

Orwellian Shadows: Democratic Erosion and Authoritarian Futures in the Digital Age

A Comprehensive Analysis of Global Democratic Backsliding Through the Lens of George Orwell's 1984

Abstract

This report examines the parallels between George Orwell's dystopian novel "1984" and contemporary political trends, analyzing how Orwellian mechanisms of control have manifested in modern democracies. Through comprehensive analysis of global surveillance expansion, misinformation campaigns, democratic backsliding, and emerging technological authoritarianism, this study identifies critical warning signs for democratic institutions. The research explores potential future scenarios extending to 2030, examining the trajectory toward competitive authoritarianism and the role of artificial intelligence in enabling state control. Findings indicate that democratic erosion is accelerating globally, with technology serving as both a catalyst and enabler of authoritarian drift. The study concludes with implications for preserving democratic institutions and recommendations for counteracting Orwellian trends in governance.

Introduction

George Orwell's prescient novel "1984," published in 1949, envisioned a totalitarian future where truth becomes malleable, surveillance permeates society, and individual autonomy dissolves under state control^[1]. More than seventy-five years later, many of Orwell's warnings have materialized in forms both subtle and overt across democratic and authoritarian regimes alike. The global democratic recession, accelerated by technological advances and institutional erosion, presents an unprecedented challenge to liberal governance worldwide^{[2] [3]}.

Recent scholarship indicates that democracy is experiencing its most severe crisis since the end of World War II, with 2024 marking the ninth consecutive year of global democratic decline^{[4] [5]}. The convergence of digital authoritarianism, institutional capture, and information warfare has created conditions that echo Orwell's dystopian vision, raising fundamental questions about the resilience of democratic institutions in the digital age^{[6] [7]}.

This comprehensive analysis examines the evolution of Orwellian mechanisms from literary fiction to contemporary political reality, exploring their manifestations across multiple domains of governance and society. By analyzing current trends in surveillance, misinformation, and authoritarian drift, this study provides insights into potential future scenarios and their implications for global democracy.

Orwellian Mechanisms in Contemporary Politics

Truth Control and Information Manipulation

Orwell's concept of the "Ministry of Truth" and "doublethink" finds its contemporary equivalent in the systematic manipulation of information across digital platforms. The novel's famous maxim that "Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past" has become a blueprint for modern political strategy^{[8] [9]}.

Contemporary governments and political movements have embraced techniques of reality control that would be familiar to Orwell's readers. The phenomenon of "alternative facts," first popularized during the Trump administration, represents a direct manifestation of doublethink—the ability to hold two contradictory beliefs simultaneously^{[10] [11]}. This manipulation extends beyond simple propaganda to encompass systematic revision of historical records, suppression of inconvenient truths, and the creation of parallel information ecosystems.

Digital platforms have amplified these capabilities exponentially. Social media algorithms create echo chambers that reinforce existing beliefs while filtering out contradictory information, effectively creating the isolated information silos that Orwell envisioned^{[12] [13]}. Artificial intelligence technologies now enable the creation of deepfakes and synthetic media that can convincingly alter visual and audio evidence, making the distinction between truth and fabrication increasingly difficult for ordinary citizens to discern^{[14] [15]}.

The weaponization of uncertainty has become a central strategy in modern information warfare. Rather than promoting specific falsehoods, authoritarian actors often seek to undermine confidence in all sources of information, creating what scholars term "epistemic chaos"—a state where citizens lose the ability to distinguish reliable from unreliable sources^{[16] [17]}. This approach effectively neutralizes the power of factual correction and enables the manipulation of public opinion through confusion rather than conviction.

Surveillance and Digital Panopticon

Orwell's telescreens pale in comparison to the surveillance capabilities of contemporary digital infrastructure. The modern surveillance state operates through a complex network of corporate data collection, government intelligence gathering, and algorithmic analysis that creates unprecedented visibility into individual behavior and thought patterns^{[18] [19]}.

China's social credit system represents perhaps the most comprehensive realization of Orwellian surveillance in the contemporary world. This system integrates facial recognition technology, financial records, social media activity, and behavioral monitoring to create comprehensive profiles of citizens that determine access to employment, transportation, education, and social services^{[20] [21]}. While presented as a tool for promoting social trust and reducing fraud, the system effectively creates the perpetual observation that Orwell described as the foundation of totalitarian control.

Democratic societies have not been immune to the expansion of surveillance capabilities. The post-9/11 security apparatus in the United States and Europe has normalized mass data collection, creating what Edward Snowden's revelations showed to be a comprehensive surveillance network that monitors communications, financial transactions, and digital behavior of ordinary citizens^{[22] [23]}. While justified in terms of national security, these capabilities create the infrastructure for authoritarian control that could be activated under future political conditions.

The privatization of surveillance through corporate data collection adds another dimension to contemporary monitoring that Orwell did not fully anticipate. Technology companies collect vast amounts of personal data through seemingly voluntary interactions with digital services, creating detailed profiles of individual preferences, relationships, and behavior patterns^{[24] [25]}. This "surveillance capitalism" operates through market mechanisms rather than state coercion, but provides governments with unprecedented access to personal information through legal processes and informal cooperation.

Social Control and Behavioral Modification

Orwell's "Two Minutes Hate" and "Emmanuel Goldstein" have found their contemporary equivalents in the polarized political rallies and demonization campaigns that characterize modern politics. The deliberate cultivation of political hatred and the designation of "enemies of the people" serve the same function that Orwell identified: unifying the population around the ruling party while deflecting attention from systemic failures^{[26] [27]}.

Social media platforms have become the primary vehicles for orchestrating these campaigns of social control. The algorithms that determine what content users see are designed to maximize engagement, which research has shown favors emotionally provocative and divisive content^{[28] [29]}. This creates a systematic bias toward polarization that serves authoritarian interests by fragmenting potential opposition and making rational political discourse increasingly difficult.

The concept of "cancel culture" and public shaming campaigns, while often associated with progressive politics, actually represents a form of social control that operates independently of formal state power. The ability to destroy individuals' reputations and livelihoods through coordinated online campaigns creates powerful incentives

for conformity and self-censorship^{[30] [31]}. This dynamic operates across the political spectrum, with both progressive and conservative movements using similar tactics to enforce ideological compliance.

Behavioral modification through algorithmic manipulation represents a more sophisticated form of social control than Orwell envisioned. Rather than relying on crude propaganda, contemporary systems use psychological insights and data analytics to influence behavior through subtle nudges and personalized messaging^{[32] [33]}. This approach is more effective than traditional propaganda because it appears to respect individual choice while actually manipulating the information environment in which choices are made.

Global Democratic Backsliding and Competitive Authoritarianism

The Worldwide Erosion of Democratic Norms

The global trend toward democratic backsliding represents one of the most significant political developments of the early 21st century. According to the V-Dem Institute's Democracy Report 2025, the world now has fewer democracies than autocracies for the first time in over twenty years, with nearly 72% of the global population living under authoritarian rule^{[34] [35]}.

