



FROM CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS TO PIRATE PARTIES* TO DIGITAL DEMOCRACY

Zoltan Zakota

Introduction

Reshaping our political and social systems for a sustainable future requires a multifaceted approach that addresses several key areas: political reform, social change, economic development, environmental preservation, and technological innovation. When dealing with politics, we cannot ignore the antidemocratic tendencies that are increasingly infiltrating our everyday lives. Under these circumstances, it is crucial to acknowledge that one of the most important tasks of political reform is strengthening democracy. The current political discourse is replete with buzzwords such as proportional representation, direct democracy, sustainability-focused governance, transparency, accountability, and equity. Among the many actors attempting to infuse these terms with substantive meaning, some new entities are proposing innovative solutions utilizing the means of the Information Society (IS): digital parties, such as the pirates.

These parties, some of which emerged from anti-establishment protests, have rapidly spread across the globe in just two decades. Their journey is one of transformation, evolving from grassroots movements to established political players. They possess a clear digital agenda, focusing on issues like copyright reform, unrestricted access to information, and online privacy. They strongly advocate for net neutrality and the unrestricted flow of knowledge. However, most have recognized the importance of broader democratic values for political success. Beyond their digital focus, they also advocate for traditional democratic ideals, including civil

* <https://doi.org/10.62560/csz.2024.02.07>



rights, transparency, and combating corruption. They promote free speech, and direct democracy, and explore alternative forms of citizen participation in government, often leveraging technology (e-democracy). While the future impact of these parties remains uncertain, their influence is undeniable. They have challenged traditional political norms and brought issues of the digital age to the forefront. They have spurred the emergence of a new generation of digital parties, reshaping the European political landscape and inspiring similar movements worldwide. This paper aims to briefly present these political formations, with special attention to their origins and their relationships with civil society. After outlining the broad framework, I will present a case study of one of the most prominent and successful of these formations.

Literature and Methodology

This article is a qualitative analysis of the relationship between civil society organizations (CSOs) and digital parties (DPs), with particular emphasis on pirate parties (PPs). I primarily used secondary sources, supplemented by some personal conversations. The literature on digital parties, particularly pirate parties, is surprisingly rich, given their brief history of less than twenty-five years. Notable authors in this field include Anja Adler, David Altman, Sebastian Berg, Radu Carp, Rick Falkvinge, Catherine Fieschi, Gregory Fossedal, Martin Fredriksson, Paolo Gerbaudo, Jeanette Hofmann, and Matt Qvortrup. The programs of the parties also provide insight into the values and policies they represent. For statistical data, I relied on corresponding Wikipedia pages, which proved to be high-quality synthetic sources in this case. I refrain from extensively presenting the theoretical background due to length constraints and because I have briefly covered it in a previous article (Zakota 2023). However, a thorough analysis of the topic would warrant a separate study.

Shared values and differences

Civil society organizations and pirate parties share a complex and evolving relationship, primarily based on their value systems. Here is a breakdown of the key connections:

1. *Transparency and openness*: Both PPs and CSOs advocate for transparency in government and access to information. They believe citizens should have a clear understanding of how decisions are made and the data that informs them.
2. *Free speech and digital rights*: Both groups champion the protection of free speech online and advocate for strong digital rights. They view unrestricted access to information and the ability to express oneself freely as crucial aspects of a healthy democracy.



3. *Citizen participation and engagement*: PPs and CSOs encourage active citizen participation in shaping policies and advocating for change. They believe a strong civil society is essential for a functioning democracy.

While there are areas of overlap and potential collaboration, it is important to note that CSOs and PPs typically have distinct organizational structures, goals, and methods of operation. CSOs encompass a wide range of non-profit, non-governmental organizations working on various social, environmental, and human rights issues. In contrast, PPs are political entities focusing specifically on digital rights, civil liberties, and democratic reform, often through participation in electoral politics. The two main categories of differences are:

- *Focus and scope*: CSOs address a wide range of issues beyond those central to PPs. While PPs focus heavily on digital rights and copyright, CSOs may address issues like social justice, environmental protection, or human rights.
- *Institutional politics vs. grassroots activism*: PPs participate in politics by contesting elections and proposing legislation. In contrast, CSOs operate outside traditional political structures, relying on advocacy, campaigns, and social pressure to achieve their goals.

