disputes. Models like Citizens' Juries or independent electoral commissions offer precedents.[96]

- **Decentralized Autonomous Organizations (DAOs):** While DAOs offer a novel approach to decentralized governance using blockchain and smart contracts [102], they face significant challenges in practice. These include voter apathy, the concentration of power among large token holders ("whales"), difficulties in balancing diverse interests (e.g., commercial vs. public good), maintaining adaptive integrity in the face of evolving circumstances, and achieving true decentralization without emergent hierarchies.[104] Given these issues, a DAO model is unlikely to be suitable for governing a national-level civic technology platform that requires profound political neutrality and broad, sustained public trust, at least with current DAO governance maturity.
- **Transparency and Public Trust:** All operational aspects, funding sources, decision-making processes, and performance metrics of the system must be transparent to build and maintain public trust.[4]

4. Impact on Free Speech and Potential for Censorship

The AI-driven filtering of "extreme" comments presents a direct challenge to free speech principles.

- **The 'Extreme' Labyrinth:** As established, defining "extreme" is fraught with subjectivity and the risk of political bias.[47] Any attempt to automate this filtering risks unfairly silencing legitimate, albeit unpopular or critical, viewpoints.
- **Chilling Effects:** The knowledge that comments are being monitored and filtered by AI for "extremism" could lead to self-censorship, discouraging citizens from expressing genuine concerns or unconventional ideas, thereby narrowing the scope of public discourse.
- **Due Process and Appeals:** A robust, transparent, and timely appeals process for individuals whose comments are filtered is essential to provide due process and correct errors.

5. Ethical Implications of Conditioning Media Access on Participation

The user query alluded to a hypothetical scenario where journalists might need to participate (e.g., "vote") in the system to gain access to its AI-generated summaries of public opinion. Such a requirement would raise grave ethical concerns for journalism.

- **Compromised Independence and Objectivity:** Forcing journalists to participate in a system they are meant to cover objectively would inherently compromise their independence.[106] The act of participation, however symbolic, could be seen as an endorsement or create a conflict of interest, affecting their ability to report impartially on the system itself or the public opinion it purports to represent.
- **Information as a Public Good:** Information about public sentiment on legislation, especially if generated through a publicly-sanctioned system, should be accessible to the media (and the public) without preconditions that could impinge on journalistic ethics.[106] APM Reports' ethics guidelines, for example, stress that journalists gain access through honesty and do not make promises or engage in activities that could

compromise their integrity in exchange for information.[107]

The governance model chosen for this system is paramount. A flawed, biased, or opaque governance structure will inevitably undermine any technological sophistication and erode public trust, potentially transforming a tool intended for democratic enhancement into one that simulates responsiveness or, worse, enables manipulation.

D. Potential Pushback and Societal Impact

1. Resistance from Existing Political Structures

Elected officials, accustomed to current modes of constituent interaction and legislative maneuvering, may resist a system they perceive as undermining their autonomy, subjecting them to constant public scrutiny, or obligating them to respond to what they might consider "uninformed" or easily swayed public opinion. Political parties and powerful special interest groups, whose influence operates through established channels, might view such a direct citizen feedback mechanism as a threat to their influence, or alternatively, seek to co-opt or manipulate it for their own ends.

2. Public Trust in AI and Automated Decision-Making

There is considerable public skepticism and concern regarding the role of AI in society, particularly its potential for bias, error, and the spread of misinformation.70 Building public trust in AI-generated legislative summaries and the AI-filtered representation of public comments will be a significant hurdle. The "black box" nature of many AI algorithms, where the decision-making process is not easily interpretable, fuels this suspicion and makes accountability difficult.45

3. Risk of Creating Echo Chambers or Exacerbating Polarization

If the AI summaries or the presentation of filtered comments inadvertently favor certain viewpoints, or if individuals are primarily exposed to feedback that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs, the system could reinforce echo chambers rather than fostering a more informed and deliberative public sphere.110 The very act of presenting "public opinion" could become another battleground for partisan framing and interpretation. While strategies exist to promote exposure to diverse perspectives, such as the HearHere system which uses AI to classify political stances in news to encourage balanced consumption 111, these are not without their own complexities and potential for unintended consequences, such as backfire effects where exposure to opposing views hardens initial beliefs.111 Applying prosocial tech design principles, which focus on creating digital environments that encourage constructive interaction and common ground, could be a more holistic approach.113

The system could paradoxically lead to increased political cynicism. If citizens invest time and effort to participate but perceive no tangible impact on legislative outcomes, or if the AI-generated summaries are widely seen as biased, easily gamed, or simply a performative exercise in engagement by politicians, disillusionment with both the technology and the democratic process could deepen.[8] This connects directly to the challenge of voter fatigue; fatigue arises not just from the frequency of participation requests but also from a perceived lack of efficacy.[64] A high-tech system that fails to deliver on its core promise of enhanced responsiveness could further alienate citizens.