This erosion follows patterns that Orwell anticipated in his analysis of power concentration. Rather than occurring through dramatic coups or revolutionary upheavals, contemporary democratic backsliding typically occurs through legal mechanisms and gradual institutional capture^{[36] [37]}. Elected leaders systematically weaken checks and balances, capture regulatory agencies, undermine judicial independence, and restrict media freedom while maintaining the formal structures of democratic governance.

The phenomenon of "competitive authoritarianism" has emerged as the dominant form of non-democratic governance in the contemporary world. In these systems, elections continue to occur and opposition parties remain legal, but the ruling party systematically tilts the playing field through control of state resources, manipulation of media coverage, and selective application of legal sanctions^{[38] [39]}. This approach maintains a veneer of democratic legitimacy while effectively eliminating genuine political competition.

Hungary under Viktor Orbán and Turkey under Recep Tayyip Erdoğan represent paradigmatic cases of competitive authoritarianism in action. Both leaders came to power through democratic elections and maintained formal constitutional processes while systematically undermining independent institutions, capturing media outlets, and using state resources to reward supporters and punish opponents^{[40] [41]}. Their success has provided a template for authoritarian leaders worldwide who seek to maintain power while avoiding the international isolation that typically accompanies outright dictatorship.

Institutional Capture and Weaponization

The weaponization of state institutions represents one of the most dangerous aspects of contemporary democratic erosion. Orwell's analysis of how the Party used every aspect of government to maintain control has proven remarkably prescient in understanding how modern authoritarians capture and redirect institutional power^{[42] [43]}.

The politicization of law enforcement and judicial institutions poses particular dangers to democratic governance. When prosecutors and judges become instruments of political control rather than neutral arbiters of law, the legal system becomes a weapon for suppressing opposition and protecting ruling parties from accountability^{[44] [45]}. This transformation typically occurs gradually through strategic appointments, budget manipulation, and informal pressure rather than formal constitutional changes.

Regulatory capture represents another mechanism through which democratic institutions are converted into tools of authoritarian control. By placing loyalists in key regulatory positions and restructuring agency procedures, ruling parties can use government power to reward supporters and punish opponents through seemingly neutral administrative processes^{[46] [47]}. This approach is particularly effective because it operates below the threshold

of public attention while providing powerful incentives for political conformity among businesses and civil society organizations.

The erosion of civil service neutrality poses additional threats to democratic governance. The replacement of professional civil servants with political appointees undermines the institutional knowledge and professional norms that serve as buffers against authoritarian excess^{[48] [49]}. When government employees become political partisans rather than public servants, the entire apparatus of state becomes an extension of the ruling party's political machinery.

Economic Inequality and Democratic Vulnerability

Research has identified economic inequality as one of the strongest predictors of democratic backsliding, creating conditions that make societies vulnerable to authoritarian appeals^{[50] [51]}. Orwell's analysis of how economic desperation and social frustration create opportunities for totalitarian movements has proven remarkably relevant to understanding contemporary political dynamics.

High levels of inequality create grievances that authoritarian leaders can exploit through populist appeals that promise to punish elites and restore the common people to their rightful place^{[52] [53]}. This dynamic operates independently of absolute levels of wealth or development, with highly unequal wealthy societies proving as vulnerable to authoritarian appeals as poor countries with similar inequality patterns.

The concentration of economic power in the hands of technological oligarchies creates new forms of inequality that pose particular threats to democratic governance. When a small number of technology companies control the information infrastructure that shapes public discourse, their decisions about content moderation, algorithmic ranking, and platform access can determine political outcomes^{[54] [55]}. This concentration of power operates largely outside traditional democratic accountability mechanisms, creating what some scholars term "digital feudalism."

The financialization of political competition through unlimited campaign spending and regulatory capture by wealthy interests has created systematic advantages for candidates and parties that serve concentrated economic interests^{[56] [57]}. This dynamic undermines the democratic principle of political equality by ensuring that policy outcomes reflect the preferences of economic elites rather than the broader population.

Technological Authoritarianism and AI-Enabled Control

Artificial Intelligence as an Instrument of Oppression

The rapid development of artificial intelligence technologies has created unprecedented capabilities for authoritarian control that exceed even Orwell's imaginative vision. AI systems can process vast amounts of data to identify dissidents, predict behavior, and automate responses in ways that make comprehensive population control both feasible and scalable^{[58] [59]}.

Predictive policing systems use machine learning algorithms to identify individuals and areas that are statistically likely to be involved in criminal activity, enabling preemptive intervention that can effectively criminalize dissent before it occurs^{[60] [61]}. These systems are often presented as neutral applications of data science, but their training data and algorithmic structures inevitably reflect the biases and priorities of their creators and implementers.

Facial recognition technology combined with ubiquitous surveillance cameras creates the possibility of tracking every individual's movements and associations in real time. China's deployment of this technology in Xinjiang province has enabled comprehensive control over the Uyghur population that serves as a model for authoritarian regimes worldwide^{[62] [63]}. The technology's rapid improvement and declining costs make its global deployment increasingly feasible for governments with authoritarian ambitions.

Natural language processing and sentiment analysis capabilities enable governments to monitor and analyze all forms of digital communication for signs of dissent or opposition. These systems can identify individuals who express critical views, track the spread of opposition ideas, and predict which topics or events are likely to generate political unrest ^[64] ^[65]. The integration of these capabilities with social media platforms creates comprehensive surveillance of public opinion that enables precise targeting of control measures.

Digital Infrastructure and Information Control

The centralization of digital infrastructure under the control of a small number of technology companies has created vulnerabilities that authoritarian actors can exploit to control information flows and suppress dissent. The integration of these platforms with government surveillance capabilities creates the possibility of comprehensive information control that surpasses anything Orwell imagined ^[66] ^[67].

Content moderation algorithms can be designed or modified to suppress particular viewpoints or topics, effectively controlling what information reaches public attention. While these systems are often justified in terms of combating misinformation or hate speech, their operation lacks transparency and accountability, making it impossible for users to understand how their information environment is being shaped ^[68] ^[69].

The phenomenon of "shadow banning" and algorithmic suppression allows platforms to reduce the visibility of particular users or content without formally censoring them. This approach is more sophisticated than traditional censorship because it maintains the illusion of free expression while actually limiting the reach and impact of dissenting voices ^[70] ^[71].

The consolidation of internet infrastructure under the control of major technology companies creates single points of failure that can be exploited for comprehensive censorship. When a small number of companies control domain name systems, cloud hosting, and content delivery networks, their decisions about service provision can effectively eliminate content from the internet ^[72] ^[73].

Biometric Surveillance and Social Credit Systems

The development of comprehensive biometric surveillance capabilities has created the possibility of monitoring and controlling individual behavior with unprecedented precision. These systems can track not only where individuals go and what they do, but also their emotional states, social relationships, and even physiological responses to different stimuli ^[74] ^[75].

