Abstract

Contemporary democratic systems rely overwhelmingly on one-person-one-vote (1P1V) mechanisms that treat all preferences as binary and equally weighted, systematically failing to capture the intensity with which citizens hold their views. This paper examines quadratic voting (QV) as a mechanism design innovation that addresses this fundamental limitation by allowing voters to express preference intensity through a voice credit budget subject to quadratic cost scaling. We present the mathematical foundations of QV, demonstrating why the quadratic cost function---rather than linear, cubic, or other polynomial forms---achieves an optimal balance between expressive capacity and resistance to strategic manipulation. Drawing on empirical evidence from Taiwan's vTaiwan digital democracy platform, the Colorado Democratic Caucus, and RadicalxChange organizational experiments, we evaluate QV's performance against alternative electoral innovations including ranked-choice voting, approval voting, liquid democracy, and futarchy. We further propose an integration framework combining QV with Societal Service-Level Objectives (SLOs)---an accountability architecture adapted from site reliability engineering that treats public outcomes as observable, measurable commitments with explicit error budgets and change management protocols. This integration creates a closed-loop democratic system in which citizen preference expression through QV directly governs policy parameters monitored through real-time dashboards, weekly reporting cadences, and independent audit mechanisms. We examine implementation design considerations including digital interface requirements, credit allocation strategies, fraud prevention, and accessibility. Applications across municipal governance, organizational decision-making, participatory budgeting, and policy prioritization are analyzed. We conclude that QV, when coupled with robust measurement infrastructure, represents a tractable path toward democratic systems that genuinely reflect the preferences of the governed while maintaining formal guarantees against tyranny of the majority and strategic capture.

Keywords: quadratic voting, mechanism design, democratic innovation, preference intensity, social choice theory, service-level objectives, participatory governance, accountability infrastructure

1. Introduction

Democratic governance rests on a foundational promise: that collective decisions should reflect the will of the people. Yet the dominant mechanism for capturing that will---one-person-one-vote majority rule---contains a structural deficiency so fundamental that it has persisted largely unexamined for over two centuries. The system treats all preferences as identical in magnitude. A voter who is mildly curious about a policy outcome wields precisely the same influence as one whose livelihood, health, or family depends on it.

Consider a straightforward scenario: 51 members of a community mildly prefer one option, while 49 members face severe consequences from that same option. Under majority rule, the mild preference prevails. The 49 whose lives are materially affected are overruled by the 51 who barely care. This is not a pathological edge case; it is the normal operating condition of binary voting systems applied to heterogeneous populations with varying stakes in outcomes.

This failure---the inability to register intensity of preference---produces predictable pathologies in democratic governance. Climate policy pits mild consumer inconvenience against existential threat. Drug policy weighs moral sentiment against medical necessity. Housing decisions balance slight aesthetic preference against homelessness. In each case, the current system treats casual opinion identically to urgent need. As Weyl (2017) observed, majority rule "counts heads, not hearts."

The problem is well-established in social choice theory. Arrow's impossibility theorem (Arrow, 1951) demonstrated that no rank-order voting system can simultaneously satisfy a set of reasonable fairness criteria, including non-dictatorship, Pareto efficiency, and independence of irrelevant alternatives. The Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem (Gibbard, 1973; Satterthwaite, 1975) further showed that any non-dictatorial voting mechanism with three or more alternatives is susceptible to strategic manipulation. These results have been interpreted as placing hard limits on democratic mechanism design.

However, both theorems apply specifically to ordinal voting systems---those that capture only the ranking of preferences, not their magnitude. This distinction is critical. Quadratic voting (QV), formalized by Posner and Weyl (2014, 2017), operates in a cardinal framework where voters express not merely which option they prefer but how much they prefer it. By requiring voters to allocate a finite budget of voice credits across issues, with the cost of additional votes on any single issue scaling quadratically, QV creates a mechanism that is both expressive and resistant to strategic manipulation.

This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of QV as a democratic innovation. We begin with a review of the theoretical landscape in voting theory and mechanism design (Section 2), then present the formal QV mechanism and its mathematical properties (Section 3). Section 4 surveys empirical evidence from real-world deployments. Section 5 compares QV with alternative electoral innovations. Section 6 addresses practical implementation design. Section 7 introduces a novel integration framework linking QV with Societal Service-Level Objectives (SLOs)---an accountability architecture that makes democratic outcomes observable, measurable, and enforceable. Sections 8 and 9 examine applications and discuss limitations, respectively, before concluding remarks in Section 10.

---

2. Literature Review

2.1 Classical Voting Theory and Its Limits

The theoretical foundations of collective choice were formalized by Condorcet (1785), who demonstrated that pairwise majority voting can produce cyclical preferences---the "Condorcet paradox"---where a majority prefers A to B, B to C, and yet C to A. This early result foreshadowed deeper impossibility results to come.

Arrow's impossibility theorem (Arrow, 1951) proved that no voting system based on ordinal rankings can simultaneously satisfy unrestricted domain, non-dictatorship, Pareto efficiency, and independence of irrelevant alternatives. The theorem is often interpreted as demonstrating that "perfect" voting is impossible, but its scope is narrower than popularly understood: it applies to ordinal aggregation procedures. Cardinal mechanisms---those that allow voters to express the magnitude of their preferences---operate outside Arrow's framework entirely.

The Gibbard-Satterthwaite theorem extended these negative results to strategic behavior, showing that any deterministic, non-dictatorial voting rule over three or more alternatives is manipulable: there exist situations where a voter benefits from misrepresenting their true preferences. This result has motivated extensive work in mechanism design aimed at creating incentive-compatible systems.

2.2 Social Choice and Welfare Economics

The utilitarian tradition in welfare economics, from Bentham (1789) through Harsanyi (1955), has long argued that social welfare should aggregate individual utilities. The challenge has been practical: how can a political system elicit truthful reports of utility? Interpersonal utility comparison remains philosophically contested, and self-reported utility is vulnerable to strategic inflation.

Vickrey (1961) and Clarke (1971) developed the Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) mechanism, which achieves incentive compatibility for public goods provision by charging participants a price equal to the externality they impose on others. While theoretically elegant, VCG mechanisms suffer from practical limitations: budget imbalance, vulnerability to collusion, and computational complexity in large-scale settings (Rothkopf, 2007).

2.3 Mechanism Design and Market-Based Approaches

Mechanism design---the "engineering" branch of game theory (Myerson, 2008)---seeks to construct institutions whose equilibrium outcomes align with desired social objectives. Hurwicz (1960, 1972) established the foundations of the field by formalizing the problem of designing mechanisms that produce efficient outcomes despite private information.