To provide a structured overview of these multifaceted risks, the following table summarizes

key challenges and potential mitigation strategies:

Table 2: Key Challenges to SMS/AI-driven Citizen Engagement and Proposed Mitigation Strategies

Challenge Area	Specific Challenge	Potential Impact	Proposed Mitigation Strategies (Illustrative Snippet IDs)
Technological	Digital Divide (Access & Literacy)	Unequal participation, skewed representation	Public access points, digital literacy programs, multilingual support, simple UX [8]
	SMS Security (SIM Swap, Bots, Spam)	Fraudulent voting, system overload, loss of trust	SIM swap detection (e.g., Plivo API [27]), advanced bot detection, robust authentication for registration (if any)
	AI Neutrality (Summaries)	Biased information to legislators/public, erosion of trust	Diverse training data, "max equal approval" [44], MoDS [37], human oversight, transparent criteria [43]
	AI Fairness (Filtering "Extreme" Comments)	Censorship, suppression of dissent, chilling effect	Narrow, public definitions of "extreme," human review of flagged content, appeals process [47]
	Data Privacy & Anonymity	PII breaches, re-identification, loss of trust	Robust PII stripping, secure two-server architecture, encryption, access controls, clear data retention/deletion policies [57]
Engagement	Voter Fatigue / Low Sustained Engagement	Declining participation, unrepresentative feedback	Manage polling frequency, demonstrate impact (feedback loops), gamification, personalized outreach

			[64]
	Misinformation & Manipulation (Astroturfing, Foreign Interference)	Skewed policy influence, erosion of democratic integrity	AI-based CIB detection, verification of participant eligibility (challenging with SMS), collaboration with cybersecurity agencies [80]
Governance	Defining 'Significant' Legislation	Partisan selection, public overload or perceived tokenism	Independent body with clear, public criteria for selection [96]
	Governance & Oversight of System	Lack of trust, capture by special interests, biased operation	Independent, non-isan, multi-stakeholder oversight body; transparent funding; regular audits [96]
	Cost & Scalability (Financial, Logistical)	System unsustainability, reliance on biased funding	Secure, long-term public funding with safeguards; phased rollout; efficiency optimization [9]

This table draws on a comprehensive range of cited research material.

V. Can This System Fix a 'Broken Congress'? A Realistic Appraisal

The allure of the proposed SMS and AI-driven citizen engagement system is partly rooted in the hope that it could be a mechanism to mend aspects of a "broken Congress," often characterized by partisan deadlock, perceived unresponsiveness, and low public trust. While the system has the potential to introduce positive changes, a realistic appraisal must acknowledge its limitations in addressing the deep, structural issues underpinning congressional dysfunction.

A. Analyzing the System's Potential to Improve Legislative Efficiency and Reduce Partisan Deadlock

By increasing the transparency of public sentiment on specific legislative items, the system could exert a new form of public scrutiny on legislators.[17] If there is a clear, widely known consensus among a legislator's constituents on a particular bill, it might become more politically challenging to vote strictly along party lines in opposition to that consensus, or to engage in obstructionist tactics without clear justification. This heightened visibility could, in some instances, incentivize cooperation or make partisan intransigence more politically costly. If the feedback gathered is genuinely issue-specific and the AI summaries effectively capture nuanced public opinion rather than just raw approval or disapproval, it might encourage

legislators to consider the merits of a bill beyond purely partisan lenses. Furthermore, sophisticated AI analysis of textual comments could potentially identify unexpected areas of public consensus or common ground on complex issues, even among citizens who identify with different political parties.[19] Presenting such findings to legislators could open new avenues for bipartisan compromise that are currently obscured by polarized rhetoric.

B. Limitations in Addressing Deeper Structural Issues Within Congress

Despite these potential benefits, the proposed system is unlikely to be a panacea for the multifaceted problems contributing to a "broken Congress." Several fundamental aspects of the U.S. political and legislative system would remain largely untouched:

- **Influence of Money in Politics and Lobbying:** The system does not directly address the powerful influence of campaign contributions, corporate lobbying, and well-funded special interest groups, which often play a significant role in shaping legislation and legislative priorities.
- **Gerrymandering and Electoral Pressures:** In many congressional districts, gerrymandering has created "safe seats" where the primary election is often more decisive than the general election. In such contexts, legislators may be more responsive to the preferences of their party's primary voters, who are often more ideologically extreme, than to broader public opinion within their district.
- **Procedural Rules and Norms within Congress:** The internal dynamics of Congress, including rules like the Senate filibuster, the power of committee chairs, the influence of party leadership in setting the agenda, and long-standing norms of behavior, are significant drivers of legislative outcomes. An external citizen feedback system, however robust, is unlikely to fundamentally alter these internal power structures and procedural realities on its own.
- **Deep-Seated Ideological Polarization:** The U.S. is experiencing significant ideological polarization among both elites and the public. While the proposed system might help moderate positions on some specific issues or reveal areas of shared interest, it is unlikely to bridge fundamental ideological divides on highly contentious topics. Indeed, as noted earlier, direct democracy tools can sometimes be co-opted by political parties to advance polarizing agendas rather than foster consensus.[7]

A "broken Congress" is a symptom of a complex interplay of political, societal, and institutional factors. These include the nature of media coverage, the structure of the campaign finance system, the decline of cross-party social interaction among legislators, and broader societal trends in civic engagement and trust. The proposed SMS/AI system primarily targets one dimension of this complex equation: the communication channel between citizens and their representatives and the transparency of public sentiment on specific issues. While it could provide better *information* to legislators and increase the *visibility* of public opinion, it does not fundamentally alter many of the core *incentives* (e.g., fundraising, primary challenges) or the *structural constraints* (e.g., procedural rules, party discipline) under which legislators operate.