Overall, the relationship between PPs and CSOs is one of both collaboration and distinction. While they share core values and occasionally work together on specific issues, they operate in different spheres with varying degrees of engagement with the formal political system.

Policy Overlap

CSOs and PPs both engage with political and social issues, particularly advocating for transparency, digital rights, and democratic reform. Despite their different operational methods, there are several connections and overlaps between the two. Here are some key areas where the goals of CSOs overlap with the political objectives of PPs:

- *Advocacy for digital rights*: Both CSOs and PPs often advocate for digital rights, including issues such as internet freedom, privacy protection, and access to information. They campaign against censorship, surveillance, and restrictive copyright laws that limit individuals' rights online.
- *Copyright reform*: PPs are known for their stance on copyright reform, advocating for a more balanced approach that protects creators' rights while allowing for fair use and access to information. This aligns with the goals of some civil society groups working on intellectual property issues.
- *Data privacy*: Data privacy is a growing concern for both. They advocate for strong data protection laws and individual control over personal information.



- *Net neutrality*: Both groups support net neutrality principles, ensuring equal access to the internet without throttling or prioritizing content.
- *Transparency and accountability*: CSOs and PPs may push for reforms that promote openness in governance, fight against corruption, and demand transparency and accountability from those in power, both in government and corporations.
- *Participatory democracy*: Both CSOs and PPs often promote participatory democracy, encouraging citizens to actively engage in political processes beyond traditional voting. They support initiatives such as citizen-led decision-making, participatory budgeting, and direct democracy mechanisms.
- *Alternative political platforms*: PPs often emerge as alternative political movements challenging the status quo. They prioritize issues related to information freedom, intellectual property reform, and civil liberties. While CSOs typically operate outside formal political structures, they may align with PPs on specific policy goals or collaborate on campaigns and advocacy efforts.
- *Youth engagement*: PPs tend to attract younger people who are tech-savvy and concerned about digital rights and civil liberties. Similarly, many CSOs engage with youth and use digital platforms to gain support and raise awareness about social and political issues.
- *Coalition building*: In some cases, CSOs and PPs may collaborate or form alliances on specific issues where their interests align. For example, they may work together on campaigns related to internet freedom, copyright reform, or civil liberties, leveraging their respective strengths and networks to achieve common goals.

One reason for this overlap may be attributed to the fact that many PPs are rooted in civil society activism and, as a party, they still use organizational and communication techniques typical of CSOs. Emerging from the digital world, they represent a fresh wave of political movements with deep roots in online activism. Although many digital parties do not adopt an ideology in the traditional sense and do not place themselves on either the right or the left side of the political spectrum, some left-wing affiliations can be observed in many cases (Carp 2023).

The shifting landscape of organization and communication

„On June 7, 2009, the Swedish Pirate Party received 225,915 votes in the European elections, becoming the largest party in the most coveted sub-thirty demographic” Rick Falkvinge, the leader of the party at the time, attributed the victory to their swarm-wise working style: "A swarm organization is a decentralized, collaborative effort of volunteers that looks like a hierarchical, traditional organization from the outside. It is built by a small core of people that construct a scaffolding of go-to people, enabling many volunteers to cooperate on a common goal in quantities of people not possible before the net was available" (Falkvinge 2013: 13–14).



There are two key issues in this definition, both resembling the functioning of a CSO:

- Using volunteers who cooperate on a common goal.
- Using the internet to gather as many such volunteers as possible.

Traditionally, social movements have been characterized by shared ideologies and collective identities, often rooted in grand narratives of justice, equality, or liberation. Although this ideological cohesion provided a solid foundation for mobilization and collective action, recent years have witnessed a shift in the landscape of social movements. There is a growing trend towards movements that are:

- *Networked*: Leveraging digital technologies like social media, these movements facilitate communication, collaboration, and resource sharing across geographical boundaries.
- *Issue-Specific*: These movements focus on specific, time-bound issues such as environmental protection campaigns or movements against police brutality.
- *Identity-Based*: Movements centered on shared experiences of marginalized groups can be powerful, but they may not always translate into a broader, unified ideology.