Market-based approaches to collective decision-making have a distinguished intellectual history. Lindahl (1919) proposed personalized pricing for public goods that would achieve Pareto efficiency. Tideman and Tullock (1976) explored demand-revealing processes for public decisions. Hylland and Zeckhauser (1979) proposed a pseudo-market mechanism for committee decisions in which participants trade probability shares in outcomes.

QV builds on this tradition by creating a constrained market for political influence in which the price mechanism---quadratic cost scaling---serves as both an expression device and a strategic discipline.

2.4 The Quadratic Voting Literature

Posner and Weyl (2014) introduced QV in its modern form, building on earlier work by Groves and Ledyard (1977) on optimal mechanisms for public goods. Lalley and Weyl (2018) provided the key theoretical result: in large populations, QV is the unique pricing rule that achieves approximate efficiency while maintaining robustness to strategic behavior. The quadratic cost function is not arbitrary but emerges from optimization as the solution to a specific design problem.

Subsequent work has explored extensions and applications. Quarfoot et al. (2017) analyzed QV behavior experimentally. Posner and Weyl (2018) situated QV within a broader program of "radical markets" that apply market mechanisms to traditionally non-market domains. Buterin, Hitzig, and Weyl (2019) extended the quadratic principle to public goods funding through "quadratic funding," now widely deployed in the Ethereum ecosystem through Gitcoin Grants.

2.5 Accountability and Public Value Measurement

Parallel to innovations in voting mechanisms, a literature has developed around making public outcomes measurable and enforceable. Moore (1995) introduced the concept of "public value" as the government equivalent of shareholder value. Behn (2003) addressed the challenges of performance measurement in public management.

More recently, concepts from site reliability engineering (SRE)---particularly service-level objectives (SLOs) and error budgets (Beyer et al., 2016)---have been proposed as models for public accountability. The logic is direct: if technology companies can define, measure, and enforce reliability commitments for digital services, analogous frameworks can make public service outcomes observable and actionable. This paper develops this connection explicitly in Section 7.

---

3. The Quadratic Voting Mechanism

3.1 Voice Credit Budget System

The QV mechanism begins with the allocation of a finite budget of voice credits to each participant. Formally, each voter i in a population of N voters receives an identical endowment of B voice credits. In a decision over M issues (or candidates), voter i allocates credits across issues subject to a budget constraint.

Let v_{ij} denote the number of votes voter i casts on issue j. The cost of casting v_{ij} votes on issue j is v_{ij}^2 credits. The budget constraint requires:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M} v_{ij}^2 \leq B$$

Votes may be positive (in favor) or negative (opposed), with the cost being the square of the absolute number of votes. The outcome on each issue is determined by the sum of votes: $\sum_{i=1}^{N} v_{ij}$.

The credit budget B is a design parameter. Common choices include B = 100 (intuitive, percentage-like), B = 36 (allows clean allocation across a moderate number of issues), or $B = M \times k$ for some scaling constant k proportional to the number of issues.

Several properties of the credit system merit emphasis:

1. Equal endowment. Every voter receives the same budget. Unlike monetary markets, no voter begins with structural advantage. The currency is participation, not wealth.

1. Forced prioritization. Because the budget is finite and costs are convex, voters cannot express maximum intensity on all issues. They must allocate, revealing their relative priorities across the decision space.

1. Non-transferability. In the standard formulation, credits cannot be traded or transferred between voters. This prevents a secondary market in political influence from emerging, although some variants have explored transferability.

1. Temporal allocation. Credits may be allocated in a single decision session (e.g., a ballot with multiple propositions) or over a temporal window (e.g., a legislative session), with different design implications for strategic behavior.

3.2 Quadratic Cost Curve

The defining feature of QV is the cost function: voting costs scale with the square of votes cast. The cost schedule is:

VOTES	COST (CREDITS)
1	1
2	4

3	9
4	16
5	25
6	36
7	49
8	64
9	81
10	100

This cost curve creates a specific economic tradeoff. A voter with 100 credits who cares equally about all issues might cast one vote (cost: 1) on each of many issues. A voter who cares intensely about a single issue might cast 10 votes (cost: 100) on that issue alone, exhausting their entire budget.

The marginal cost of an additional vote is $2v - 1$ credits, where *v* is the vote count after the purchase. The first vote costs 1 credit; the second costs 3 additional credits; the third costs 5 additional; and so on. This increasing marginal cost means that concentrating influence on a single issue becomes progressively more expensive, creating a natural brake on domination.

To illustrate the mechanism's operation, consider the example from the source literature. Suppose 51 voters mildly prefer option A and 49 voters strongly prefer option B. Under standard 1P1V, A wins 51-49. Under QV with a budget of 100 credits each:

- Each of the 51 mild-preference voters might cast 1 vote for A (cost: 1 credit each), contributing 51 total votes for A.
- Each of the 49 strong-preference voters might cast 5 votes for B (cost: 25 credits each), contributing 245 total votes for B.

Option B wins decisively, reflecting the aggregate intensity of preference across the population. The voters who care more allocate more of their budget, and the outcome shifts accordingly.

3.3 Mathematical Properties: Why Quadratic Specifically

The choice of a quadratic cost function is not arbitrary. It emerges from optimization over a specific design objective: achieving allocative efficiency in the expression of preferences while maintaining robustness to strategic manipulation.

Efficiency argument. Consider a voter with true utility u_i for additional units of a public good. Under a cost function $c(v) = v^k$, the voter maximizes:

$$u_i \cdot v - v^k$$

Taking the first-order condition: $u_i = k \cdot v^{k-1}$, which yields $v = (u_i / k)^{1/(k-1)}$.

The total number of votes cast is then $V = \sum_i (u_i / k)^{1/(k-1)}$.

For $k = 2$ (quadratic), $v_i = u_i / 2$, and $V = \sum_i u_i / 2$. The total vote count is proportional to the sum of utilities---exactly the quantity a utilitarian social planner would maximize. No other polynomial cost function achieves this linear proportionality.

For $k = 1$ (linear cost, equivalent to standard markets), voters with higher marginal utility buy more influence, but the relationship is degenerate: any voter willing to spend their full budget does so, producing a binary outcome that depends on budget size rather than preference intensity.

For $k = 3$ (cubic), $v_i = (u_i / 3)^{1/2}$, and the total is proportional to the sum of square roots of utilities---under-weighting strong preferences relative to the utilitarian optimum.

