NA-02 Collective animal decisions: democratic versus despotic, and the role of the uninformed

The permanent loss of industrial supply chains and the apparatus of the modern state forces a return to the foundational mechanics of human organization. When the grid fails, the remnants of society must reconstruct governance from the household up to the bioregion.

Understanding the principles of self-governance that endure across deep time requires examining both the biological baseline of collective animal behavior and the historical record of human institutional design. Governance architectures must inherently solve two problems: the optimization of collective resource allocation in uncertain environments, and the resistance of capture by individuals possessing dark-triad psychological traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy).

This report analyzes the mechanisms of collective decision-making, contrasting "democratic" (shared, majority-based) and "despotic" (unshared, leader-driven) models. It establishes the mathematical and biological conditions under which majority rule minimizes consensus costs, evaluates the crucial stabilizing role of uninformed individuals in resisting extremist minorities, and translates these biological dynamics into historical human frameworks. By rigorously applying these models to historical cases—the catastrophic failure of the Athenian assembly, the collapse of the stateless Icelandic Commonwealth, and the mathematical resilience of the Venetian Republic—this analysis extracts testable principles for post-collapse institutional design.

The Biology of Group Decisions: Consensus Costs and the Democratic Baseline

In social animals, conflicts of interest constantly arise over the timing and direction of activities, such as foraging, resting, or migrating. To maintain group cohesion and avoid the severe survival costs of fragmentation, animals must reach a consensus[1]. Theoretical models developed by Conradt and Roper in their 2003 *Nature* study, "Group decision-making in animals," provide a mathematical framework for evaluating the costs of different decision-making architectures, specifically comparing despotic decisions (where one dominant individual dictates the outcome) against democratic decisions (where the outcome represents the majority preference)[4].

The underlying calculus relies on "consensus costs"—the metabolic or fitness penalty an individual pays by synchronizing its activity with the group rather than following its own optimal schedule[6]. Conradt and Roper demonstrated that democratic decisions result in significantly lower overall consensus costs for the group in the vast majority of circumstances[3]. In a modeled group of n synchronized individuals, if a democratic group stops an activity when a

majority wants to stop (at time $T = t_{(n+1)/2}$), the costs are distributed across the population. In a despotic group, the expected group costs are $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{m=1}^{n} C_m$. The despot pays zero consensus cost, while the remaining $n-1$ subordinates shoulder the entire burden equally[5].

The model predicts that subordinates will benefit from a democratic decision if the aggregate synchronization costs under despotism exceed those under democracy. Mathematically, the costs are higher in a despotic group if $c\sum_{i\neq(n+1)/2}(n-i)D_i$ exceeds the distributed costs of the democratic threshold[5]. Thus, democratic decisions are mathematically least costly for the group as a whole.

The empirical record shows this principle manifesting in wild animal populations through quorum thresholds and simple voting mechanisms. In red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), groups of approximately 10 to 50 individuals move only when a mean of 62% (with a standard deviation of 8%) of the adults stand up, effectively setting a supermajority threshold[5]. Similarly, mountain gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla*) initiate group movement when a median of 65% (range 43–86%) of adults vocalize[5]. African buffalo have been observed "voting" on travel direction through resting posture, where the eventual direction of the herd correlates tightly with the average vector of the adult females' gaze, successfully dictating travel direction in 131 out of 155 observations[5].

However, Conradt and Roper's analysis identifies specific, narrow conditions under which despotism is mathematically more efficient for the group as a whole. Despotism prevails when group sizes are exceptionally small and there is a massive information asymmetry—meaning the despot possesses crucial survival information (e.g., the exact location of a hidden water source) that the rest of the group entirely lacks[4]. If the cost of a wrong decision is catastrophic, the group benefits from surrendering agency to the informed minority. Outside of these precise parameters, majority rule dominates because it structurally minimizes the aggregate drag of consensus costs[1].

Arrangement 1: Biological Democratic Consensus

- **What the people (or biology) say it does:** Biological systems optimize for genetic fitness and survival, strictly balancing the energetic costs of moving against the safety of remaining in a group.
- **What the record shows:** Animal groups across taxa (primates, ungulates, fish) utilize decentralized, supermajority thresholds to initiate collective movement, consistently rejecting despotic leadership unless severe information asymmetries exist.
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Democracy is not a human ethical invention but a mathematically optimal evolutionary strategy for minimizing aggregate group friction in social species.