Therefore, its ability to "fix" Congress is likely limited. It might improve responsiveness on certain issues where public opinion is clear, widely shared, and intensely held, making it politically risky for legislators to ignore. However, for issues where public opinion is divided,

less salient, or where powerful countervailing interests are at play, the system's impact may be marginal in overcoming systemic gridlock or deep-seated partisanship.

VI. Recommendations and The Path Forward

The concept of an SMS and AI-driven citizen engagement system for political decision-making in the U.S. is ambitious and carries both significant promise and substantial risks. For such a system to move from a theoretical proposal to a viable and beneficial democratic tool, a cautious, iterative, and ethically grounded approach is essential.

A. Key Considerations for Designing and Implementing Such a System

- **Pilot Programs and Iterative Development:** Given the novelty, complexity, and potential for unintended consequences, a full-scale national rollout without extensive prior testing would be imprudent. The system should begin with smaller-scale, localized pilot programs (e.g., at the municipal or state level, or focused on specific policy areas). These pilots would allow for rigorous testing of technological feasibility (SMS load, AI accuracy), user engagement patterns, security vulnerabilities, and overall impact. Learnings from these pilots would be crucial for refining the technology, operational processes, and governance structures before any consideration of broader application. This phased, experimental approach is vital for identifying and mitigating risks proactively.[8]
- **Multi-Modal Approach to Engagement:** Relying solely on SMS, despite its ubiquity, will inevitably exclude certain populations and limit the depth of engagement. The system should be designed as part of a broader, multi-modal citizen engagement strategy. This includes providing alternative channels for participation (e.g., web portals, phone lines for voice input, partnerships with community organizations for in-person feedback collection) and ensuring that information about legislation is accessible through various formats to cater to different literacy levels and accessibility needs.
- **User-Centric Design:** The interface for citizens must be exceptionally simple, intuitive, and trustworthy. This includes the language used in SMS prompts, the clarity of legislative summaries, and the ease of submitting votes and comments. User testing with diverse demographic groups throughout the design process is critical.

B. Strategies for Mitigating Identified Risks and Challenges

- **Security and Authentication:**
    - For any initial registration phase (if deemed necessary to link participation to verified individuals, though this complicates anonymity), robust multi-factor authentication methods should be explored, moving beyond simple SMS verification if possible.[115]
    - Implement advanced SIM swap detection services (e.g., leveraging carrier APIs or services like Plivo Lookup [27]) and monitor for suspicious account activity.
    - Employ sophisticated bot detection and mitigation techniques, potentially using AI to identify patterns of inauthentic activity.
- **AI Ethics and Neutrality:**
    - Establish a comprehensive AI ethics framework from the outset, with clear

guidelines for development, training, and deployment of AI models used for summarization and filtering.[100] This framework must prioritize fairness, accountability, and transparency.
    - Mandate rigorous, ongoing audits of AI algorithms for bias (demographic, ideological, etc.) by independent third parties.
    - Ensure all AI-generated legislative summaries and critical filtering decisions are subject to human review and approval by a diverse, non-partisan team of experts before dissemination or action.[34]
    - Strive for algorithmic transparency by publicly documenting the criteria and methodologies used by the AI, even if specific code remains proprietary.[44]
- **Addressing the Digital Divide:**
    - Partner with community organizations, libraries, and local governments to provide public access points for participation for those without personal devices or internet access.
    - Invest in digital literacy programs to equip citizens with the skills needed to engage effectively and critically with the system.[8]
    - Ensure all communications and legislative summaries are available in multiple languages relevant to the U.S. population.
- **Combating Fatigue and Maintaining Engagement:**
    - Carefully manage the frequency of polling to avoid overwhelming citizens.[64]
    - Implement clear feedback mechanisms that show citizens how their collective input is being used and what impact it is having (or not having) on policy decisions.[67] Transparency about impact is key to sustained motivation.
    - Explore ethical uses of gamification (e.g., rewarding consistent participation with recognition rather than monetary incentives) or personalized updates based on user-expressed interests to maintain engagement.[62]

C. Proposals for Governance, Oversight, and Ensuring Ethical Deployment

The governance structure for this system is arguably the most critical determinant of its legitimacy and success.