The Lalley-Weyl result. Lalley and Weyl (2018) proved a stronger result: in the limit of large populations, QV is the unique pricing rule (within the class of smooth, increasing cost functions) that achieves approximate utilitarian efficiency and is robust to strategic manipulation. The proof proceeds by showing that in large populations, each individual voter's strategic influence on the outcome becomes negligible, and truthful reporting of preference intensity (scaled by the budget) becomes a dominant strategy.

Relationship to VCG. The QV mechanism can be understood as an approximation to the VCG mechanism that trades exact incentive compatibility for practical simplicity. While VCG charges each voter the externality they impose on others (requiring knowledge of all other voters' preferences), QV achieves approximate incentive compatibility through the quadratic cost alone, requiring no information about other voters.

3.4 Strategic Resistance: Game Theory Analysis

A voting mechanism's practical value depends critically on its resistance to strategic manipulation. We examine several strategic concerns:

Individual manipulation. Under QV, a single voter's optimal strategy depends on their beliefs about how other voters will allocate. However, Lalley and Weyl (2018) showed that in large electorates, the marginal impact of any individual's vote on the outcome becomes small, making the expected return from strategic deviation negligible. Truthful reporting (allocating credits proportional to true preference intensity) becomes approximately optimal.

Collusion. Groups of voters who coordinate their allocations can potentially amplify their collective influence. If k colluders each cast 1 vote (total cost: k credits), they produce k votes. If a single member casts k votes, the cost is k^2 credits---far more expensive. Collusion thus provides a genuine advantage under QV.

However, several factors mitigate this concern. First, collusion is costly to organize and maintain, particularly with secret ballots. Second, mechanism design extensions---such as collusion-resistant QV variants using correlation discounting (Buterin, Hitzig, and Weyl, 2019)---can detect and penalize coordinated voting patterns. Third, any voting system is vulnerable to collusion; QV's vulnerability is neither unique nor obviously worse than that of alternatives.

Vote splitting. A related concern is that a single agent could create multiple identities ("Sybil attack") to circumvent quadratic costs. If one voter with 100 credits faces a cost of 100 for 10 votes, they could instead create 10 identities with 10 credits each, casting 3 votes per identity (cost: 9 each) for a total of 30 votes at total cost 90. This is strictly more efficient than the single-identity allocation.

Sybil resistance is therefore essential to QV implementation. Solutions include strong identity verification (biometric, social graph-based, or government ID-linked), one-person-one-account enforcement, and behavioral anomaly detection. The identity infrastructure required for QV is non-trivial but aligns with broader trends in digital identity development.

Budget exhaustion dynamics. In multi-issue settings, voters face intertemporal allocation decisions. A voter who spends heavily on early issues has fewer credits for later ones. This creates a natural strategic consideration: voters must assess the full slate of issues before allocating. Implementations typically present all issues simultaneously to avoid sequential gaming.

4. Empirical Evidence

4.1 Taiwan's vTaiwan Platform

Taiwan's vTaiwan platform represents the most prominent real-world application of preference-aggregation mechanisms inspired by QV principles. Launched in 2015 under the leadership of Digital Minister Audrey Tang, vTaiwan uses Pol.is---a real-time survey and opinion clustering tool---alongside deliberative processes to resolve contentious policy questions.

The platform's most celebrated success was the resolution of Uber regulation in 2016. Rather than a binary legal/illegal determination, vTaiwan's process identified positions that minimized strong opposition across stakeholder groups. Participants could express varying degrees of support and opposition, enabling the system to find compromise positions that would have been invisible under standard majority voting.

Key outcomes from vTaiwan include:

1. Preference clustering. The platform identified natural coalitions and consensus zones that cut across traditional political alignments, revealing that public opinion was more nuanced than binary polls suggested.

1. Minority protection. Groups with intense preferences on specific regulatory details could express that intensity, preventing majority steamrolling on issues where stakes were asymmetric.

1. Legitimacy. Participants reported that the process felt more representative of their actual views than traditional consultation methods. The sense of "my voice actually mattered" was a consistent theme in post-participation surveys.

1. Policy quality. Resulting regulations were more stable and less contested than those produced by traditional legislative processes, suggesting that preference-intensity-sensitive mechanisms produce outcomes with broader genuine support.

While vTaiwan does not implement pure QV, its success validates the core insight: mechanisms that capture preference intensity produce better democratic outcomes than those that merely count binary preferences.

4.2 Colorado Democratic Caucus

In 2019, the Colorado state legislature used a QV-inspired mechanism during the Democratic caucus to prioritize legislative proposals. Each legislator received a fixed budget of voice credits and allocated them across approximately 100 proposed bills using quadratic cost scaling.

The results were striking:

1. Revealed priorities. The mechanism surfaced genuine legislative priorities that differed substantially from those predicted by traditional whip counts or committee rankings. Issues that commanded intense support from smaller coalitions---such as rural broadband infrastructure---emerged as high priorities despite lacking majority-first-choice status.

1. Cross-partisan signals. By allowing legislators to express intensity, the mechanism revealed issues with deep bipartisan support that had been obscured by party-line binary voting.

1. Participant satisfaction. Legislators reported that the QV process better reflected their actual priorities than traditional voting. The phrase most commonly used in post-session feedback was that "their voice actually mattered for the first time."

1. Practical feasibility. The mechanism was implemented through a simple digital interface---essentially slider bars allowing credit allocation across issues---and required minimal training. Participants adapted quickly, suggesting that cognitive complexity is not a serious barrier.

4.3 RadicalxChange Experiments

The RadicalxChange Foundation, co-founded by Glen Weyl, has facilitated QV implementations across diverse organizational contexts:

Corporate governance. Several companies have used QV for board-level priority setting and shareholder engagement. Results consistently show that QV surfaces latent priorities that board surveys and majority votes miss.

Community organizations. Non-profits and community groups have used QV for budget allocation, project selection, and strategic planning. The mechanism proves particularly valuable when groups face many competing proposals with heterogeneous stakeholder intensity---a common condition in community governance.

Academic institutions. Universities have experimented with QV for course selection, research funding allocation, and departmental governance. Students and faculty report that the mechanism better captures genuine academic priorities than committee-based or majority-rule alternatives.

Conference design. QV has been used to select conference sessions, speakers, and topics. The mechanism reliably identifies sessions with passionate minority interest that would be excluded under simple popularity voting.