Scale (Rung)	Efficacy	Rationale & Historical/Biological Context

Household (4-10)	Highly Effective	Information asymmetry often justifies temporary despotism (e.g., an experienced elder guiding the young), but shared consensus easily operates via direct physical cues.
Hamlet/Band (30-50)	Highly Effective	Matches the scale of red deer herds (62% standing rule) and stickleback fish quorums. Everyone can visually or acoustically verify the threshold.
Village (150-500)	Functional	Biological consensus relies on spatial proximity. At this scale, it requires deliberate architecture (a central clearing or plaza) to ensure all members can register the physical "votes" (postures, calls).
Parish/District (1,500-5,000)	Fails	Exceeds the capacity for direct sensory verification of a quorum. Biological mechanisms of pure consensus break down into fragmented sub-herds or chaotic mobs.
Town to Planet	Never Tried	Pure biological consensus is physically impossible at macro scales without representation or abstract technology.

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Biological Consensus

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A physically dominant or hyper-aggressive individual

(analogous to a psychopath) attempts to force movement without waiting for the 62-65% threshold, using coercion (biting, charging) to inflict immediate costs on non-compliant subordinates.

- **Historical/Biological Cases:** In some primate troops, a highly aggressive alpha male attempts to dictate foraging routes.
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** In most ungulate and primate species, the aggregate inertia of the group simply outlasts the despot. If the despot leaves without the quorum, they face the cost of isolation (predation risk). If they attempt to coerce the entire group, the energetic expenditure exhausts them. The mathematical weight of the group's passive resistance naturally reverses the capture attempt.

The Dampening Power of the Uninformed

While democratic decisions minimize baseline costs, collective intelligence faces a severe vulnerability: the presence of highly opinionated, stubborn minorities. In human governance, highly motivated factions often capture the apparatus of state or community. In animal groups, a similar dynamic can theoretically occur if a subset of the population possesses a strong, inflexible preference for a specific outcome.

Couzin et al. (2011) fundamentally altered the understanding of this vulnerability in their *Science* publication, "Uninformed Individuals Promote Democratic Consensus in Animal Groups." They demonstrated that "uninformed" individuals—those lacking a strong preference or prior information—act as a critical defensive mechanism against extremist capture[11].

In their spatial model, a group is divided into three subpopulations: a majority group (N_1) preferring target A, a minority group (N_2) preferring target B, and an uninformed group (N_3). The influence of each informed individual is determined by the strength of their preference, represented by weight ω. If the minority is highly opinionated or extremist ($\omega_2 \gg \omega_1$), they exhibit extreme intransigence during interactions. In a group composed entirely of informed individuals ($N_3 = 0$), the opinionated minority easily overrides the numerical majority, dragging the entire group to target B[11].

However, when uninformed individuals ($\omega_3 \approx 0$) are introduced, the system undergoes a saddle-node bifurcation. The uninformed spontaneously inhibit the extremist minority and return control to the numerical majority[11]. Because the uninformed individuals respond to local numerical density rather than the intensity of a neighbor's preference, they amplify the sheer headcount of the majority. The uninformed act as an inertial anchor, mathematically dampening the leverage of the highly motivated minority. As N_3 increases, the minority loses the capacity to exploit the majority, regardless of how aggressively the minority asserts its preference[11].

This model was empirically tested using schooling golden shiners (*Notemigonus crysoleucas*). Researchers trained two subpopulations to prefer different targets, deliberately making the minority highly motivated (by manipulating food expectations). In experiments with group sizes

of 150 and 300 fish, the presence of untrained, uninformed fish consistently thwarted the highly motivated minority, causing the school to reliably choose the target preferred by the numerical, albeit weakly motivated, majority[11].

The implication for post-collapse human governance is profound: political systems that demand universal, high-intensity engagement from all citizens are structurally highly vulnerable to capture by extremist, dark-triad actors. A passive, relatively uninformed demographic within a voting body provides vital structural friction, preventing a highly organized, Machiavellian faction from easily hijacking the consensus process.

Arrangement 2: Uninformed-Dampened Systems (The Apathetic Buffer)

- **What the people say it does:** In human contexts, civic apathy is universally decried. Citizens are told that total engagement and maximal information are the civic ideal.
- **What the record shows:** When every member of a polity is forced into a state of high-information/high-preference engagement, societies polarize violently. Extremist minorities dominate because they easily out-escalate moderate majorities.
- **What modern scholarship infers:** A significant proportion of politically unengaged, weakly preference-holding individuals serves as a vital mathematical ballast. By voting based on general societal mood or simple numerical cues rather than ideological intensity, they block extreme factions from achieving systemic leverage.