The rise of personal relations has induced a shift towards networked, issue-specific communication, placing greater emphasis on personal connections and shared experiences. This shift is evident in several key aspects:

- *Peer-to-Peer Mobilization*: Social media platforms facilitate direct connections among individuals, bypassing traditional leadership structures. This fosters a sense of collective action grounded in shared experiences.
- *Emotional Resonance*: Personal stories and testimonials shared online can create strong emotional connections to causes, motivating participation even without a fully formed ideology.
- *Focus on Shared Values*: Movements may coalesce around shared values like human rights, environmental protection, or social justice, without adhering to a rigid set of beliefs.

Digital channels, especially social media platforms, significantly facilitate the development of transnational movements by leveraging personal connections. This impact manifests in several ways:

- *Global solidarity*: social media allows individuals from diverse backgrounds to connect and build solidarity around shared issues, transcending national borders.
- *Decentralized action*: networked movements do not rely on centralized leadership, enabling rapid mobilization and coordinated action across different countries.
- *Rapid diffusion of ideas*: successful tactics and campaign strategies can be quickly shared and adopted globally, leading to a domino effect of social movements.



This innovative technology also implies several challenges and considerations, the most important being the following:

- *Echo chambers and confirmation bias*: social media algorithms can create echo chambers where users are primarily exposed to information that confirms their existing beliefs and this can hinder constructive dialogue and limit the reach of movements.
- *Short-term focus*: the fast-paced nature of online communication may favor short-term mobilization over long-term strategic planning for achieving lasting social change.
- *Sustainability and impact*: sustaining momentum and achieving concrete results can be challenging for movements reliant on personal connections without a strong ideological foundation.

This new type of communication is addressed by the new types of digital parties, pirates among them. “New technology is thus seen as providing the potential for a tremendously popular communication, where people can communicate directly with one another on a global scale, individually or en masse, without mediations from corporations or authorities. This new state of connectedness is, however, threatened by censorship imposed by not only more or less authoritarian governments but copyright regimes.” (Fredriksson 2015: 9–15)

From pirate parties to digital parties

Although pirate parties have only a history of not even two decades, a new player has appeared on the political scene for some time: the digital party. Although some authors use the terms as synonyms, they should not be confused, because, despite some superficial similarities and obvious affiliations, the two categories are fundamentally different.

According to Paolo Gerbaudo “The digital party is the new organizational template seen across several new political formations that have been created in recent years, from the Pirate Parties that have emerged in many Northern European countries, to left-wing populist formations such as Podemos in Spain and France Insoumise in France, down to new campaign organizations such as Momentum, driving the surge in popularity of Corbyn’s Labour Party in the United Kingdom. Despite their manifest differences, these various formations display evident commonalities in the way in which they promise to deliver a new politics supported by digital technology; a kind of politics that – as featured by different elements of this opening scene – professes to be more democratic, more open to ordinary people, more immediate and direct, more authentic and transparent.” (Gerbaudo 2019: 4)

At the same time, it seems as if the new political formation also means a kind of return to the roots, to the activist past. By this, I mean that one of their main means of communication is directly addressing the individual through social media



networks and one of their key promises is the broadening of democracy by these means. Gerbaudo calls this type of party “a ‘platform party’ because it mimics the logic of companies such as Facebook and Amazon of integrating the data-driven logic of social networks in its very decision-making structure; an organization that promises to use digital technology to deliver a new grassroots democracy, more open to civil society and the active intervention of ordinary citizens.” (Gerbaudo 2019: 5)

Nowadays digital parties’ participation is described as distancing from traditional political parties, to be seen as “movements, fluid aggregations of individuals, participatory spaces, [...] as ‘open spaces’ where the citizens can gather to cooperate, without the implications of conformity traditionally associated with the political party.” (Gerbaudo 2019: 82)

The Realm of E-Democracy

Three forms of democracy have emerged within the realm of Information Society (IS): digital democracy, direct democracy, and liquid democracy. These forms differ significantly in both their role and their toolkit, but they all share a common feature: they have evolved during the turn of the century. In some regard, these diverse types of democracy have converged in recent decades. One of the reasons for this can undoubtedly be found in the spread of new ICT tools, while the other is the need to reach an ever-wider audience by these means.

All three models have the goal of empowering the citizens, which means providing technologies, tools, and platforms for them, to express their opinions and influence decision-making, to attain their goals. These cover a wide range, both existing and emerging, but all of them are ICT-related, such as:

- *Traditional media*: television and radio broadcasts can be used to disseminate information and facilitate discussions.
- *Online platforms*: websites, forums, social media, and e-government portals enable interactive communication and information sharing.
- *Online voting systems*: can be used for elections or public opinion polls. Security and accessibility considerations are crucial for online voting.