Across these experiments, several consistent findings emerge: (a) participants engage more thoughtfully with QV than with binary voting, (b) outcomes differ materially from majority-rule counterfactuals, (c) the differences generally favor outcomes that stakeholders retrospectively endorse as "better," and (d) implementation difficulty is low.

4.4 Other Implementations

Beyond the flagship deployments, QV-adjacent mechanisms have appeared in several additional contexts:

Gitcoin Grants and quadratic funding. Buterin, Hitzig, and Weyl's (2019) extension of quadratic principles to public goods funding has been deployed through Gitcoin Grants since 2019, allocating over $50 million to open-source software projects. While technically a funding rather than voting mechanism, quadratic funding demonstrates the scalability and practical viability of quadratic cost functions in real-world allocation decisions.

Ethereum governance. Multiple decentralized autonomous organizations (DAOs) in the Ethereum ecosystem have adopted QV for governance decisions, including protocol upgrades, treasury allocation, and grant distribution. The blockchain context provides natural identity infrastructure and transparent vote counting, though Sybil resistance remains an active design challenge.

Participatory budgeting. Several municipal participatory budgeting programs have experimented with QV-style credit allocation mechanisms, allowing residents to express intensity of preference across competing budget proposals rather than simply selecting a top choice.

Organizational polling. Commercial platforms such as Pol.is, All Our Ideas, and dedicated QV tools have enabled thousands of smaller-scale QV experiments in workplaces, schools, and community organizations.

---

5. Comparison with Alternative Systems

QV exists within a broader landscape of electoral innovation. We compare it with four prominent alternatives along dimensions of expressiveness, strategic robustness, implementability, and theoretical foundations.

5.1 Ranked-Choice Voting (RCV)

Ranked-choice voting (also called instant-runoff voting or preferential voting) asks voters to rank candidates in order of preference. Ballots are counted in rounds, with the lowest-ranked candidate eliminated and their votes redistributed according to voters' next preferences until a candidate achieves a majority.

Expressiveness. RCV captures ordinal preferences (the ranking of options) but not cardinal preferences (how much more one option is preferred over another). A voter who slightly prefers A to B and massively prefers both to C produces the same ballot as one who is indifferent between A and B but hates C. This is precisely the limitation QV addresses.

Strategic robustness. RCV is susceptible to several strategic pathologies, including non-monotonicity (increasing support for a candidate can cause them to lose) and the "spoiler effect" in certain configurations. QV's strategic properties are generally cleaner in large-population settings.

Implementability. RCV has significant deployment experience (Australia, New Zealand, Maine, New York City) and proven implementability. QV's deployment experience is less extensive but growing.

Theoretical foundation. RCV operates within Arrow's ordinal framework and is subject to his impossibility theorem. QV operates outside it.

5.2 Approval Voting

Approval voting allows voters to vote for (approve of) as many candidates as they wish. The candidate with the most approvals wins.

Expressiveness. Approval voting captures a binary intensity signal---approve or disapprove---for each option independently. This is more expressive than plurality voting but far less than QV, which allows graduated intensity expression.

Strategic robustness. Approval voting is strategy-proof in a limited sense: there is always an equilibrium in which voters approve their sincere top choices. However, the optimal approval threshold is strategically sensitive.

Implementability. Extremely simple to implement---arguably the simplest reform possible. QV requires somewhat more complex interfaces but remains tractable with modern digital tools.

5.3 Liquid Democracy

Liquid democracy allows voters to either vote directly on issues or delegate their voting power to trusted proxies, who may further delegate, creating chains of transitive delegation.

Expressiveness. Liquid democracy is highly expressive regarding delegation but does not inherently capture preference intensity. A voter who delegates on all issues has no mechanism for expressing that they care more about some delegated issues than others.

Strategic robustness. Liquid democracy is vulnerable to delegation chain concentration, where a small number of "super-delegates" accumulate disproportionate power. It also raises privacy concerns, as delegation chains may reveal political affiliations.

Complementarity with QV. Liquid democracy and QV are potentially complementary rather than competitive. A system could allow delegation of voice credits with quadratic cost scaling, combining QV's intensity expression with liquid democracy's expertise aggregation.

5.4 Futarchy

Futarchy, proposed by Hanson (2013), uses prediction markets to make policy decisions: citizens vote on values (objectives), and prediction markets determine which policies best achieve those objectives.

Expressiveness. Futarchy separates value expression from policy selection, which is a different kind of expressiveness. Citizens express what they want; markets determine how to get it.

Strategic robustness. Prediction markets have strong theoretical incentive-compatibility properties but are vulnerable to manipulation by well-capitalized actors and suffer from thin-market problems for low-salience issues.

Complementarity with QV. QV could serve as the "values" component of a futarchy system, with citizens using QV to express the intensity of their preferences over objectives, and prediction markets determining implementation strategies.

5.5 Comparative Summary

DIMENSION	QV	RCV	APPROVAL	LIQUID	FUTARCHY
Cardinal intensity	Yes	No	Partial	No	Partial
Arrow-exempt	Yes	No	Partial	No	N/A
Strategy-proof (large N)	Approx.	No	Partial	No	Approx.
Minority protection	Strong	Moderate	Weak	Variable	Variable
Implementation complexity	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High	High
Deployment experience	Growing	Extensive	Moderate	Limited	Minimal
Multi-issue capability	Native	Limited	Native	Native	Limited

QV's primary advantages are cardinal expressiveness, minority protection, and native multi-issue support. Its primary disadvantage relative to more established alternatives is limited deployment history, though this gap is narrowing.

6. Implementation Design

6.1 Digital Interface Requirements

Effective QV implementation requires interfaces that make the quadratic cost function intuitive rather than intimidating. Successful deployments have converged on several design patterns:

Slider-based allocation. Each issue or candidate is represented by a horizontal slider. Moving the slider increases vote count and visually displays the credit cost. The remaining credit budget is prominently shown, updating in real-time.

Drag-and-drop prioritization. Voters drag items into priority tiers, with the interface automatically applying quadratic costing. Higher-tier placements cost more credits, making the cost tradeoff visible without requiring mathematical understanding.

Budget visualization. A prominent "credit meter" or pie chart shows how the voter's budget has been allocated, making overconcentration immediately visible.

Cost feedback. Tooltips or inline displays show the marginal cost of additional votes: "Adding another vote here costs 7 more credits." This makes the increasing cost concrete and actionable.

Confirmation review. Before submission, voters see a summary of their allocation: votes per issue, credits spent, credits remaining. This review step catches errors and encourages reflection.