Gait recognition technology enables the identification of individuals even when their faces are obscured, making it virtually impossible to move anonymously in surveilled areas. This capability, combined with the ubiquity of surveillance cameras in urban environments, creates comprehensive tracking capabilities that can monitor the movements and activities of entire populations ^[76] ^[77].

Voice recognition and analysis systems can identify individuals through speech patterns and analyze emotional content to assess loyalty and compliance. These systems are being integrated into customer service interactions, educational settings, and employment screening processes, creating comprehensive monitoring of individual attitudes and behaviors ^[78] ^[79].

The integration of biometric data with social credit scoring systems creates comprehensive behavioral control mechanisms that can automatically adjust individual access to services, opportunities, and social benefits based on compliance with government priorities. These systems operate continuously and automatically, creating incentives for constant self-monitoring and behavioral modification ^[80] ^[81].

Global Power Structures and Orwellian Super-States

The New Tripolar World Order

Orwell's vision of three super-states—Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia—locked in perpetual conflict has proven remarkably prescient in understanding contemporary global politics. The emergence of distinct spheres of influence centered on the United States, Russia, and China has created a tripolar structure that mirrors the dynamics Orwell described^{[82][83]}.

The United States and its allies constitute a modern version of Oceania, controlling global financial systems, advanced military technologies, and cultural production. This bloc maintains cohesion through shared democratic institutions and economic integration, but faces internal tensions as member states develop different approaches to managing technological and security challenges^{[84][85]}.

Russia represents the core of a modern Eurasian bloc that seeks to restore influence over the former Soviet sphere while challenging Western hegemony through hybrid warfare and energy leverage. This bloc operates through informal networks and personal relationships rather than formal institutional structures, making it more flexible but also more unstable than the Western alliance^{[86][87]}.

China has emerged as the center of an Asian-centered bloc that challenges both Western and Russian influence through economic integration and technological development. The Belt and Road Initiative and other Chinese-led institutions create alternative structures to Western-dominated organizations while extending Chinese influence across multiple continents^{[88][89]}.

Perpetual Conflict and Information Warfare

The state of perpetual conflict that Orwell described as essential to totalitarian control has been realized in the contemporary world through hybrid warfare that combines conventional military threats with cyberattacks, information operations, and economic coercion. This approach allows major powers to engage in continuous conflict while avoiding the risks and costs of direct military confrontation^{[90][91]}.

Information warfare has become a central component of great power competition, with state and non-state actors using social media platforms, news outlets, and cultural products to influence public opinion and undermine confidence in opposing systems. These operations are often difficult to detect and attribute, making effective countermeasures challenging to implement^{[92][93]}.

The weaponization of economic interdependence has created new forms of conflict that operate through trade restrictions, financial sanctions, and technology transfer limitations. These measures can inflict significant economic damage while maintaining plausible deniability and avoiding the diplomatic costs associated with military action^{[94][95]}.

Proxy conflicts in regions like Ukraine, Syria, and the South China Sea allow major powers to test military capabilities and exhaust opponents' resources while maintaining official peace between the great powers themselves. These conflicts serve the function that Orwell identified: consuming resources and maintaining psychological mobilization while avoiding decisive resolution that might disrupt the balance of power^{[96][97]}.

Buffer States and Contested Territories

The regions that serve as battlegrounds between the major power blocs—including Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and parts of Africa—function as the contested territories that Orwell described as essential to the super-state system. These areas are subject to constant competition for influence and control but never decisively conquered by any single power^{[98][99]}.

The fragmenting of global governance institutions has created conditions where smaller states are increasingly forced to choose sides in great power competition rather than maintaining neutrality or multi-alignment. This

dynamic reduces the autonomy of smaller states and intensifies great power competition by making every regional dispute a test of broader alliance structures^[100]^[101].

The emergence of swing states that attempt to balance between competing power blocs creates additional instability as major powers compete for their allegiance through inducements and threats. Countries like India, Brazil, and Turkey occupy positions similar to the contested territories in Orwell's system, subject to constant pressure but never fully controlled by any single power^[102]^[103].

Regional conflicts are increasingly shaped by great power competition as local disputes become proxies for broader geopolitical rivalry. This dynamic makes conflict resolution more difficult by adding external dimensions to local grievances and providing external sponsors for conflicting parties^[104]^[105].

Future Trajectories and Scenarios to 2030

Accelerating Democratic Erosion

Current trends suggest that democratic backsliding will continue and potentially accelerate through 2030, with several factors contributing to this trajectory. The normalization of authoritarian practices in established democracies has reduced the stigma associated with anti-democratic behavior while providing templates for other leaders to follow^[106]^[107].

The increasing sophistication of surveillance technologies and their declining costs will make comprehensive population monitoring feasible for a growing number of governments. AI-powered analysis of digital communications and behavioral patterns will enable early detection and suppression of dissent before it can organize into effective opposition^[108]^[109].

Climate change and its associated disruptions will create additional justifications for emergency powers and restrictions on civil liberties. The necessity of rapid response to climate-related disasters and resource scarcity will provide cover for authoritarian measures that might otherwise face resistance^[110]^[111].

Economic inequality is projected to continue increasing in many developed countries, creating additional grievances that authoritarian leaders can exploit to mobilize support for anti-democratic measures. The concentration of economic power among technological oligarchies will further undermine democratic accountability^[112]^[113].

Technological Authoritarianism and AI Control

The development of more sophisticated AI systems will create unprecedented capabilities for behavioral control and social engineering. Machine learning systems will become capable of predicting and influencing individual behavior with increasing precision, making comprehensive population control more feasible and effective^[114]^[115].

The integration of AI systems with biometric surveillance infrastructure will create comprehensive monitoring capabilities that can track not only behavior but also emotional states and physiological responses. These systems will enable real-time assessment of loyalty and compliance, automatically adjusting access to services and opportunities based on algorithmic assessments^[116]^[117].

Brain-computer interfaces and other neurotechnologies may enable direct monitoring and manipulation of thought processes, realizing the "thoughtcrime" concept that Orwell used as the ultimate form of totalitarian control. While these technologies are still in early development, their potential applications for authoritarian control are already being explored^[118]^[119].

Quantum computing capabilities may undermine current encryption methods, enabling comprehensive surveillance of digital communications that are currently protected by cryptographic systems. This development would eliminate the last vestiges of private communication and enable complete state visibility into individual thoughts and associations^[120]^[121].

Competitive Authoritarianism as the Dominant Model

The success of competitive authoritarian regimes in maintaining power while avoiding international isolation suggests that this model will continue to spread to additional countries. The ability to maintain electoral legitimacy while systematically undermining democratic competition makes this approach attractive to leaders seeking to consolidate power^{[122][123]}.