Digital democracy, also known as electronic democracy, e-democracy, or internet democracy, leverages information and communication technology (ICT) to enhance and promote democratic processes. Its core concept involves utilizing technology to empower citizens and improve their participation in decision-making at various levels (local, national, and global).

Digital democracy can be understood “as a concept that links practices and institutions of collective political self-determination with its mediating digital infrastructures. Digital democracy has both an analytical and a normative dimension.



As an analytical lens, digital democracy investigates how the use of digital technologies may influence the conditions, institutions, and practices of political engagement and democratic governance. As a normative concept, it enables us to think about democracy as an open, alterable form of political organization that is always in the making.” (Berg–Hofmann 2021)

Direct democracy is a form of democracy in which citizens can participate directly in decision-making processes rather than through elected representatives. In a direct democracy system, citizens can propose, vote on, and enact laws and policies without intermediaries through “a *mechanism of direct democracy* as a publicly recognized, institutionalized process by which citizens of a region or country register their choice or opinion on specific issues through a ballot with universal and secret suffrage.” (Altman 2019: 6) The deployment of these tools, characterized by Matt Qvortrup as “supply-side politics” (Qvortrup 2013: 151–155), in the political struggle is often initiated by CSOs. These are the following:

- *Initiatives*: allow citizens to propose new laws or constitutional amendments directly, bypassing the legislature.
- *Referendums*: allow citizens to vote directly on specific laws, policies, or constitutional changes proposed by the government or initiated by citizens themselves.
- *Plebiscites*: allow authorities to pose a question to the citizenry for them to answer.

While direct democracy can empower citizens and promote greater political participation, it also has challenges and limitations, including potential issues with minority rights protection, the complexity of decision-making, and the risk of populism. As such, direct democracy is often used in conjunction with representative democracy, where citizens elect representatives to make decisions on their behalf, to balance the advantages of direct participation with the need for efficient and accountable governance.

Under the pressures and the promises of the digital revolution, populism became a significant source of danger not only for digital parties but also for CSOs, by placing the promise of authenticity at the center of their appeal and thus being able to exploit the promises of democracy and subvert them. “It is a kind of political jiu-jitsu, in which rather than using its force against its democratic opponents, populism has turned the opponent’s force on itself.” (Fieschi 2019: 157)

Liquid democracy “is a hybrid form of indirect and direct democracy, [with] a smooth transition between the two. Each participant can decide for themselves how far they want to pursue their interests or how far they want to be represented by others. In particular, the mandator can reclaim the voting rights transferred to the delegate at any time and does not have to wait until a new electoral period to do so. This results in a network of delegations that is constantly in flux.” (Piratenwiki 2022)

Rick Falkvinge highlights the affinity between the idea of liquid democracy and his swarm concept: “This voting right can be assigned differently for different is-



sues, and be assigned in turn, creating a chain of trust to make an informed vote. This taps into the heart of the swarm's social mechanisms of trusting people and friends, rather than fearing to lose. 'Trust over fear.' We like that. That is swarm think. The German Pirate Party calls this *liquid democracy*." (Falkvinge–Swarmwise. The Tactical Manual to Changing the World 2013)

To many, liquid democracy is a story of failure, which evolved from a panacea for disenchantment with politics to a display of mass tyranny and digital surveillance. The controversial nature of the concept is due to its different definitions, but in general, liquid democracy is identified with the occasional flexible delegation of one's voice. Moreover, the term liquid democracy exaggerated, albeit for understandable reasons, the hopes for participation that arose during the founding of the Pirate Party. (Adler 2018: p. 9)

One of the main fields where these three forms of democracy meet is that of the sets of objectives. They overlap in many regards, as we can see from the following list:

- *Popular sovereignty* is the base principle of democracy, meaning that ultimate political authority rests with the people. Through direct participation, citizens exercise their sovereignty by directly shaping the laws and policies that govern them.
- *Increase citizen engagement and participation* by encouraging more people to participate in democratic processes beyond traditional voting. Especially direct democracy places a strong emphasis on citizen participation in the political process, by giving them the right to directly participate in decision-making through mechanisms such as citizen assemblies, town hall meetings, referendums, and initiatives.
- *Enhance transparency and accountability* by making government decision-making more open and accessible to public scrutiny, by promoting these values publicly in the political process. When citizens directly make decisions, there is even greater transparency in the decision-making process, and elected representatives are held directly accountable to the electorate.
- *Decentralized decision-making* is often needed by a democracy, with decisions made at the local, regional, or national level based on the scope of the issue. This decentralization allows for greater responsiveness to local needs and preferences.
- *Improve communication* by facilitating real-time, two-way communication between citizens and policymakers.