- **Independent, Non-Partisan Oversight Body:** The establishment of a truly independent, non-partisan, and professionally staffed oversight body is paramount. This body should be responsible for:
    - Defining the transparent criteria for selecting "significant legislation" to be included in the system.[96]
    - Overseeing and approving the AI-generated legislative summaries for neutrality, accuracy, and clarity before they are sent to citizens.
    - Establishing and overseeing the protocols for AI-based filtering of "extreme" comments, including the definition of "extreme" and the human review and appeals processes.[48]
    - Commissioning regular, independent audits of the system's technology, algorithms, security, and overall impact.
    - Ensuring compliance with data privacy regulations and ethical guidelines.

    - This body should have diverse representation, including technologists, legal experts, ethicists, social scientists, and representatives of civil society and the general public. Models could be drawn from existing independent bodies like certain electoral commissions or specialized regulatory agencies, or deliberative bodies like Citizens' Juries.[96]
- **Transparent and Sustainable Funding Model:** The system should ideally be publicly funded to ensure its independence and avoid conflicts of interest associated with private or corporate funding. This public funding must come with stringent safeguards against political interference in its operations or the manipulation of its outputs.
- **Clear Legal Framework:** Given its potential impact on democratic processes, the system may require a specific legislative framework to authorize its operation, define the roles and responsibilities of the oversight body, mandate data protection and security standards, ensure access to information for all citizens, and establish clear lines of accountability.
- **Public Education and Awareness:** A significant and ongoing public education campaign would be necessary to inform citizens about the system's purpose, how it works, its limitations, how their data is protected, and how they can participate effectively and responsibly. This is crucial for building trust and ensuring informed engagement.

A comparative look at governance models highlights the challenges:

Table 3: Governance Model Considerations for a National Citizen Engagement Platform

Governance Model	Key Features	Strengths for Neutrality & Trust	Weaknesses/Challenges	Applicability to this System
Independent Non-Partisan Commission	Appointed members with expertise, statutory independence, transparent processes, dedicated budget.[95]	High potential for perceived neutrality and professionalism. Can focus solely on system integrity.	Appointments can become politicized; ensuring true independence requires strong legal safeguards. Can be slow to adapt.	**High:** Considered a strong model for functions requiring impartiality.
Legislative Committee Oversight	Oversight by existing or newly formed congressional committee(s).	Direct link to legislative process; potentially faster decision-making.	Highly susceptible to partisan control and political influence; lacks public perception of neutrality.	**Low:** Unlikely to achieve necessary public trust for neutrality.
Decentralized Autonomous	Token-based or reputation-based	Potential for high transparency	Voter apathy, whale dominance,	**Very Low:** Current DAO models are

Organization (DAO)	governance on a blockchain; smart contract enforcement. [102]	(on-chain actions); community-driven.	security risks, legal ambiguity, difficulty balancing diverse interests, questionable for true decentralization. [104]	too immature and vulnerable for a national civic platform requiring broad trust and neutrality.
Multi-Stakeholder Body (Advisory/Co-governance)	Representatives from government, civil society, academia, tech sector, public.	Incorporates diverse perspectives; can enhance legitimacy.	Decision-making can be complex and slow; risk of capture by certain stakeholder groups; defining roles and powers can be difficult.	**Medium:** Could be part of the oversight structure (e.g., an advisory council to an Independent Commission) but likely not the sole governing entity.

Sources for Table 3 elements: [2]

VII. Conclusion: Navigating the Future of AI-Powered Citizen Engagement

A. Recap of the System's Transformative Potential and Critical Vulnerabilities

The proposed system for citizen engagement via SMS and AI embodies a compelling vision: a more direct, responsive, and participatory democracy. Its potential to amplify citizen voices, provide legislators with real-time public sentiment, and even foster a degree of accountability is significant. The use of ubiquitous SMS technology could lower barriers to entry for political participation, and AI offers powerful tools for synthesizing vast amounts of public feedback into actionable insights.

However, this potential is counterbalanced by critical vulnerabilities and profound challenges. Technologically, the scalability of SMS for mass, simultaneous, two-way interaction, the security of the channel against fraud and manipulation (especially SIM swaps and botnets), and the practical limitations of SMS for conveying complex information are major concerns. The AI components, while promising, face immense hurdles in achieving true neutrality in summarization, fairly and ethically filtering "extreme" comments without censorship, avoiding bias and hallucination, and ensuring the interpretability of their outputs. The digital divide, potential for voter fatigue, risks of misinformation and echo chambers, and the sheer logistical and financial costs of a national-scale system add further layers of complexity.

B. Final Assessment of the Idea's Viability and Long-Term Implications for Democracy in the United States

Is this system a "game changer"? It *could* be, but only under a stringent set of conditions. Its transformative power is not inherent in the technology itself, but in how that technology is designed, governed, and integrated into the existing democratic ecosystem. If implemented with extreme caution, robust and multi-layered safeguards against manipulation, genuinely

independent and trustworthy governance, a sustained commitment to addressing the digital divide and ethical AI principles, and a transparent funding model, it could indeed offer a valuable new dimension to American democracy.