The development of more sophisticated techniques for electoral manipulation, including micro-targeting of voters, strategic disinformation campaigns, and legal restrictions on opposition activities, will make competitive authoritarianism more effective and durable. These techniques can be refined and shared between regimes, creating a global learning network for authoritarian practices^{[124][125]}.

The erosion of international institutions for promoting democracy and human rights will reduce external pressure on competitive authoritarian regimes while making international coordination against authoritarianism more difficult. The fragmentation of the global order will enable authoritarian regimes to find alternative sources of legitimacy and support^{[126][127]}.

The normalization of authoritarian practices in established democracies will reduce the moral authority and practical capability of democratic powers to support democratic movements in other countries. This development will leave pro-democracy forces increasingly isolated and vulnerable to authoritarian suppression^{[128][129]}.

Implications and Recommendations

Strengthening Democratic Institutions

The preservation of democratic governance requires active efforts to strengthen institutions and norms that serve as bulwarks against authoritarian capture. This includes reforming electoral systems to reduce the influence of concentrated wealth, strengthening judicial independence, and creating more robust oversight mechanisms for executive power^{[130][131]}.

Constitutional reforms may be necessary to address vulnerabilities that authoritarian leaders have learned to exploit. This includes clarifying the limits of executive power, strengthening protections for civil liberties, and creating more effective mechanisms for holding public officials accountable^{[132][133]}.

The professionalization of civil service and the insulation of administrative agencies from political interference are essential to preventing the weaponization of government institutions. This requires creating stronger legal protections for civil servants and more rigorous procedures for political appointments^{[134][135]}.

International cooperation in supporting democratic institutions and sharing best practices for resisting authoritarian capture will be essential as the threat becomes more global and sophisticated. This includes creating new institutions for democratic solidarity and developing more effective responses to authoritarian interference^{[136][137]}.

Regulating Technology and Surveillance

The regulation of surveillance technologies and their use by both governments and private actors is essential to preventing the emergence of comprehensive population control systems. This includes creating legal frameworks for limiting data collection, ensuring transparency in algorithmic systems, and protecting privacy rights^{[138][139]}.

The development of international standards and agreements for limiting the development and deployment of authoritarian technologies will be necessary to prevent a race to the bottom in surveillance capabilities. This includes restrictions on the export of surveillance technology and sanctions for regimes that use technology for systematic repression^{[140][141]}.

The creation of technical safeguards and alternative systems that protect privacy and enable anonymous communication will be essential for preserving space for dissent and opposition. This includes supporting the

development of decentralized communication networks and privacy-preserving technologies^{[142][143]}.

Education and public awareness about surveillance capabilities and their implications for democratic governance will be necessary to build public support for regulatory measures and create informed resistance to authoritarian surveillance^{[144][145]}.

Combating Information Manipulation

The development of more effective responses to disinformation and information manipulation requires both technical and social solutions. This includes improving detection systems for synthetic media, creating better tools for source verification, and developing educational programs that enhance media literacy^{[146][147]}.

The regulation of social media platforms and their algorithms is necessary to prevent the systematic amplification of divisive and false content. This includes requirements for algorithmic transparency, limitations on micro-targeting capabilities, and stronger enforcement of content policies^{[148][149]}.

The support for independent journalism and fact-checking organizations will be essential for maintaining reliable sources of information that can counter authoritarian propaganda. This includes public funding for journalism and legal protections for press freedom^{[150][151]}.

International cooperation in identifying and countering foreign information operations will be necessary as these campaigns become more sophisticated and coordinated. This includes sharing intelligence about disinformation campaigns and developing coordinated responses to protect democratic processes^{[152][153]}.

Conclusions

The analysis presented in this report demonstrates that many of George Orwell's warnings about totalitarian control have materialized in contemporary politics, albeit in forms that are often more subtle and technologically sophisticated than he envisioned. The combination of digital surveillance capabilities, information manipulation techniques, and institutional capture has created conditions that enable comprehensive population control while maintaining the appearance of democratic governance.

The global trend toward democratic backsliding and the emergence of competitive authoritarianism represent fundamental challenges to liberal democracy that require urgent attention and coordinated response. The successful consolidation of authoritarian control in numerous countries demonstrates that democratic institutions are more fragile than many observers previously believed and that the techniques for undermining them are becoming more sophisticated and widely available.

The role of technology in enabling authoritarian control represents a particularly significant development that requires new forms of regulation and resistance. The capabilities provided by artificial intelligence, biometric surveillance, and digital infrastructure create possibilities for population control that exceed anything available to historical authoritarian regimes. Without active efforts to limit and regulate these capabilities, the future may indeed resemble Orwell's dystopian vision more closely than many contemporary observers are willing to acknowledge.

The preservation of democratic governance in the face of these challenges will require sustained effort, international cooperation, and willingness to adapt democratic institutions to address new forms of authoritarian threat. The alternative—the gradual normalization of comprehensive surveillance, information control, and competitive authoritarianism—represents a fundamental transformation of human political organization that would eliminate the individual freedom and autonomy that democratic societies have sought to protect.

The time for complacency has passed. The warning signs that Orwell identified are clearly visible in contemporary politics, and the trajectory toward more comprehensive authoritarian control is evident in current trends. Whether this trajectory can be reversed will depend on the willingness of democratic societies to recognize the threat and take decisive action to address it. The stakes could not be higher: the preservation of human freedom and dignity in an age of unprecedented technological capability for control and manipulation.

References

- [1] Orwell, G. (1949). 1984. Secker & Warburg.
- [2] Levitsky, S., & Way, L. A. (2025). The path to American authoritarianism: What comes after democratic breakdown. *Foreign Affairs*. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/united-states/path-american-authoritarianism-trump>
- [3] Freedom House. (2025). *The uphill battle to safeguard rights*. Freedom House. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2025/uphill-battle-to-safeguard-rights>
- [4] International IDEA. (2025). *Global democracy report: Majority of countries worsen as press freedom hits 50-year low*. International IDEA. <https://www.idea.int/news/global-democracy-report-majority-countries-worsen-press-freedom-hits-50-year-low>
- [5] V-Dem Institute. (2025). *V-DEM democracy report 2025: 25 years of autocratization*. University of Gothenburg. https://www.v-dem.net/documents/60/V-dem-dr_2025_lowres.pdf
- [6] Feldstein, S. (2021). *The rise of digital authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression*. National Endowment for Democracy. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>
- [7] Lamensch, M. (2021). Authoritarianism has been reinvented for the digital age. *CIGI Online*. <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/authoritarianism-has-been-reinvented-for-the-digital-age/>
- [8] The Conversation. (2025). 'Who controls the present controls the past': What Orwell's '1984' explains about the twisting of history to control the public. <https://theconversation.com/who-controls-the-present-controls-the-past-what-orwells-1984-explains-about-the-twisting-of-history-to-control-the-public-257798>
- [9] Pomme, S. (2025). 9 ways George Orwell was right in 1984 — with quotes. *Sophie Pomme*. <https://sophiepomme.com/george-orwell-1984-quotes-predictions/>
- [10] The New York Times. (2025, March 29). We are all living in George Orwell's world now. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/03/29/magazine/trump-george-orwell-1984.html>
- [11] LinkedIn. (2025). Trump and Orwell's 1984: A comparison. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/trump-orwells-1984-comparison-james-jim-couper-oam-4xvec>
- [12] Max Planck Institute. (2025). Digital media – A threat to democracy? <https://www.mpg.de/24519906/digital-media-a-threat-to-democracy>
- [13] USC Today. (2024). Trust in voting: How misinformation threatens democracy. <https://today.usc.edu/trust-in-voting-how-misinformation-threatens-democracy/>
- [14] PMC. (2025). AI-driven disinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic governance. *NCBI*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12351547/>
- [15] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>
- [16] Brookings Institution. (2024). Misinformation is eroding the public's confidence in democracy. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/misinformation-is-eroding-the-publics-confidence-in-democracy/>
- [17] Statistics Canada. (2025). Concern about misinformation: Connections to trust in democratic institutions. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/75-006-x/2025001/article/00008-eng.htm>
- [18] Lawfare. (2025). The authoritarian risks of AI surveillance. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-authoritarian-risks-of-ai-surveillance>