The expected benefits of using the above-mentioned tools are mostly the same for each of them:

- *Increased inclusivity*: can potentially allow for participation from a wider range of citizens, overcoming traditional barriers like geographical limitations or physical disabilities.



- *Informed decision-making*: easier access to information allows for more informed public discourse and policy choices.
- *Streamlined processes*: online tools can facilitate faster and more efficient communication and voting procedures.

Finally, the challenges all three systems must face are the same:

- *Digital divide*: not everyone has equal access to technology or the digital literacy skills to participate effectively.
- *Security and privacy*: concerns exist regarding online voting security and the potential for manipulation or fraud. Additionally, data privacy issues need to be addressed to ensure citizen trust.
- *Echo chambers and misinformation*: online platforms can create echo chambers where users are primarily exposed to information that confirms their existing beliefs. Countering misinformation and promoting critical thinking skills are essential.

All these similarities are the result of some kind of “convergent evolution” in the new ICT ecosystem. Overall, the use of electronic means in attaining democracy represents an evolving approach to enhancing democratic participation in the digital age. While challenges remain, it holds significant potential for fostering a more inclusive, informed, and engaged citizenry.

The Case of German Pirates

In the summer of 2006, for the first time, like-minded idealists, utopians, and humanists who were dissatisfied with the negative developments in the world met on piratenpartei.de, where one of those involved had thankfully already installed forum software. “The Pirate Party Germany was founded on September 10, 2006, in Berlin: 100% liberal, social, digital, grassroots democratic and transparent.” (Piratenpartei Deutschland 2024) Even the birth happened in an iconic place: the C-base e. V., a non-profit organization that reconstructs a fictional, crashed space station with a hackerspace. (c-base e.V. n.d.) Originally founded as an “extended living room” by the seventeen founding members on August 12, 1995, c-base now sees itself as the hub of the Berlin nerd and hacker scene. The c-base logo sticker contains the words culture communication carbonite. (Wikipedia 2023)

The first time they made their voice heard in German politics was the 2009 European Parliament (EP) election when their result would have brought them a mandate without the existence of a threshold. But this was enough an impetus to generate a significant increase in membership for the party after the elections. (Wikipedia 2024) At the next EP elections, in 2014, now without a threshold, they managed to get enough votes to have a seat in the EP. (Wikipedia 2024) This result was also repeated in the 2019 EP elections, although with a much smaller number of votes. (Wikipedia 2024)



The numerical evolution of the number and proportion of voters, as well as the number of seats gained, can be seen in the following table (*Table 1*).

Table 1. Evolution of the number of votes cast for German Pirates in the EP elections.

	2009	2014	2019
n	229,464	425,044	243,302
%	0.9	1.4	0.7
Seats	0	1	1
Source:	(Wikipedia 2024)	(Wikipedia 2024)	(Wikipedia 2024)

The Pirates ran in the federal election for the first time in 2009, on fifteen state lists (not in Saxony), and achieved the best result among the small parties, but that was not enough to get any mandate. (Wikipedia 2024) Although they succeeded in significantly increasing their voter base in the following federal elections, in 2013, unfortunately, it was not enough to win any seats in the Bundestag. (Wikipedia 2024) They suffered a spectacular decline in the next federal elections, in 2017, when not only did they not get a mandate, but the number of votes cast for them also dropped noticeably (Wikipedia 2024), a decline that continued in the 2021 elections. (Wikipedia 2024) The numerical evolution of the number and proportion of voters can be seen in the following table (*Table 2*).

Table 2. Evolution of the number of votes cast for German Pirates in the federal elections.