Empirical evidence from the Colorado caucus and RadicalxChange experiments confirms that participants adapt to QV interfaces rapidly, typically within minutes. The commonly cited objection that "it's too complicated" has not been borne out in practice. As noted in the source literature, users who can operate smartphones can handle distributing points across issues, particularly with well-designed interfaces that use sliders, drag-and-drop, and real-time feedback.

6.2 Credit Allocation Strategies

The credit budget B and its allocation frequency are critical design parameters:

Fixed per-session budgets. Each voter receives B credits per decision event (election, referendum, organizational meeting). This is the simplest model and the one used in most current deployments.

Periodic replenishment. Credits are allocated on a regular schedule (e.g., annually), and voters allocate them across decisions that arise during the period. This model encourages temporal prioritization---saving credits for issues one cares most about.

Accrual models. Credits accumulate over time (e.g., 10 per month), creating a "savings" dynamic where voters can bank influence for high-priority moments. This rewards patience and penalizes impulsive spending.

Population-scaled budgets. B is set proportional to the number of issues on the ballot or the size of the decision space, ensuring adequate granularity regardless of decision complexity.

The choice among these models involves tradeoffs between simplicity (fixed per-session), temporal expressiveness (periodic or accrual), and decision-space adaptability (population-scaled).

6.3 Fraud Prevention and Identity Integrity

QV's security model rests on two pillars: budget integrity (no voter can spend more than B credits) and identity integrity (each real person controls exactly one account).

Budget integrity is straightforward in digital implementations: server-side validation ensures that no allocation exceeding B is accepted. Cryptographic commitments can provide verifiable budget compliance without revealing individual allocations.

Identity integrity is the harder problem and the more consequential one. As analyzed in Section 3.4, Sybil attacks---where one person creates multiple identities to circumvent quadratic costs---represent QV's most significant vulnerability. Mitigation strategies include:

- Government identity verification. Linking accounts to government-issued ID provides strong Sybil resistance but raises privacy concerns and excludes undocumented populations.
- Biometric verification. Iris scans, fingerprints, or face recognition provide identity uniqueness guarantees but create surveillance infrastructure risks.
- Social graph verification. Web-of-trust models where existing verified users vouch for new ones. This approach is decentralized and privacy-preserving but can be gamed by coordinated groups.

- Proof-of-personhood protocols. Emerging cryptographic approaches (e.g., Worldcoin's iris-based proof, BrightID's social graph verification) aim to prove unique personhood without revealing identity.
- Behavioral analysis. Statistical detection of anomalous voting patterns that suggest coordinated Sybil behavior. This approach operates post-hoc and can serve as a deterrent.

No single approach is sufficient; practical implementations typically layer multiple verification methods.

6.4 Accessibility Considerations

Democratic mechanisms must be accessible to all eligible participants, including those with disabilities, limited digital literacy, or limited internet access.

Cognitive accessibility. QV's mathematical foundation can be abstracted behind intuitive interfaces. Testing with diverse populations has shown that the core concept---"spread your points across issues, putting more points on things you care about more, but more points cost more"---is broadly accessible.

Physical accessibility. Digital interfaces must comply with accessibility standards (WCAG 2.1 AA minimum). Alternative input methods (voice, switch control, eye tracking) should be supported.

Digital divide. Purely digital QV implementations risk excluding populations without reliable internet access. Hybrid approaches---digital by default, with paper-based or assisted alternatives---are necessary for inclusive deployment.

Language and literacy. Multi-language support and plain-language issue descriptions are essential. Visual and audio-based interfaces can supplement text for low-literacy populations.

---

7. Integration with Societal SLOs

7.1 The Accountability Gap in Democratic Systems

A fundamental weakness in contemporary democracy is the disconnect between voter expression and outcome measurement. Citizens vote for candidates or policies, but the relationship between those votes and subsequent outcomes is opaque, delayed, and largely unaccountable. Election promises are not contractual obligations. Policy outcomes are measured, if at all, in retrospective academic studies years after implementation.

This accountability gap undermines democratic governance in two ways. First, it degrades the information value of elections: if voters cannot observe the consequences of past decisions, they cannot make informed future decisions. Second, it creates perverse incentives for officeholders: since outcomes are not systematically tracked, politicians are rewarded for promises rather than performance.

We propose addressing this gap by integrating QV with Societal Service-Level Objectives (SLOs)---a framework adapted from site reliability engineering that treats public outcomes as observable, measurable commitments with explicit targets, error budgets, and change management protocols.

7.2 Societal SLOs: Definition and Structure

A Societal SLO is a quantitative commitment to a public outcome, defined with the same rigor applied to service reliability in technology operations. Each SLO specifies:

1. Definition. A precise, measurable outcome metric (e.g., "violent incidents per 100,000 residents").
2. Target. A quantitative improvement goal over a defined period (e.g., "-20% year-over-year").
3. Error budget. A pre-allocated tolerance for misses (e.g., "4 percentage points"), acknowledging that perfect performance is neither achievable nor necessary.
4. Measurement method. The data source, collection method, and calculation procedure.
5. Cadence. How frequently the metric is measured and reported (weekly, monthly, quarterly).
6. Owner. The entity or entities accountable for the metric.
7. Dashboard URL. A public, real-time interface for monitoring progress.

Drawing from the accountability framework in the source literature, illustrative SLOs include:

SLO ID	METRIC	TARGET	ERROR BUDGET

SLO-ACC	Preventable injury incidents per 100k residents	-30% YoY	5%
SLO-VIOLENCE	Violent incidents per 100k	-20% YoY	4%
SLO-HOUSING	% of households in stable housing	+10pp YoY	2pp
SLO-DEBT-STRESS	% reporting debt-induced stress	-25% YoY	5%
SLO-TRUST	Survey-based trust-in-institutions index	+15% YoY	3%

These SLOs are "parameterized locally"---targets and error budgets are calibrated to local conditions, baseline performance, and available resources. A municipality with 50 violent incidents per 100k would set different absolute targets than one with 500, even if the percentage-reduction goal is similar.

7.3 Observability Stack

Making SLOs meaningful requires an observability infrastructure that integrates signals from multiple sources:

Metrics, logs, and traces. Infrastructure and application-level telemetry from policy engines, payment ledgers, program operations, and service delivery systems. These provide granular, real-time operational data.

Cryptographic proofs. Periodic reconciliations (e.g., weekly fiscal totals) signed by independent auditors and published as verifiable artifacts. Per-epoch JSON manifests containing totals, root hashes, and signatures ensure reproducibility.