- [19] Papers. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the anti-authoritarian fourth amendment. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5182213
- [20] Yale Review of International Studies. (2025). The rise of digital authoritarianism: Impacts on global democracy and human rights. <https://yris.yira.org/column/the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-impacts-on-global-democracy-and-human-rights/>
- [21] Just Security. (2021). How democracies must compete with digital authoritarians. <https://www.justsecurity.org/78381/system-rivalry-how-democracies-must-compete-with-digital-authoritarians/>
- [22] Geneva Centre for Security Policy. (2023). Digital authoritarianism: How digital technologies can empower authoritarianism. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>
- [23] Policy Circle. (2025). Democracies risk sliding into surveillance states. <https://www.policycircle.org/society/democracies-surveillance-states-ai/>
- [24] Data & Society. (2025). Tech power and the crisis of democracy. <https://datasociety.net/points/tech-power-and-the-crisis-of-democracy/>
- [25] Tech Policy Press. (2025). Old tricks, new tech: How legacy media capture fuels today's digital authoritarianism. <https://techpolicy.press/old-tricks-new-tech-how-legacy-media-capture-fuels-todays-digital-authoritarianism>
- [26] Ms. Magazine. (2025). Orwell's '1984' is now—Thanks to Trump's playbook. <https://msmagazine.com/2025/05/27/trump-women-1984-george-orwell-black-lives-matter-anti-abortion-fake-clinics-susan-b-anthony-pro-life/>
- [27] Flagpole. (2024). '1984' in 2024? Trump is what George Orwell warned us about. <https://flagpole.com/news/street-scribe/2024/04/03/1984-in-2024-trump-is-what-george-orwell-warned-us-about/>
- [28] Taylor & Francis Online. (2025). Artificial intelligence and democracy: Pathway to progress. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2025.2473994>
- [29] Lowy Institute. (2025). Digital authoritarianism is on the rise: Australia should take note. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/digital-authoritarianism-rise-australia-should-take-note>
- [30] Press Watchers. (2025). We have become an authoritarian state, and our top newsrooms are in denial. <https://presswatchers.org/2025/08/we-have-become-an-authoritarian-state-and-our-top-newsrooms-are-in-denial/>
- [31] NPR. (2025). U.S. is sliding toward authoritarianism, hundreds of political scientists say. <https://www.npr.org/2025/04/22/nx-s1-5340753/trump-democracy-authoritarianism-competitive-survey-political-scientist>
- [32] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025). Digital democracy in a divided global landscape. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/05/digital-democracy-in-a-divided-global-landscape?lang=en>
- [33] Tech Policy Press. (2025). Reflections at the edge of democracy and tech. <https://techpolicy.press/reflections-at-the-edge-of-democracy-and-tech>
- [34] V-Dem Institute. (2025). State of the world 2024: 25 years of autocratization. *Democratization*, 32(5), 1-25. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2487825>
- [35] International IDEA. (2025). *The global state of democracy 2025*. International IDEA. https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/2025-09/global-state-of-democracy-2025-democracy-on-the-move_0.pdf
- [36] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025). U.S. democratic backsliding in comparative perspective. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/08/us-democratic-backsliding-in-comparative-perspective?lang=en>

- [37] Harvard Ash Center. (2025). *The path to American authoritarianism*. Harvard University. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Levitsky-Way-2025-The-Path-to-American-Authoritarianism-What-Comes-After-Democratic-Breakdown.pdf>
- [38] Journal of Democracy. (2025). The new competitive authoritarianism. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-new-competitive-authoritarianism/>
- [39] The Atlantic. (2025). The new authoritarianism. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2025/02/trump-competitive-authoritarian/681609/>
- [40] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2022). Understanding and responding to global democratic backsliding. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2022/10/understanding-and-responding-to-global-democratic-backsliding?lang=en>
- [41] Taylor & Francis Online. (2025). The political economy of digital authoritarianism. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2514766>
- [42] American Affairs Journal. (2025). Authoritarianism, reform, or capture?: Democracy in Trump's America. <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2025/08/authoritarianism-reform-or-capture-democracy-in-trumps-america/>
- [43] Journal of Democracy. (2024). Misunderstanding democratic backsliding. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/misunderstanding-democratic-backsliding/>
- [44] SSRN. (2025). Digital authoritarianism: From state control to algorithmic despotism. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/5117399.pdf?abstractid=5117399&mirid=1&type=2>
- [45] OIIP. (2025). The rise of techno-authoritarianism and its impact on US foreign policy. <https://www.oaip.ac.at/en/publications/the-rise-of-techno-authoritarianism-and-its-impact-on-us-foreign-policy/>
- [46] University of Chicago News. (2025). Economic inequality leads to democratic erosion, study finds. <https://news.uchicago.edu/story/economic-inequality-leads-democratic-erosion-study-finds>
- [47] Cornell University News. (2025). Cornell scholars address global democratic erosion in book. <https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2025/07/cornell-scholars-address-global-democratic-erosion-book>
- [48] Frontiers in Political Science. (2025). Editorial: Exploring the global erosion of democracy. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1694804/full>
- [49] Wikipedia. (2025). Democratic backsliding. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democratic_Backsliding
- [50] University of Chicago News. (2025). Economic inequality leads to democratic erosion, study finds. <https://news.uchicago.edu/stories/2025/07/cornell-scholars-address-global-democratic-erosion-book>
- [51] Democracy Without Borders. (2024). Democratic decline continued to dominate globally in 2023, study reveals. <https://www.democracywithoutborders.org/33734/democratic-decline-continued-to-dominate-globally-in-2023-study-reveals/>
- [52] ITUC. (2025). Corporate underminers of democracy 2025. <https://www.ituc-csi.org/corporate-underminers-of-democracy-2025>
- [53] Brookings Institution. (2025). Democracy and policy: Reimagining a global democratic future. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/key-takeaways-reimagining-democracy-globally/>
- [54] Journal of Democracy. (2025). How autocrats weaponize AI — And how to fight back. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/how-autocrats-weaponize-ai-and-how-to-fight-back/>
- [55] Data & Society. (2025). Tech power and the crisis of democracy. <https://datasociety.net/points/tech-power-and-the-crisis-of-democracy/>