However, if these conditions are not met, the long-term implications could be negative. A poorly executed system risks becoming a tool for political manipulation, a source of citizen disillusionment if perceived as ineffective or biased, or a mechanism that further amplifies the voices of the already privileged while marginalizing others. It could lead to a more reactive, poll-driven form of governance that undermines thoughtful deliberation and expert judgment. The system should not be viewed as a singular solution to complex problems like a "broken Congress." Congressional dysfunction stems from a multitude of deep-seated issues that this system, in isolation, cannot resolve. At best, it could be one tool among many in a broader effort to enhance democratic responsiveness and citizen engagement.

Ultimately, the success of such an ambitious endeavor will be determined less by the sophistication of its SMS or AI components, and more by the robustness of its *human-centric governance, its unwavering ethical framework, and its ability to integrate meaningfully and constructively into existing democratic processes without being captured by partisan interests or discredited by its own vulnerabilities*. The path forward requires humility, a commitment to iterative learning through rigorous piloting, and a clear-eyed understanding that technology alone cannot perfect democracy; it can only offer new tools whose ultimate impact depends on human wisdom, ethical commitment, and institutional design.

Works cited

1. Direct democracy | Definition, History, & Facts | Britannica, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/topic/direct-democracy
2. Putting the Initiative Back Together - Harvard Law Review, accessed May 13, 2025, https://harvardlawreview.org/print/vol-138/putting-the-initiative-back-together/
3. What is Civic Tech? A Comprehensive Study - Wallarm, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.wallarm.com/what/civic-tech
4. What governments should know about digital participation & AI ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.peoplepowered.org/news-content/what-governments-should-know-about-digital-participation-amp-ai
5. Impact of Information and Communication Technologies on ... - MDPI, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/2/40
6. documents1.worldbank.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099029103062432172/pdf/IDU1e2fc782f13ddb14ac41ae801f190d313322f.pdf
7. Direct democracy - Referendums, Participation, Representation - Britannica, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.britannica.com/topic/direct-democracy/Issues-and-controversies
8. 7 critical challenges to civic engagement and how to deal with them, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.rocket.chat/blog/civic-engagement
9. Elections: How SMS and 10DLC can increase voter engagement ..., accessed May

13, 2025, https://www.infobip.com/blog/increase-voter-engagement-with-sms
10. 115+ Mobile & SMS Marketing Statistics for 2025 | SMS Stats - Sixth City Marketing, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.sixthcitymarketing.com/mobile-marketing-statistics/
11. The Ultimate Guide to Using SMS Marketing for Political Campaigns - Sendmode, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.sendmode.co.uk/the-ultimate-guide-to-using-sms-marketing-for-political-campaigns
12. Americans' Use of Mobile Technology, Home Broadband | Pew ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2024/01/31/americans-use-of-mobile-technology-and-home-broadband/
13. The Digital Divide and Health Equity: Ensuring the Digital Transformation of Healthcare Doesn't Leave the Vulnerable Behind - KARNA LLC, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.karna.com/the-digital-divide-and-health-equity-ensuring-the-digital-transformation-of-healthcare-doesnt-leave-the-vulnerable-behind/
14. 4. How COVID-19 impacted Americans' relationship with technology - Pew Research Center, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2025/02/12/how-covid-19-impacted-americans-relationship-with-technology/
15. Broadband - Research and data from Pew Research Center, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pewresearch.org/topic/internet-technology/platforms-services/internet-connectivity/broadband/
16. Transforming governance: - Citizen Pulse - PwC, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pwc.com/m1/en/publications/2025/docs/citizen-pulse-delivering-real-time-insights-to-meet-societys-evolving-needs.pdf
17. An effective scorecard for political accountability - The Fulcrum, accessed May 13, 2025, https://thefulcrum.us/justice/an-effective-scorecard-for-political-accountability
18. Democracy Report Card — Leadership Now Project, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.leadershipnowproject.org/democracy-report-card
19. [2503.04769] Applications of Artificial Intelligence Tools to Enhance Legislative Engagement: Case Studies from Make.Org and MAPLE - arXiv, accessed May 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04769
20. AI Will Write Complex Laws | Lawfare, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/ai-will-write-complex-laws
21. Voice and Value: How Elected Officials Evaluate Online and Offline ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/poq/advance-article/doi/10.1093/poq/nfaf006/8128097?searchresult=1
22. EAC Clearinghouse Award Winners 2024 | U.S. Election Assistance Commission, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eac.gov/election-officials/eac-clearinghouse-award-winners-2024