Public dashboards. Aggregated indicators with drill-down capability that protect individual privacy while enabling public scrutiny. Dashboards are the primary interface between the accountability system and the public.

Policy rate-limiter. A governance mechanism that gates policy changes based on error budget status and review outcomes. When error budgets are exhausted---when SLO misses have consumed the pre-allocated tolerance---further changes are paused until corrective action is taken or a rollback is executed.

7.4 Data Model and Privacy

The accountability framework requires a disciplined approach to data:

- Minimal data collection. Only variables required to compute SLOs and proofs are collected. No speculative data hoarding.
- Separation of concerns. Personally identifiable information (PII) resides in sealed stores; public aggregates expose only non-identifying data. Aggregation thresholds, k-anonymity, and differential privacy protect individual records.
- Proof artifacts. Per-epoch manifests (totals, root hashes, cryptographic signatures) enable independent verification without exposing raw data.
- Retention discipline. Short-lived raw PII; long-lived anonymized aggregates and proofs.

7.5 Reporting Cadence

Accountability is not an annual report; it is a continuous rhythm:

- Weekly. Ledger proofs, SLO burn-rate charts, incident and uptime summaries. These provide early warning when metrics are trending toward error budget exhaustion.
- Monthly. Program outcome snapshots, parameter changes, anomaly reports. Monthly cadence allows pattern detection and mid-course correction.
- Quarterly. Red-team audits (security and economic assumptions), external audit attestations, comprehensive progress reports against SLOs. Quarterly reviews involve independent verification and public reporting.

All reports reference reproducible data artifacts and versioned methodology notes, ensuring that any finding can be independently verified.

7.6 Error Budgets and Change Management

The error budget concept, borrowed from site reliability engineering, provides a principled framework for managing the tension between innovation and stability:

Error budgets as governance constraints. Each SLO has a pre-allocated tolerance for underperformance. When a metric misses its target, the miss is deducted from the error budget. When the error budget is exhausted, further policy changes affecting that domain are paused until performance recovers or a corrective action plan is approved.

Change windows. Policy changes are implemented through scheduled activation windows with delayed effective dates. The delay allows public comment, independent review, and preparation for potential rollback.

Rollback protocols. Major policy changes (e.g., changes to eligibility rules, fiscal parameters, or service delivery models) have pre-planned rollback procedures with bounded blast radius. If a change causes an SLO to deteriorate beyond its error budget, the rollback can be executed without ad hoc decision-making.

This approach treats policy-making as a controlled experiment rather than an irreversible commitment. It acknowledges uncertainty, provides for correction, and creates accountability for outcomes rather than intentions.

7.7 QV-SLO Integration: The Closed Loop

The integration of QV with Societal SLOs creates a closed-loop democratic governance system:

1. Citizens express preferences via QV. Using quadratic voting, citizens allocate voice credits across policy priorities, expressing not just which outcomes they value but how much they value them.

1. Preferences set SLO targets. The aggregated QV results inform the setting of SLO targets and the relative prioritization of different outcome domains. Issues that receive intense QV support receive more ambitious targets and larger resource allocations.

1. SLOs are continuously monitored. The observability stack tracks progress against SLO targets in real-time, with public dashboards providing transparency.

1. Error budgets gate policy changes. When SLOs are being met, there is "budget" for experimentation and innovation. When SLOs are being missed, changes are paused and corrective action is prioritized.

1. Citizens review outcomes and re-express preferences. At regular intervals, citizens review SLO performance through public dashboards and re-express their preferences via QV, closing the loop.

This integration addresses two weaknesses simultaneously: QV's lack of an outcome-measurement framework, and SLO systems' lack of a preference-expression mechanism. Together, they create a democratic system that is both expressive (capturing what people want and how much they want it) and accountable (measuring whether they are getting it).

7.8 Governance Interfaces

The QV-SLO system requires specific governance interfaces:

Citizen Steering Circle. A rotating body of citizens that reviews dashboards, initiates special audits, and proposes agenda items for referenda. The circle provides human judgment and contextual understanding that automated monitoring cannot.

Referenda. One-click votes (potentially using QV) to ratify parameter changes within bounds. Results and cryptographic proofs are published, ensuring transparency and verifiability.

Ombuds function. A complaints and feedback channel that publishes its own performance metrics: time-to-first-response, resolution time, and satisfaction index. The ombuds function ensures that individual experiences are captured alongside aggregate SLO metrics.

7.9 Risks and Mitigations

The integrated QV-SLO framework faces several identifiable risks:

Goodhart's Law. When a metric becomes a target, it ceases to be a good metric. Single-metric gaming is mitigated by using balanced scorecards with multiple SLOs, conducting regular metric reviews, and publishing which decisions were gated by which metrics (preventing "dashboard theater").

Privacy leakage. Detailed outcome measurement creates surveillance risk. Mitigation requires aggregation thresholds, k-anonymity, differential privacy for sensitive statistics, and strict data minimization.

Data bias. Measurement systems can embed biases in sampling, collection, and analysis. Mitigation includes publishing sampling frames, inviting external critique, and adjusting methods with transparency.

Accountability theater. The framework could become performative---dashboards that are published but not used, error budgets that are overridden. Mitigation requires structural teeth: tying change management to SLO status so that the system cannot be bypassed without visible, accountable override decisions.

8. Applications

8.1 Municipal Governance

Municipal governance is perhaps the most natural application domain for QV-SLO integration. Cities face dozens of competing priorities---infrastructure, public safety, housing, parks, transit, education---with heterogeneous intensity of preference across neighborhoods and demographic groups.

A QV-enabled municipal system would allocate voice credits to residents and present the city's priority decisions through an accessible digital interface. Residents would allocate credits across competing proposals, with the quadratic cost function ensuring that residents who feel most strongly about specific issues can express that intensity without monopolizing the process.

SLOs would track outcomes: response times for city services, infrastructure maintenance metrics, housing availability, crime rates, environmental quality. Public dashboards would provide real-time visibility, and error budgets would constrain the pace of policy change to what the system can absorb.

This approach directly addresses the common frustration with municipal governance: decisions that seem disconnected from resident priorities, with no systematic way for residents to communicate relative urgency.

8.2 Organizational Decision-Making

Organizations---corporations, non-profits, cooperatives---face collective decision problems similar to political governance but in smaller-scale, higher-frequency settings. QV is particularly well-suited to:

Board priority-setting. Directors allocate voice credits across strategic priorities, revealing genuine intensity of commitment rather than the bland consensus of traditional board discussions.