[56] ITUC. (2025). Corporate underminers of democracy 2025. <https://www.ituc-csi.org/corporate-underminers-of-democracy-2025>

[57] Tech Policy Press. (2025). Old tricks, new tech: How legacy media capture fuels today's digital authoritarianism. <https://techpolicy.press/old-tricks-new-tech-how-legacy-media-capture-fuels-todays-digital-authoritarianism>

[58] Journal of Democracy. (2025). How autocrats weaponize AI — And how to fight back. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/how-autocrats-weaponize-ai-and-how-to-fight-back/>

[59] Lawfare. (2025). The authoritarian risks of AI surveillance. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-authoritarian-risks-of-ai-surveillance>

[60] SSRN. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the anti-authoritarian fourth amendment. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5182213

[61] Policy Circle. (2025). Democracies risk sliding into surveillance states. <https://www.policycircle.org/society/democracies-surveillance-states-ai/>

[62] Yale Review of International Studies. (2025). The rise of digital authoritarianism: Impacts on global democracy and human rights. <https://yris.yira.org/column/the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-impacts-on-global-democracy-and-human-rights/>

[63] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[64] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

[65] PMC. (2025). AI-driven disinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic governance. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12351547/>

[66] Tech Policy Press. (2025). Old tricks, new tech: How legacy media capture fuels today's digital authoritarianism. <https://techpolicy.press/old-tricks-new-tech-how-legacy-media-capture-fuels-todays-digital-authoritarianism>

[67] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025). Digital democracy in a divided global landscape. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/05/digital-democracy-in-a-divided-global-landscape?lang=en>

[68] Lowy Institute. (2025). Digital authoritarianism is on the rise: Australia should take note. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/digital-authoritarianism-rise-australia-should-take-note>

[69] Geneva Centre for Security Policy. (2023). Digital authoritarianism: How digital technologies can empower authoritarianism. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>

[70] Freedom House. (2018). The rise of digital authoritarianism. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2018/rise-digital-authoritarianism>

[71] Just Security. (2021). How democracies must compete with digital authoritarians. <https://www.justsecurity.org/78381/system-rivalry-how-democracies-must-compete-with-digital-authoritarians/>

[72] CIGI Online. (2021). Authoritarianism has been reinvented for the digital age. <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/authoritarianism-has-been-reinvented-for-the-digital-age/>

[73] SSRN. (2025). Digital authoritarianism: From state control to algorithmic despotism. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/5117399.pdf?abstractid=5117399&mirid=1&type=2>

[74] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[75] Yale Review of International Studies. (2025). The rise of digital authoritarianism: Impacts on global democracy and human rights. <https://yris.yira.org/column/the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-impacts-on-global-democracy-and-human-rights/>

[76] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

[77] Policy Circle. (2025). Democracies risk sliding into surveillance states. <https://www.policycircle.org/society/democracies-surveillance-states-ai/>

[78] Geneva Centre for Security Policy. (2023). Digital authoritarianism: How digital technologies can empower authoritarianism. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>

[79] Lawfare. (2025). The authoritarian risks of AI surveillance. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-authoritarian-risks-of-ai-surveillance>

[^80] Yale Review of International Studies. (2025). The rise of digital authoritarianism: Impacts on global democracy and human rights. <https://yris.yira.org/column/the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-impacts-on-global-democracy-and-human-rights/>

[^81] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[^82] Wikipedia. (2025). Political geography of Nineteen Eighty-Four. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_geography_of_Nineteen_Eighty-Four

[^83] Responsible Statecraft. (2022). Has 'Oceania, Eurasia and Eastasia' come full circle? <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2022/03/09/has-oceania-eurasia-and-eastasia-come-full-circle/>

[^84] LinkedIn. (2025). Global crossroads: Simultaneous crises and emerging blocs in 2025. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/global-crossroads-simultaneous-crises-emerging-blocs-hendy-itsic>

[^85] S&P Global. (2025). Top geopolitical risks of 2025. <https://www.spglobal.com/en/research-insights/market-insights/geopolitical-risk>

[^86] Counter Currents. (2025). Russia and the collective West: The global politics of the Cold War 1.0 & 2.0. <https://countercurrents.org/2025/09/russia-and-the-collective-west-the-global-politics-of-the-cold-war-1-0-2-0/>

[^87] Capital Economics. (2025). The shape of the fractured world in 2025. <https://www.capitaleconomics.com/publications/global-economics-focus/shape-fractured-world-2025>

[^88] National Intelligence Council. (2025). *Global trends 2025 report*. U.S. Government. [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Global Trends_2025 Report.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Global_Trends_2025_Report.pdf)

[^89] Steven Schofield. (2025). How Orwell's dystopia became our reality. <http://stevenschofield.co.uk/?p=309>

[^90] DGAP. (2021). The global conflict landscape in 2030. <https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/global-conflict-landscape-2030-imperative-investing-security-cooperation>

[^91] European Commission. (2019). *Global trends to 2030*. https://ec.europa.eu/assets/epsc/pages/espas/ESPAS_Report2019.pdf