		2009	2013	2017	2021
First votes	n	46,770	963,623	93,196	60,550
	%	0.1	2.2	0.2	0.1
Second votes	n	847,870	959,177	173,476	169,591
	%	2.0	2.2	0.4	0.4
Mandates	n	0	0	0	0
	Source:	(Wikipedia 2024)	(Wikipedia 2024)	(Wikipedia 2024)	(Wikipedia 2024)

Despite their deficient performance in the federal elections, in September 2011, the German pirates saw a momentous victory in the Berlin state elections, by winning 73,333 first votes (5.0%) and 130,105 second votes (8.9%). So, they became the fifth biggest faction in the regional parliament by getting a total of fifteen seats out of 149. (Wikipedia 2024)



Rick Falkvinge, founder of the Swedish Pirate Party, welcomed the success in Berlin, writing in his blog post: “We all stand shoulder to shoulder in fighting for the next generation – one of us succeeding is all of us succeeding. Tomorrow, people will look to your success, and the movement will grow yet more. You are the source of inspiration for the next wave of civil liberties activists.” (Falkvinge, Pirate Party of Berlin WINS, Enters Parliament n.d.) Five years after the formation of the first pirate parties, the activist vocabulary was still in use. The same grassroots, populist spirit was reflected by the party slogans, like: “We have the questions, you have the answers,” or “The Internet is in the hands of the users.” (Marsh 2011)

But it was not just the vocabulary the key ingredient of their success. As Sarah Marsh pointed it out before the elections: “Berlin, a hub for information technology startups with a young and creative population, is a Pirates stronghold and the place where the party faithful are placing their biggest bets – Pirates from all around Europe have piled into the city to help in the campaign.” The campaign needed the activists indeed, as only a modest budget of 50,000 euros was available.

The party became a lot more professional in the half-decade since its establishment, as evidenced by the fact that it has expanded its political offer with several social and liberal goals. They managed to get rid of the “group of nerds interested mainly in some issues around Internet use” image. As Holger Liljeberg of the Info polling institute said: “The Pirates are in tune with the Berlin vibe with their relaxed campaign. [...] They focus a lot on liberalism, freedom, and self-determination. [...] And you find technology fiends more often in big cities than in the countryside, and Berlin.” (Marsh 2011)

As for the structure and operation of the party, in addition to the traditional party structure, the Pirate Party includes working and service groups, which is remarkably like the structure of IT organizations. The working groups (Arbeitsgemeinschaften – AG) are voluntary and openly organized. Party membership is not necessary to be able to work with the AG, what counts is knowledge and enthusiasm for the topic. Some working groups have their own rules of procedure and rules for accepting new members. Service groups (Servicegruppen – SG) do not work programmatically but rather perform specific tasks within the party such as public relations, graphics/design, etc. The admission requirements here also vary and can also include approval from the federal executive board. (Piratenpartei Deutschland 2024) The party has state associations (Landesverbände) for all sixteen constituent states of the federation.

As for the tools used by the party for bilateral communication, there are the following (Piratenpartei Deutschland 2024):

- *Cryptpad*: an online notebook where all pirates work cooperatively.
- *Piraten-Wiki*: its online lexicon that contains all information about vision, values, topics, processes, members, programs, protocols, events, applications for party conferences, lists of all regular meetings, working groups, and much more.



- *Mumble*: a free voice conferencing software, which is a central working tool among pirates.
- The *Discourse Forum* is the central discussion platform for pirates, sympathizers, and interested parties, where political and organizational topics can be discussed.
- *Mailing lists* are like group discussions via email on a topic; each list contains any number of email addresses of pirates interested in something.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the impetus for the founding of the New Left and the Green Parties often came from those activists who for a long time preached the futility of political parties, while asserting the primacy of civil society and social movements. By expanding their agenda to include issues such as setting a minimum wage, and offering a new alternative to stale mainstream politics, the Pirates have taken on a role like the former role of the Greens, who meanwhile entered the Parliament, formed coalitions, in short, became part of the political establishment. The pirates started similarly, as a movement, but their path took them in a different direction.

Conclusion

In recent decades, many civil society organizations have become parties and integrated into the political-institutional system. Some of them became a pirate party, while others followed a much more populist line. But what they have in common is a much looser networked organizational structure than that of traditional political parties, as well as the intensive and extensive use of digital tools in reaching their audience.

The evolving role of personal connections in nowadays parties presents both opportunities and challenges. While it empowers individuals to connect and mobilize for change on a global scale, it also raises questions about the sustainability and long-term impact of these movements. Their future may lie in a hybrid model that leverages the power of personal connections and shared experiences while recognizing the importance of strategic planning, ideological grounding, and building coalitions across diverse groups. By critically examining these trends and fostering responsible use of technology, we can ensure that they continue to be a powerful force for positive change in a globalized world.