Budget allocation. Department heads or project leaders allocate credits across competing budget requests, ensuring that the most urgent needs receive priority regardless of the political influence of their advocates.

Product roadmap decisions. Development teams allocate credits across feature requests, bug fixes, and technical debt. The quadratic cost ensures that no single stakeholder can monopolize the roadmap.

Employee engagement. Workers express intensity of preference across workplace improvements, benefits options, or policy changes, giving management actionable data on what employees genuinely value rather than what surveys with binary choices suggest.

8.3 Policy Prioritization

National and regional governments face complex multi-issue environments where simple majority voting provides inadequate guidance. QV offers a mechanism for large-scale preference elicitation:

Legislative priority-setting. As demonstrated in Colorado, QV can help legislatures identify which bills have the most intense support, allowing limited legislative time to be allocated to the proposals that matter most to the most people.

Regulatory consultation. Regulatory agencies typically receive binary comments (support/oppose) during public comment periods. QV-structured consultations would reveal which regulatory provisions generate intense stakeholder concern and which are broadly acceptable.

National planning. Long-term infrastructure, environmental, and social investments could be prioritized through QV, ensuring that decisions reflect weighted preferences rather than the outcomes of lobbying by organized interests.

8.4 Participatory Budgeting

Participatory budgeting (PB)---the direct involvement of citizens in allocating portions of public budgets---is a natural fit for QV. Traditional PB typically allows residents to vote for their top project choices, producing outcomes dominated by the most popular but not necessarily the most valued proposals.

QV-enhanced PB would allow residents to allocate credits across budget proposals with quadratic costing. A resident who desperately needs a new transit route could concentrate credits there, outweighing multiple casual supporters of a park renovation. The result would be budget allocations that better reflect aggregate preference intensity across the community.

SLO integration would close the loop: each funded project would have defined success metrics, monitored through the accountability framework, and reported back to participants in the next budget cycle.

---

9. Discussion

9.1 Scalability

QV's computational requirements are modest---summing votes and verifying budget constraints scale linearly with the number of voters and issues. The scalability challenge is not computational but institutional: implementing QV for a city of 100,000 requires identity infrastructure, digital interfaces, and public education at scale.

Evidence from Taiwan's vTaiwan (population-scale, though not mandatory) and Gitcoin Grants (tens of thousands of participants, millions of dollars allocated) suggests that QV-style mechanisms can scale to large populations with existing technology. The binding constraint is not the mechanism but the surrounding infrastructure.

9.2 Accessibility

The concern that QV is "too complicated" for ordinary voters deserves careful treatment. The mathematical mechanism is indeed more complex than binary voting. However, the user experience need not expose that complexity. Slider-based interfaces, real-time budget displays, and intuitive cost feedback can make QV participation straightforward.

Empirical evidence from deployment consistently shows rapid adaptation. Participants in the Colorado caucus---a politically diverse group, not a self-selected sample of mathematics enthusiasts---managed QV allocation with minimal training. The comparison to smartphone adoption is apt: the underlying technology is complex, but the interface can be simple.

Nevertheless, any QV deployment must invest in accessibility: plain-language explanations, multilingual support, alternative input modalities, and non-digital fallback options. The democratic legitimacy of QV depends on broad, not just technically sophisticated, participation.

9.3 Political Feasibility

The most significant barrier to QV adoption is neither technical nor conceptual but political. Incumbent elected officials have won under current rules and have limited incentive to change them. Electoral reform movements face coordination problems: voters may favor reform in the abstract but prioritize substantive policy issues in actual elections.

The most promising path to adoption runs through non-governmental contexts first. Corporate governance, community organizations, participatory budgeting, and regulatory consultations can serve as proving grounds, building public familiarity and a track record of success. Municipal adoption may follow, with state and national implementation as a longer-term aspiration.

The blockchain and DAO ecosystem has provided an unexpected accelerant: thousands of organizations now use QV or quadratic funding for consequential decisions, creating a generation of participants with direct experience of the mechanism.

9.4 Limitations

QV is not without genuine limitations:

Identity requirements. Strong identity verification is essential but creates tension with privacy values and may exclude marginalized populations. No current identity system perfectly balances uniqueness, privacy, and inclusion.

Collusion vulnerability. While QV is individually strategy-proof in large populations, coordinated groups can gain advantages. Collusion resistance requires additional mechanism design and monitoring infrastructure.

Preference formation. QV assumes voters have well-formed cardinal preferences. In practice, preferences may be unstable, poorly introspected, or subject to framing effects. The mechanism does not solve the upstream problem of informed preference formation.

Cultural fit. QV's individualist, market-inspired logic may not resonate in all cultural contexts. Communitarian traditions that emphasize consensus over individual expression may find the competitive allocation dynamic alien.

Transition costs. Replacing established voting systems involves significant institutional, legal, and cultural change. The transition period is vulnerable to confusion, manipulation, and legitimacy challenges.

Dimensionality reduction. While QV captures more preference information than binary voting, it still requires complex policy landscapes to be decomposed into discrete issues or proposals. The decomposition itself is a political act that can shape outcomes.

9.5 Future Research Directions

Several questions merit further investigation:

1. Optimal credit allocation models. What budget size and allocation frequency best balance expressiveness, simplicity, and strategic robustness across different decision contexts?

1. Collusion-resistant variants. How effective are correlation-discounting and other anti-collusion mechanisms in practice, and what are their expressiveness costs?

1. Hybrid mechanisms. How can QV be combined with deliberation, liquid democracy, or prediction markets to create richer democratic systems?

1. SLO calibration. How should Societal SLO targets and error budgets be set to be ambitious but achievable, and how should they adapt over time?

1. Behavioral dynamics. How do voters actually form and express preferences under QV, and how does this differ from theoretical predictions?

1. Longitudinal effects. How does repeated QV participation affect democratic engagement, political polarization, and institutional trust over time?

10. Conclusion

The central argument of this paper is straightforward: the dominant mechanism for democratic preference expression---one-person-one-vote---systematically fails to capture the intensity with which citizens hold their views, producing outcomes that can be profoundly unrepresentative of aggregate welfare. Quadratic voting addresses this failure through an elegant mechanism: a voice credit budget with quadratic cost scaling that allows citizens to express how much they care, not merely which side they favor.

The theoretical foundations are solid. The quadratic cost function is not an arbitrary design choice but the unique pricing rule that achieves approximate utilitarian efficiency in large populations while maintaining robustness to individual strategic manipulation. QV sidesteps Arrow's impossibility theorem by operating in a cardinal rather than ordinal framework, expanding the design space for democratic mechanisms.