23. Cost of SMS Marketing: Is It Worth It or Just Another Expense? - TxtCart, accessed May 13, 2025, https://txtcartapp.com/blog/cost-of-sms-marketing/
24. How Much Does SMS Marketing Cost? (Comparison to Push & Email) - MobiLoud, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.mobiloud.com/blog/how-much-does-sms-marketing-cost
25. Authenticators - NIST Pages - National Institute of Standards and Technology, accessed May 13, 2025, https://pages.nist.gov/800-63-4/sp800-63b/authenticators/
26. NIST Special Publication 800-63-4, accessed May 13, 2025, https://pages.nist.gov/800-63-4/sp800-63.html
27. How to Prevent SIM Swapping Fraud | Plivo, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.plivo.com/blog/sim-swapping-fraud/
28. Cybersecurity Risks Caused by SMS Vulnerabilities - Epic.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://epic.org/documents/cybersecurity-risks-caused-by-sms-vulnerabilities/
29. Tip Sheet on Preventing Fraudulent Responses and Bots in Online Studies - Institutional Review Board, accessed May 13, 2025, https://uwm.edu/irb/wp-content/uploads/sites/127/2024/01/Tip-Sheet-on-Preventing-Bots.pdf
30. Coordinated inauthentic behavior: An innovative manipulation tactic to amplify COVID-19 anti-vaccine communication outreach via social media - PubMed Central, accessed May 13, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10060790/
31. Decentralizing Democracy: Secure and Transparent E-Voting Systems with Blockchain Technology in the Context of Palestine - MDPI, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/16/11/388
32. Anonymous Voting System | eBallot, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eballot.com/anonymous-secret-voting-system
33. All About Anonymous Voting | eBallot, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eballot.com/resources/anonymous-voting
34. AI legal text summarizer for compliance clarity | Enhesa, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.enhesa.com/resources/article/ai-legal-text-summarizer/
35. Legislative Use of Artificial Intelligence 2024 Survey, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ncsl.org/center-for-legislative-strengthening/legislative-use-of-artificial-intelligence-2024-survey
36. Legislative Use of Artificial Intelligence - National Conference of State Legislatures, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ncsl.org/about-state-legislatures/legislative-use-of-artificial-intelligence
37. MoDS: Moderating a Mixture of Document Speakers to Summarize Debatable Queries in Document Collections - arXiv, accessed May 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2502.00322v1
38. aclanthology.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://aclanthology.org/2022.naacl-main.228.pdf
39. LLM Mixture of Experts Explained - TensorOps, accessed May 13, 2025,

https://www.tensorops.ai/post/what-is-mixture-of-experts-llm
40. How AI Enhances Legal Document Review - American Bar Association, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/law_practice/resources/law-technology-today/2025/how-ai-enhances-legal-document-review/
41. MoLE:Decoding by Mixture of Layer Experts Alleviates Hallucination in Large Vision-Language Models, accessed May 13, 2025, https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/34056/36211
42. Mitigating Hallucinations in LLMs: Techniques for Accurate AI Responses | Tredence, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.tredence.com/blog/mitigating-hallucination-in-large-language-models
43. Question: Best practices for generating neutral news summaries with AI? - Reddit, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/PromptEngineering/comments/1jufe9i/question_best_practices_for_generating_neutral/
44. A Practical Definition of Political Neutrality for AI – Center for Human ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://humancompatible.ai/news/2025/02/04/a-practical-definition-of-political-neutrality-for-ai/
45. Common ethical challenges in AI - Human Rights and Biomedicine - The Council of Europe, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-and-biomedicine/common-ethical-challenges-in-ai
46. AI Ethics Concerns: A Business-Oriented Guide to Responsible AI ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://smartdev.com/ai-ethics-concerns-a-business-oriented-guide-to-responsible-ai/
47. Content-filtering AI systems - limitations, challenges and regulatory ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ntu.edu.sg/business/research/nbs-knowledge-lab/nbs-research-blog/content-filtering-ai-systems-limitations-challenges-and-regulatory-approaches
48. www.disinfobservatory.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.disinfobservatory.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/AI4Dignity-AI-Extreme-Speech-Policy-Brief.pdf
49. Scalable anomaly detection algorithms for observability - Eyer.ai, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eyer.ai/blog/scalable-anomaly-detection-algorithms-for-observability/
50. AI-Powered Anomaly Detection 2024 Ultimate Guide | Boost Efficiency - Rapid Innovation, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.rapidinnovation.io/post/ai-in-anomaly-detection-for-businesses
51. AI in anomaly detection: Use cases, methods, algorithms and solution - LeewayHertz, accessed May 13, 2025,

https://www.leewayhertz.com/ai-in-anomaly-detection/
52. AI-Driven Anomaly Detection: Strengthening Data Security and Quality in Large Databases, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/389429725_AI-Driven_Anomaly_Detection_Strengthening_Data_Security_and_Quality_in_Large_Databases
53. The Analytic Edge: Leveraging Emerging Technologies to Transform Intelligence Analysis, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.csis.org/analysis/analytic-edge-leveraging-emerging-technologies-transform-intelligence-analysis
54. Working with anomaly detection at scale | Elastic Docs, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.elastic.co/docs/explore-analyze/machine-learning/anomaly-detection/anomaly-detection-scale
55. Mastering Anomaly Detection in AI Training Data - Encord, accessed May 13, 2025, https://encord.com/blog/anomaly-detection/
56. Scaling Anomaly Detection to Thousands of Performance Metrics: A Guide - Eyer.ai, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eyer.ai/blog/scaling-anomaly-detection-to-thousands-of-performance-metrics-a-guide/
57. PII & PCI Data Security Checklist: A Guide to Protecting Sensitive ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pkware.com/blog/pii-pci-data-security-checklist-a-guide-to-protecting-sensitive-data
58. What is Personally Identifiable Information (PII)? - IBM, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/pii
59. How to secure user data in your identity server and take it global - InCountry, accessed May 13, 2025, https://incountry.com/blog/how-to-secure-user-data-in-your-identity-server-and-take-it-global/
60. Best Practices For Protecting PII: How To Secure Sensitive Data - Protecto.ai, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.protecto.ai/blog/best-practices-for-protecting-pii-data
61. Lima | Strengthening Participatory Governance Through Resilience and Tech-Enabled Democratic Innovations | Journal of Deliberative Democracy, accessed May 13, 2025, https://delibdemjournal.org/article/id/1613/
62. How To Utilise The Power Of Online Citizen Engagement - iBabs, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ibabs.com/en/local-authorities-and-governments/online-citizen-engagement/
63. Political SMS Marketing: Strategies to Engage Voters & Boost Campaign Success - Textla, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.textla.com/post/political-sms-marketing-strategies
64. (PDF) Understanding Voter Fatigue: Election Frequency & Electoral ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388594228_Understanding_Voter_Fatigue_Election_Frequency_Electoral_Abstention_Approval