Scale (Rung)	**Efficacy**	**Rationale & Historical/Biological Context**
Household (4-10)	Fails	In very small groups, apathy is a liability. Every member's active contribution and attention are required for baseline survival.
Hamlet/Band (30-50)	Functional	A small subset of unopinionated members naturally sides with the majority, preventing a loud faction of 5 people from overriding 25 moderates.
Village (150-500)	Highly Effective	Matches the 150-300 golden shiner experiments. A large unengaged middle physically prevents radical

		factions from steering the village's resource allocation.
Parish/District (1,500-5,000)	Vulnerable	The buffer works until a demagogue artificially inflames the uninformed. If the apathetic are panicked, the buffer becomes a stampede.
Town to Planet	Variable	Scales only if the unengaged are physically insulated from mass media/propaganda contagion that artificially spikes their preference weights (ω).

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Dampened Systems

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A Machiavellian actor recognizes that the uninformed buffer (N_3) blocks their path to power. The actor initiates a strategy of artificial polarization—using fear, scapegoating, or crisis manufacturing—to force the uninformed to adopt a high preference weight ($\omega_3 \rightarrow \omega_2$). By eliminating the middle, the extremist captures the narrative.
- **Historical/Biological Cases:** The Golden Shiner model shows that if the ratio ω_2/ω_1 is astronomically high and the N_1/N_2 ratio is low, the minority can dictate motion regardless of uninformed individuals[14]. In human history, radical vanguard parties (e.g., the Bolsheviks) successfully captured the state by forcing moderate, unengaged populations into extreme binary choices through terror.
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** Institutional friction. If the system requires physical voting or relies on localized, decentralized execution, the extremist cannot broadcast the polarizing signal to the entire population simultaneously. Isolation of the uninformed preserves their dampening effect.

Shared Decisions and Vector Compromise in Stratified Societies

The binary of democracy versus despotism is complicated by the presence of complex social hierarchies. Strandburg-Peshkin et al. (2015) examined wild olive baboons (*Papio anubis*) in Kenya to understand how groups with strict dominance hierarchies make collective spatial decisions[15]. Using high-resolution GPS collars recording position data every second for 25 baboons (approximately 80% of the adult/subadult troop), the researchers analyzed 123,773 "pulls" (initiations of movement) and "anchors" (failures to follow)[15].

Despite the rigid social stratification of baboons, the data revealed that decision-making was fundamentally shared rather than despotic[15]. A dominant male could attempt to initiate a movement, but if he lacked secondary supporters, he would inevitably fail and return to the group, paying the cost of isolation[12]. The baboons utilized a precise vector-based compromise mechanism: when multiple initiators pulled in different directions, the troop's behavior depended on the angle of disagreement. If the angle between the competing directions was less than 90 degrees, the troop compromised, moving along the average middle vector. If the angle exceeded 90 degrees, compromise was abandoned, and the troop effectively "voted" with their feet, choosing the direction supported by the numerical majority and forcing the minority to abandon their preference[15]. This finding—that democracy emerges from self-organizing rules even in highly stratified, socially complex mammalian groups—has been independently replicated in vulturine guineafowl, validating the robustness of the mechanism[17].

Furthermore, biological systems optimize decision speed and accuracy through "quorum responses." Research by Ward, Sumpter, and Couzin (2012) on threespine sticklebacks demonstrated that animals do not follow initiators linearly[18]. Instead, the probability of following is governed by a steep, non-linear function. In their mathematical model, the individual probability of leaving a site (Q_1) as a function of the number of individuals already committed (X) is defined by equations utilizing a steepness parameter k [20]. When $k = 1$, the response is linear and highly error-prone, as individuals merely copy the nearest neighbor. When $k > 1$, a quorum response is in effect[21].

For sticklebacks choosing between food patches, empirical data perfectly fit a model with a steep quorum threshold of $k = 3.2$, with spontaneous accept rates remaining exceptionally low until the threshold was breached[21]. This quorum threshold ensures that an individual waits until a definitive, un-ignorable critical mass is reached before abandoning their current state, filtering out the "noise" of random movements by single individuals.

Arrangement 3: Vector Compromise and Quorum Sensing

- **What the people (or biology) say it does:** Maintains absolute group cohesion by averaging out minor differences in preference while decisively resolving major ideological or spatial rifts through strict majoritarianism.
- **What the record shows:** Stratified hierarchies (baboons, guineafowl) override dominance rankings when navigating geographic space, prioritizing the physics of the vector over the social rank of the initiator.
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Social dominance (the ability to win a one-on-one

physical fight) does not equal leadership (the ability to initiate a group consensus) in complex biological systems. Leadership is distributed and requires a non-linear quorum of secondary supporters to activate.