The empirical evidence, while still developing, is encouraging. Taiwan's vTaiwan platform has resolved contentious policy questions by finding positions that minimize intense opposition. Colorado's Democratic caucus surfaced legislative priorities invisible to traditional whip counts. RadicalxChange experiments across corporate, community, and academic settings consistently produce outcomes that stakeholders endorse as better reflecting genuine priorities.

This paper's contribution extends beyond advocacy for QV itself to the proposal of integrating preference expression with outcome accountability through Societal SLOs. The closed-loop system we describe---in which citizens express intensity-weighted preferences via QV, those preferences inform measurable outcome targets, outcomes are continuously monitored through public dashboards with error budgets, and citizens review performance before re-expressing preferences---represents a democratic architecture that is simultaneously more expressive and more accountable than current practice.

The challenges are real: identity infrastructure, collusion resistance, accessibility, political feasibility, and cultural fit all require sustained attention. But the cost of inaction---continuing to make collective decisions with a mechanism that treats casual opinion identically to urgent need---is also real and growing as societies face increasingly complex, high-stakes policy choices.

The technology exists. The mathematics work. The experiments have succeeded. The question is not whether better democratic mechanisms are possible, but whether we have the institutional will to adopt them.

Measurement makes democracy governable: visible, correctable, and shared.

Series Context

This paper is No. 8 in the OMXUS Research Series (32 theses). It provides evidence for Conclusion #5: Direct democracy works at national scale.

How this connects:

- (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Swiss Direct Democracy*") (Swiss Direct Democracy) provides 178 years of empirical proof that citizens can govern directly; this paper supplies the mechanism design that makes preference intensity legible within that system.
- (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Two Monkey Theory*") (Two Monkey Theory) establishes that fairness norms are biologically deep; quadratic voting is the electoral architecture that honours those norms by preventing wealth-based preference domination.
- (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Trust-First Governance*") (Trust-First Governance) argues institutions must be redesigned around trust rather than control; the SLO accountability framework proposed here is the measurement layer that makes trust-first governance auditable.
- (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Cooperative Capitalism*") (Cooperative Capitalism) proposes distributed ownership structures; QV provides the democratic decision-making mechanism those cooperatives need to govern at scale without majority tyranny.

The convergence: Every paper in this series proves every other. If people can detect unfairness at the neurological level ((Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Two Monkey Theory*")), and if 178 years of Swiss history show they can govern themselves ((Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Swiss Direct Democracy*")), then the only missing piece is an electoral mechanism that matches the complexity of real preferences to the simplicity of a ballot -- and that is what quadratic voting provides.

*See also: (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Swiss Direct Democracy*") (Swiss Direct Democracy), (Applebee & Combe, 2026, "*Two Monkey Theory*") (Two Monkey Theory). Full series index: CONCLUSIONS.md.*

References

Arrow, K. J. (1951). *Social Choice and Individual Values*. Yale University Press.

Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 586-606.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. T. Payne and Son.

Beyer, B., Jones, C., Petoff, J., & Murphy, N. R. (2016). *Site Reliability Engineering: How Google Runs Production Systems*. O'Reilly Media.

Buterin, V., Hitzig, Z., & Weyl, E. G. (2019). A flexible design for funding public goods. *Management Science*, 65(11), 5171-5187.

Clarke, E. H. (1971). Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public Choice*, 11(1), 17-33.

Condorcet, M. J. A. N. de C. (1785). *Essai sur l'application de l'analyse a la probabilite des decisions rendues a la pluralite des voix*. Imprimerie Royale.

Gibbard, A. (1973). Manipulation of voting schemes: A general result. *Econometrica*, 41(4), 587-601.

Groves, T., & Ledyard, J. (1977). Optimal allocation of public goods: A solution to the "free rider" problem. *Econometrica*, 45(4), 783-809.

Hanson, R. (2013). Shall we vote on values, but bet on beliefs? *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 21(2), 151-178.

Harsanyi, J. C. (1955). Cardinal welfare, individualistic ethics, and interpersonal comparisons of utility. *Journal of Political Economy*, 63(4), 309-321.

Hurwicz, L. (1960). Optimality and informational efficiency in resource allocation processes. In K. J. Arrow, S. Karlin, & P. Suppes (Eds.), *Mathematical Methods in the Social Sciences* (pp. 27-46). Stanford University Press.

Hurwicz, L. (1972). On informationally decentralized systems. In C. B. McGuire & R. Radner (Eds.), *Decision and Organization* (pp. 297-336). North-Holland.

Hylland, A., & Zeckhauser, R. (1979). A mechanism for selecting public goods when preferences are private. *Kennedy School of Government Discussion Paper*, 70D.

Lalley, S. P., & Weyl, E. G. (2018). Quadratic voting: How mechanism design can radicalize democracy. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 108, 33-37.

Lindahl, E. (1919). Just taxation---a positive solution. In R. A. Musgrave & A. T. Peacock (Eds.), *Classics in the Theory of Public Finance* (pp. 168-176). Macmillan. (Translated 1958.)

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.

Myerson, R. B. (2008). Perspectives on mechanism design in economic theory. *American Economic Review*, 98(3), 586-603.

Posner, E. A., & Weyl, E. G. (2014). Quadratic voting as efficient corporate governance. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 81(1), 251-272.

Posner, E. A., & Weyl, E. G. (2018). *Radical Markets: Uprooting Capitalism and Democracy for a Just Society*. Princeton University Press.

Quarfoot, D., von Kohorn, D., Slavin, K., Sutherland, R., Goldstein, D., & Konar, E. (2017). Quadratic voting in the wild: Real people, real votes. *Public Choice*, 172(1-2), 283-303.

Rothkopf, M. H. (2007). Thirteen reasons why the Vickrey-Clarke-Groves process is not practical. *Operations Research*, 55(2), 191-197.

Satterthwaite, M. A. (1975). Strategy-proofness and Arrow's conditions: Existence and correspondence theorems for voting procedures and social welfare functions. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 10(2), 187-217.

Tideman, T. N., & Tullock, G. (1976). A new and superior process for making social choices. *Journal of Political Economy*, 84(6), 1145-1159.

Vickrey, W. (1961). Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *Journal of Finance*, 16(1), 8-37.

Weyl, E. G. (2017). The robustness of quadratic voting. *Public Choice*, 172(1-2), 75-107.