65. Boost Employee Engagement in Wellness Programs with Gamification - Advantage Club, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.advantageclub.ai/blog/gamification-boost-participation-and-employee-engagement
66. Civic Gamification Level Up Your Civic Engagement: How Gamification Can Transform Participation - FasterCapital, accessed May 13, 2025, https://fastercapital.com/content/Civic-Gamification-Level-Up-Your-Civic-Engagement--How-Gamification-Can-Transform-Participation.html
67. www.metropolis.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.metropolis.org/sites/default/files/resources/PB-Fostering_Citizen_Engagement_With_Digital_Strategies.pdf
68. The Power of Social Proof: How It Shapes Consumer Choices - Helio, accessed May 13, 2025, https://helio.app/ux-research/laws-of-ux/social-proof/
69. The social proof principle: The influence of others on our choices - A3 Life Design, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.a3lifedesign.com/blog-english/the-social-proof-principle
70. The origin of public concerns over AI supercharging misinformation in the 2024 U.S. presidential election, accessed May 13, 2025, https://misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu/article/the-origin-of-public-concerns-over-ai-supercharging-misinformation-in-the-2024-u-s-presidential-election/
71. Biased AI can Influence Political Decision-Making - arXiv, accessed May 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2410.06415v1
72. Biased AI can Influence Political Decision-Making - ResearchGate, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384769688_Biased_AI_can_Influence_Political_Decision-Making
73. AI's Powers of Political Persuasion - Stanford HAI, accessed May 13, 2025, https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ais-powers-political-persuasion
74. Testing theories of political persuasion using AI | PNAS, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2412815122
75. Public Opinion and Public Policy | Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics, accessed May 13, 2025, https://oxfordre.com/politics/politics/abstract/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-74?rskey=SptJsp%26result=3
76. The Precarious Link between Legislators and Constituent Opinion: Evidence from Matched Roll Call and Referendum Votes - American Economic Association, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2016/retrieve.php?pdfid=13726&tk=NRTRHbeh
77. Representative Bodies in the AI Era: Sample Use Cases - POPVOX Foundation, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.popvox.org/representative-bodies-in-the-ai-era/use-cases
78. The Internet and Civic Engagement | Pew Research Center, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2009/09/01/the-internet-and-civic-engag

ement/
79. Top 8 civic engagement strategy to boost civic participation - Rocket.Chat, accessed May 13, 2025, https://de.rocket.chat/blog/community-engagement-strategy
80. Astroturfing - Wikipedia, accessed May 13, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Astroturfing
81. Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections - The White House, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/03/preserving-and-protecting-the-integrity-of-american-elections/
82. Foreign Interference Targeting Election Infrastructure or Political Organization, Campaign, or Candidate Infrastructure Related - Department of Justice, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.justice.gov/archives/opa/press-release/file/1376761/dl
83. Preparing for AI & Other Challenges to Election Administration | Bipartisan Policy Center, accessed May 13, 2025, https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/preparing-for-artificial-intelligence-and-other-challenges-to-election-administration/
84. Election Security 2024: Information, Influence and Generative AI - OnSolve, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.onsolve.com/blog/sra-election-security-2024-information-influence-ai/
85. AI Development Cost Estimation: Pricing Structure, Implementation ROI - Coherent Solutions, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.coherentsolutions.com/insights/ai-development-cost-estimation-pricing-structure-roi
86. AI Pricing: How Much Does AI Implementation Cost - Neurond AI, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.neurond.com/blog/how-much-does-ai-cost
87. Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2025 - AWS, accessed May 13, 2025, https://hai-production.s3.amazonaws.com/files/hai_ai_index_report_2025.pdf
88. Pricing - Scale AI, accessed May 13, 2025, https://scale.com/pricing
89. Anomaly detection based on Artificial Intelligence of Things: A Systematic Literature Mapping - ResearchGate, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377345638_Anomaly_detection_based_on_Artificial_Intelligence_of_Things_A_Systematic_Literature_Mapping
90. AWS vs. Azure vs. Google Cloud: A Complete Comparison - DataCamp, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.datacamp.com/blog/aws-vs-azure-vs-gcp
91. How to Build an AI Agent for Healthcare: A Step-by-Step Guide, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.aalpha.net/blog/how-to-build-ai-agent-for-healthcare/
92. aclanthology.org, accessed May 13, 2025, https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.20.pdf
93. Pricing - Azure AI Language | Microsoft Azure, accessed May 13, 2025, https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/pricing/details/cognitive-services/language-service/
94. Azure AI Anomaly Detector pricing, accessed May 13, 2025,