Bibliography

- Adler, A. (2018): *Liquid Democracy in Deutschland. Zur Zukunft digitaler politischer Entscheidungsfindung nach dem Niedergang der Piratenpartei*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Altman, D. (2019): *Citizenship and Contemporary Direct Democracy*. Cambridge: University Press.



- Berg, S.–Hofmann, J. (2021): Digital democracy. *Internet Policy Review*, 10., (4.). doi:<https://doi.org/10.14763/20214.1612>
- Carp, R. (2023): The Rise and Fall of Digital Parties – Searching for a Common Model. *Civil Review(Special Issue) V.*, pp. 107–112. Retrieved 04 07, 2024, from <https://www.civilszemle.hu/005-kulonszam-2023-5-civil-szemle/>
- c-base e.V. (n.d.): *c-base*. Retrieved 04 04, 2024, from c-base: <https://www.c-base.org/>
- Falkvinge, R. (2013): *Swarmwise. The Tactical Manual to Changing the World*. North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace Publishing Platform. Retrieved 04 01, 2024, from <https://falkvinge.net/files/2013/04/Swarmwise-2013-by-Rick-Falkvinge-v1.1-2013Sep01.pdf>
- Falkvinge, R. (n.d.): *Pirate Party of Berlin WINS, Enters Parliament. Falkvinge on Liberty*. Retrieved 03 31, 2024, from <https://falkvinge.net/2011/09/18/pirate-party-of-berlin-wins-enters-parliament/>
- Fieschi, C. (2019): *Populocracy. The Tyranny of Authenticity and the Rise of Populism*. Agenda Publishing Limited.
- Fredriksson, M. (2015): The Pirate Party and the Politics of Communication. *International Journal of Communication*, 9., pp. 909–924. Retrieved 03 31, 2024, from <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/3742/1339>
- Gerbaudo, P. (2019): *The Digital Party. Political Organisation and Online Democracy*. Pluto Press.
- Marsh, S. (2011): *German "pirates" gunning for a seat in Berlin*. Retrieved 03 31, 2024, from Reuters: <https://jp.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE78C48A/>
- Piratenpartei Deutschland (2024): *Geschichte*. Retrieved 04 04, 2024, from Piratenpartei Deutschland: <https://www.piratenpartei.de/partei/geschichte/>
- Piratenwiki (2022): *Liquid Democracy*. Retrieved 04 03, 2024, from Piratenwiki: https://wiki.piratenpartei.de/Liquid_Democracy
- Qvortrup, M. (2013): *Direct democracy – A comparative study of the theory and practice of government by the people*. Manchester–New York: Manchester University Press.
- Wikipedia (2023): *c-base*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 04, 2024, from Wikipedia - *Die freie Enzyklopädie*: <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/C-base>
- Wikipedia (2024): *Bundestagswahl 2009*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 06, 2024, from Wikipedia - *Die freie Enzyklopädie*: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bundestagswahl_2009
- Wikipedia (2024): *Bundestagswahl 2013*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 07, 2024, from Wikipedia – *Die freie Enzyklopädie*: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bundestagswahl_2013
- Wikipedia (2024): *Bundestagswahl 2017*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 07, 2024, from Wikipedia: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bundestagswahl_2017
- Wikipedia. (2024, 04 06): *Bundestagswahl 2021*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 14, 2024, from *Wikipedia – Die freie Enzyklopädie*: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bundestags-wahl_2021
- Wikipedia (2024): *Europawahl in Deutschland 2009*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 06, 2024, from Wikipedia – *Die freie Enzyklopädie*: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Europawahl_in_Deutschland_2009
- Wikipedia (2024): *Wahl zum Abgeordnetenhaus von Berlin 2011*. (Wikimedia Foundation Inc.) Retrieved 04 06, 2024, from Wikipedia – *Die freie Enzyklopädie*: https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wahl_zum_Abgeordnetenhaus_von_Berlin_2011
- Zakota, Z. (2023): Pirate Parties and Civil Organizations in the Information Society. *Civil Review (Special Issue) V.*, pp. 113–126. Retrieved 04 07, 2025, from <https://www.civilszemle.hu/005-kulonszam-2023-5-civil-szemle/>