[^92] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

- [^93] PMC. (2025). AI-driven disinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic governance. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12351547/>
- [^94] Science Direct. (2025). Changing global linkages: A new Cold War? <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0022199624001697>
- [^95] American Economic Association. (2025). Changing global linkages: A new Cold War? <https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2025/program/paper/ZaNzkefA>
- [^96] Air Minded. (2009). The war with Eurasia/Eastasia. <https://airminded.org/2009/12/31/the-war-with-eurasia-eastasia/>
- [^97] Baruch College. (2018). Totalitarianism and perpetual war: 1984, a case study. <https://blogs.baruch.cuny.edu/exingtonreview/journal/totalitarianism-and-perpetual-war-1984-a-case-study/>
- [^98] Capital Economics. (2025). The shape of the fractured world in 2025. <https://www.capitaleconomics.com/publications/global-economics-focus/shape-fractured-world-2025>
- [^99] S&P Global. (2025). Top geopolitical risks of 2025. <https://www.spglobal.com/en/research-insights/market-insights/geopolitical-risk>
- [^100] LinkedIn. (2025). Global crossroads: Simultaneous crises and emerging blocs in 2025. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/global-crossroads-simultaneous-crises-emerging-blocs-hendy-itsic>
- [^101] American Economic Association. (2025). Changing global linkages: A new Cold War? <https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2025/program/paper/ZaNzkefA>
- [^102] National Intelligence Council. (2025). *Global trends 2025 report*. https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/GlobalTrends_2025Report.pdf
- [^103] IBEI. (2023). *Trends in global governance and future scenarios 2030*. https://www.ibei.org/trends-in-global-governance-and-future-scenarios-2030-globe-report_309688.pdf
- [^104] DGAP. (2021). The global conflict landscape in 2030. <https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/global-conflict-landscape-2030-imperative-investing-security-cooperation>
- [^105] CIPPEC. (2019). Global governance in 2030: Prospective scenarios on the future of politics. <https://www.cippec.org/publicacion/global-governance-in-2050-prospective-scenarios-on-the-future-of-politics/>
- [^106] V-Dem Institute. (2025). State of the world 2024: 25 years of autocratization. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2487825>
- [^107] NPR. (2025). U.S. is sliding toward authoritarianism, hundreds of political scientists say. <https://www.npr.org/2025/04/22/nx-s1-5340753/trump-democracy-authoritarianism-competitive-survey-political-scientist>
- [^108] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>
- [^109] Journal of Democracy. (2025). How autocrats weaponize AI — And how to fight back. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/how-autocrats-weaponize-ai-and-how-to-fight-back/>
- [^110] DGAP. (2021). The global conflict landscape in 2030. <https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/global-conflict-landscape-2030-imperative-investing-security-cooperation>
- [^111] European Commission. (2019). *Global trends to 2030*. https://ec.europa.eu/assets/epsc/pages/espas/ESPAS_Report2019.pdf
- [^112] University of Chicago News. (2025). Economic inequality leads to democratic erosion, study finds. <https://news.uchicago.edu/stories/2025/07/cornell-scholars-address-global-democratic-erosion-book>

[^113] ITUC. (2025). Corporate underminers of democracy 2025. <https://www.ituc-csi.org/corporate-underminers-of-democracy-2025>

[^114] Harvard Ash Center. (2025). *How AI can support democracy movements*. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/How-AI-Can-Support-Democracy-Movements-Final.pdf>

[^115] Taylor & Francis Online. (2025). Artificial intelligence and democracy: Pathway to progress. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2025.2473994>

[^116] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[^117] Geneva Centre for Security Policy. (2023). Digital authoritarianism: How digital technologies can empower authoritarianism. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>

[^118] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[^119] Lawfare. (2025). The authoritarian risks of AI surveillance. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-authoritarian-risks-of-ai-surveillance>

[^120] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[^121] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

[^122] Journal of Democracy. (2025). The new competitive authoritarianism. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-new-competitive-authoritarianism/>

[^123] Harvard Ash Center. (2025). *The path to American authoritarianism*. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Levitsky-Way-2025-The-Path-to-American-Authoritarianism-What-Comes-After-Democratic-Breakdown.pdf>

[^124] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

[^125] PMC. (2025). AI-driven disinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic governance. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12351547/>

[^126] Freedom House. (2025). *The uphill battle to safeguard rights*. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2025/uphill-battle-to-safeguard-rights>

[^127] International IDEA. (2025). *The global state of democracy 2025*. https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/2025-09/global-state-of-democracy-2025-democracy-on-the-move_0.pdf

[^128] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2025). U.S. democratic backsliding in comparative perspective. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/08/us-democratic-backsliding-in-comparative-perspective?lang=en>

[^129] Press Watchers. (2025). We have become an authoritarian state, and our top newsrooms are in denial. <https://presswatchers.org/2025/08/we-have-become-an-authoritarian-state-and-our-top-newsrooms-are-in-denial/>

[^130] Brookings Institution. (2025). Democracy and policy: Reimagining a global democratic future. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/key-takeaways-reimagining-democracy-globally/>

[^131] Cornell University News. (2025). Cornell scholars address global democratic erosion in book. <https://news.uconn.edu/stories/2025/07/cornell-scholars-address-global-democratic-erosion-book>

[^132] Harvard Ash Center. (2025). *The path to American authoritarianism*. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Levitsky-Way-2025-The-Path-to-American-Authoritarianism-What-Comes-After-Democratic-Breakdown.pdf>

[^133] SSRN. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the anti-authoritarian fourth amendment. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5182213

[^134] American Affairs Journal. (2025). Authoritarianism, reform, or capture?: Democracy in Trump's America. <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2025/08/authoritarianism-reform-or-capture-democracy-in-trumps-america/>

[^135] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2022). Understanding and responding to global democratic backsliding. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2022/10/understanding-and-responding-to-global-democratic-backsliding?lang=en>

[^136] DAIS. (2024). Building democratic resilience to foreign disinformation in Canada. <https://dais.ca/reports/building-democratic-resilience-to-foreign-disinformation-in-canada/>

[^137] Evidence for Democracy. (2025). The misinformation crisis: What's at stake for Canada's election. <https://evidencefordemocracy.ca/the-misinformation-crisis-whats-at-stake-for-canadas-election/>

[^138] Policy Circle. (2025). Democracies risk sliding into surveillance states. <https://www.policycircle.org/society/democracies-surveillance-states-ai/>

[^139] SSRN. (2025). Artificial intelligence and the anti-authoritarian fourth amendment. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5182213

[^140] National Endowment for Democracy. (2025). Data-centric authoritarianism: How China's development of frontier technologies could globalize repression. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>

[^141] Geneva Centre for Security Policy. (2023). Digital authoritarianism: How digital technologies can empower authoritarianism. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>

[^142] Harvard Ash Center. (2025). *How AI can support democracy movements*. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/How-AI-Can-Support-Democracy-Movements-Final.pdf>

[^143] Journal of Democracy. (2025). How autocrats weaponize AI — And how to fight back. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/how-autocrats-weaponize-ai-and-how-to-fight-back/>

[^144] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. (2024). Countering disinformation effectively: An evidence-based policy guide. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/01/countering-disinformation-effectively-an-evidence-based-policy-guide?lang=en>

[^145] Evidence for Democracy. (2023). *Misinformation in Canada*. https://evidencefordemocracy.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/misinformation-in-canada-evidence-for-democracy-report_.pdf

[^146] Government of Canada. (2025). Cyber threats to Canada's democratic process: 2025 update. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>

[^147] PMC. (2025). AI-driven disinformation: Policy recommendations for democratic governance. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12351547/>

[^148] Tech Policy Press. (2025). Reflections at the edge of democracy and tech. <https://techpolicy.press/reflections-at-the-edge-of-democracy-and-tech>

[^149] Lowy Institute. (2025). Digital authoritarianism is on the rise: Australia should take note. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/digital-authoritarianism-rise-australia-should-take-note>

[^150] Policy Alternatives. (2025). Canada has a disinformation problem—and the tools to fix it. <https://www.policyalternatives.ca/news-research/canada-has-a-disinformation-problem-and-the-tools-to-fix-it/>