https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/pricing/details/cognitive-services/anomaly-detector/
95. Congressional Commissions: Overview, Structure, and Legislative Considerations - CRS Reports, accessed May 13, 2025, https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R40076/18
96. Citizens' Jury – Participedia, accessed May 13, 2025, https://participedia.net/method/155
97. Boundary Delimitation* - The International Foundation for Electoral Systems: IFES, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ifes.org/sites/default/files/migrate/4_ifes_challenging_election_norms_and_standards_wp_bndel.pdf
98. Improving Public Consultation Mechanisms (LT0035) - Open ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/lithuania/commitments/LT0035/
99. Government consultations - UK Parliament, accessed May 13, 2025, https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-10190/CBP-10190.pdf
100. AI Governance Frameworks: Guide to Ethical AI Implementation, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.consilien.com/news/ai-governance-frameworks-guide-to-ethical-ai-implementation
101. Artificial Intelligence 2025 Legislation - National Conference of State Legislatures, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.ncsl.org/technology-and-communication/artificial-intelligence-2025-legislation
102. DAO Governance Models 2024: Ultimate Guide to Token vs ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.rapidinnovation.io/post/dao-governance-models-explained-token-based-vs-reputation-based-systems
103. DAO Governance: Decentralized Autonomous Organizations, Quadratic Voting, and Liberalism - Computer Science, accessed May 13, 2025, http://www.cs.yale.edu/homes/jf/fangmichelle_LATE_88058_5842139.pdf
104. The nature of the decentralised autonomous organisation | Journal ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-institutional-economics/article/nature-of-the-decentralised-autonomous-organisation/221DE3FF0F7E3CC3CF73CAEF8284DE28
105. Issues and Reflections on DAO: Governance Challenges and ... - AIFT, accessed May 13, 2025, https://hkaift.com/issues-and-reflections-on-dao-governance-challenges-and-solutions/
106. On the Rights, Duties, Obligations, and Responsibility of Journalists and the Media, accessed May 13, 2025, https://foreignpress.org/journalism-resources/on-the-rights-duties-obligations-and-responsibility-of-journalists-and-the-media

107. News Ethics Guidelines | APM Reports, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.apmreports.org/news-ethics-guidelines
108. What the Codes Say: Code provisions by subject | Society of Professional Journalists, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.spj.org/what-the-codes-say-code-provisions-by-subject/
109. Media ethics in journalism - importance and principles - teech, accessed May 13, 2025, https://teech.de/en/wiki/the-importance-of-media-ethics-in-journalism/
110. Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Fake News: How Social Media ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354459868_Filter_Bubbles_Echo_Chambers_and_Fake_News_How_Social_Media_Conditions_Individuals_to_Be_Less_Critical_of_Political_Misinformation
111. HearHere: Mitigating Echo Chambers in News Consumption through an AI-based Web System - arXiv, accessed May 13, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2402.18222v2
112. Echo Chambers and Recommendation Algorithms: Who Decides ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://masaar.net/en/echo-chambers-and-recommendation-algorithms-who-decides-what-we-see-online/
113. The case for prosocial tech design governance | Internet Policy ..., accessed May 13, 2025, https://policyreview.info/articles/news/prosocial-tech-design-governance
114. Direct Democracy, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.eods.eu/library/IDEA.Direct-DemocracyEN.pdf
115. Is SMS Multifactor Authentication (MFA) Still Secure? | High Touch Technologies, accessed May 13, 2025, https://hightouchtechnologies.com/is-sms-multifactor-authentication-mfa-still-secure/
116. A Secure and Scalable Behavioral Dynamics Authentication Model - ResearchGate, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/373634431_A_Secure_and_Scalable_Behavioral_Dynamics_Authentication_Model
117. Developing an effective governance operating model A guide for financial services boards and management teams - Deloitte, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/global/Documents/Financial-Services/dttl-fsi-US-FSI-Developinganeffectivegovernance-031913.pdf
118. MANUAL ON PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS - United Nations Development Programme, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/vn/31473_Manual_on_public_consultations_for_PPCs-eng.pdf
119. New Models for Keeping Partisans out of Election Administration - The Carter Center, accessed May 13, 2025, https://www.cartercenter.org/resources/pdfs/news/peace_publications/democracy/new-models-keeping-partisans-out-election-admin-013122.pdf
120. (PDF) Civic Vice in Digital Governance - ResearchGate, accessed May 13,

2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/390303927_Civic_Vice_in_Digital_Governance