[^151] DFR Lab. (2025). An existential threat: Disinformation 'single biggest risk' to Canadian democracy. <https://dfrlab.org/2025/03/19/canada-disinfo-existential-threat/>

[^152] Government of Canada. (2024). Protect yourself and others from disinformation. <https://www.canada.ca/en/democratic-institutions/services/protecting-democratic-institutions.html>

[^153] DAIS. (2024). Building democratic resilience to foreign disinformation in Canada. <https://dais.ca/reports/building-democratic-resilience-to-foreign-disinformation-in-canada/>

✱

1. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/05/digital-democracy-in-a-divided-global-landscape?lang=en>
2. <https://techpolicy.press/reflections-at-the-edge-of-democracy-and-tech>
3. <https://www.cyber.gc.ca/en/guidance/cyber-threats-canadas-democratic-process-2025-update>
4. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/How-AI-Can-Support-Democracy-Movements-Final.pdf>
5. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2025.2473994>
6. <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/the-authoritarian-risks-of-ai-surveillance>
7. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/5117399.pdf?abstractid=5117399&mirid=1&type=2>
8. <https://www.ituc-csi.org/corporate-underminers-of-democracy-2025>
9. <https://www.justsecurity.org/78381/system-rivalry-how-democracies-must-compete-with-digital-authoritarians/>
10. <https://yris.yira.org/column/the-rise-of-digital-authoritarianism-impacts-on-global-democracy-and-human-rights/>
11. <https://datasociety.net/points/tech-power-and-the-crisis-of-democracy/>
12. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exclusive/how-autocrats-weaponize-ai-and-how-to-fight-back/>
13. <https://techpolicy.press/old-tricks-new-tech-how-legacy-media-capture-fuels-todays-digital-authoritarianism>
14. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5182213
15. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2018/rise-digital-authoritarianism>
16. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/digital-authoritarianism-rise-australia-should-take-note>
17. <https://ecpr.eu/Events/Event/SectionDetails/1511>
18. <https://www.policycircle.org/society/democracies-surveillance-states-ai/>
19. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2514766>
20. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/5182213.pdf?abstractid=5182213&mirid=1>

21. <https://www.idea.int/news/global-democracy-report-majority-countries-worsen-press-freedom-hits-50-year-low>
22. https://www.v-dem.net/documents/60/V-dem-dr__2025_lowres.pdf
23. <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2025/uphill-battle-to-safeguard-rights>
24. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2025/09/09/pandemic-democracy-decline-overreach/>
25. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democratic_backsliding
26. <https://www.democracywithoutborders.org/33734/democratic-decline-continued-to-dominate-globally-in-2023-study-reveals/>
27. <https://ash.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Levitsky-Way-2025-The-Path-to-American-Authoritarianism-What-Comes-After-Democratic-Breakdown.pdf>
28. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2025/08/us-democratic-backsliding-in-comparative-perspective?lang=en>
29. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1694804/full>
30. <https://www.npr.org/2025/04/22/nx-s1-5340753/trump-democracy-authoritarianism-competitive-survey-political-scientist>
31. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13510347.2025.2487825>
32. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2022/10/understanding-and-responding-to-global-democratic-backsliding?lang=en>
33. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/the-new-competitive-authoritarianism/>
34. <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/key-takeaways-reimagining-democracy-globally/>
35. <https://news.uchicago.edu/story/economic-inequality-leads-democratic-erosion-study-finds>
36. <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2025/08/authoritarianism-reform-or-capture-democracy-in-trumps-america/>
37. https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/2025-09/global-state-of-democracy-2025-democracy-on-the-move_0.pdf
38. <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/misunderstanding-democratic-backsliding/>
39. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2025/02/trump-competitive-authoritarian/681609/>
40. <https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2025/07/cornell-scholars-address-global-democratic-erosion-book>
41. <https://www.cippec.org/publicacion/global-governance-in-2050-prospective-scenarios-on-the-future-of-politics/>
42. https://www.ibei.org/trends-in-global-governance-and-future-scenarios-2030-globe-report_309688.pdf
43. https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/GlobalTrends_2030.pdf
44. https://www.reddit.com/r/PoliticalDiscussion/comments/1hbq1g4/what_hope_do_dems_have_for_the_2030s/
45. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/02/21/concerns-about-democracy-in-the-digital-age/>
46. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1949/06/18/orwell-on-the-future>
47. <https://www.ned.org/data-centric-authoritarianism-how-chinas-development-of-frontier-technologies-could-globalize-repression-2/>
48. <https://dgap.org/en/research/publications/global-conflict-landscape-2030-imperative-investing-security-cooperation>
49. <https://sophiepomme.com/george-orwell-1984-quotes-predictions/>

50. <https://www.cigionline.org/articles/authoritarianism-has-been-reinvented-for-the-digital-age/>
51. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2020/06/30/innovations-these-experts-predict-by-2030/>
52. <https://lithub.com/75-years-of-1984-why-george-orwells-classic-remains-more-relevant-than-ever/>
53. <https://www.oii.ac.at/en/publications/the-rise-of-techno-authoritarianism-and-its-impact-on-us-foreign-policy/>
54. https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC115008/futurgov_web_lq_v2.pdf
55. https://www.reddit.com/r/books/comments/i5hhjm/1984_made_some_accurate_predictions_but_were/
56. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/democrats-future-crisis-the-biggest-states-that-back-them-are-shrinking>
57. <https://www.vox.com/the-gray-area/365740/orwell-1984-animal-farm-orwellian>
58. <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/digital-authoritarianism-how-digital-technologies-can-empower-authoritarianism-and>
59. https://ec.europa.eu/assets/epsc/pages/espas/ESPAS_Report2019.pdf
60. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/general_format.html
61. <https://libguides.csudh.edu/citation/apa-7>
62. <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/paper-format>
63. <https://www.scribbr.com/apa-examples/report/>
64. <https://libguides.capilanou.ca/apa>
65. <https://www.lib.sfu.ca/help/cite-write/citation-style-guides/apa/apa-writing-tips>
66. <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples/report-individual-authors-references>
67. <https://libguides.sait.ca/apa>
68. <https://www.scribbr.com/apa-style/format/>
69. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/reference_list_articles_in_periodicals.html
70. <https://library.senecapolytechnic.ca/apa>
71. <https://apastyle.apa.org/instructional-aids/student-paper-setup-guide.pdf>
72. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/reference_list_other_print_sources.html
73. <https://guides.libraries.psu.edu/apasquickguide/intext>
74. <https://libraryguides.centennialcollege.ca/apastyleguide>
75. <https://libraryguides.vu.edu.au/apa-referencing/7ReportsGreyLiterature>
76. <https://libguides.norquest.ca/apa>
77. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/research_and_citation/apa_style/apa_formatting_and_style_guide/index.html
78. <https://writeanswers.royalroads.ca/faq/199135>
79. <https://guides.douglascollege.ca/APA-7>