Scale (Rung)	**Efficacy**	**Rationale & Historical/Biological Context**
Household (4-10)	Highly Effective	Compromise (< 90 degrees) works flawlessly for daily resource decisions.
Hamlet/Band (30-50)	Highly Effective	The scale at which baboon troops operate. Quorum sensing ($k = 3.2$) filters out erratic individual choices, ensuring the band only commits to a decision when a critical mass forms.
Village (150-500)	Functional	Requires deliberate structuring. A village assembly must formally adopt the < 90 degree rule: if proposals are similar, average them; if fundamentally opposed (> 90), force a hard majority vote.
Parish/District (1,500-5,000)	Fails	Vector compromise requires spatial awareness of all initiators. In a district, individuals cannot perceive the "angle" of competing proposals without representative intermediaries, leading to the collapse of the

		mechanism.
Town to Planet	Never Tried	Pure vector compromise cannot scale without technology to aggregate multi-dimensional preference spaces.

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Quorum Sensing

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A narcissist seeks to establish themselves as the sole initiator. Recognizing that they need secondary supporters to trigger the $k = 3.2$ quorum, they utilize clientelism—bribing or intimidating a small vanguard of loyalists to immediately follow their every pull. By artificially generating the initial quorum, they trick the rest of the group into following.
- **Historical/Biological Cases:** In human organizational psychology, this is known as the "false consensus effect," where a vocal minority creates the illusion of a quorum, triggering the compliance of the majority.
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** Biological systems resist this because true quorums require independent assessments. If the group detects that the secondary supporters are not acting independently but are tethered to the initiator, the quorum threshold naturally steepens (e.g., requiring $k = 5$ instead of 3.2).

Human Governance and the Epistemic Edge

Modern scholarship on human decision-making echoes these biological findings through the theory of "epistemic democracy." Political theorist Hélène Landemore (2013) in *Democratic Reason* applies the "Diversity Trumps Ability" theorem (originally formalized by Lu Hong and Scott Page) to argue that the distributed intelligence of the many is inherently superior to the concentrated expertise of the few[23].

Under conditions of adequate cognitive diversity, a large group of moderately capable individuals will consistently outperform a small group of highly capable experts[23]. The logic parallels Conradt and Roper's findings: an oligarchy or a dictator (the human equivalent of a despot) requires superhuman, perfect information to make optimal decisions for a massive, complex system[24]. Because no human possesses perfect information, a democratic architecture that aggregates diverse, localized information will theoretically achieve a higher degree of accuracy in navigating uncertain environments[23].

However, translating biological quorum responses and epistemic ideals into unmitigated human majoritarianism reveals fatal flaws, as human cognition is vulnerable to emotional contagion, demagoguery, and the capacity for abstract deception.

Historical Failure 1: The Athenian Assembly and the Sicilian Expedition (415 BC)

If majority rule and uninformed dampeners are biologically robust, why do human democracies routinely collapse into catastrophic folly? The strongest case against direct, unmitigated majoritarianism is the Athenian Assembly (*Ecclesia*) and its disastrous vote to launch the Sicilian Expedition in 415 BC during the Peloponnesian War[26].

- **What the people said it did:** The Athenian assembly believed it was exercising its sovereign, democratic right to defend its allies (Segesta and Leontini) and preemptively check the rising Dorian power of Syracuse, thereby expanding Athenian glory, wealth, and imperial security[28].
- **What the record shows:** The Segestans engaged in deliberate deception, falsely inflating their wealth to secure Athenian aid. In the assembly, Alcibiades—a textbook dark-triad demagogue displaying extreme narcissism, charisma, and Machiavellianism—inflamed the public to support a modest expedition of 60 ships[28]. Nicias, a cautious elder statesman, vehemently opposed the war. In a disastrous tactical error during the second debate, Nicias attempted to call the assembly's bluff. He argued that the expedition would only succeed if it were massively expanded to 134 triremes, 5,100 hoplites, and over 30,000 total combatants, believing the staggering cost would force the citizens to abandon the project[27]. Instead of recoiling, the quorum of roughly 6,000 assemblymen was gripped by war fever and voted overwhelmingly to approve the massive escalation[26]. The expedition was utterly annihilated in 413 BC. Nicias was executed, tens of thousands of Athenians were enslaved in Syracusan quarries, and the defeat permanently broke Athenian hegemony[27].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The assembly lacked the procedural friction necessary to dampen extreme polarization. The biological mechanism of the "uninformed majority" failed because the demagogue (Alcibiades) artificially heightened the emotional engagement of the entire quorum, effectively shifting the preference weight (ω) of the normally passive citizens until everyone became an "informed/opinionated" extremist. Without an inertial anchor or a procedural delay, the collective decision cascaded into delusion[30].

Arrangement 4: Direct Majoritarian Assembly

Scale (Rung)	**Efficacy**	**Rationale & Historical/Biological Context**
Household to Village (4-500)	Functional	Direct assemblies work when the stakes are immediate, verifiable, and visually evident to all

		members.
Parish/District (1,500-5,000)	Fails Catastrophically	Matches the Athenian *Ecclesia* (~6,000 voters). Exceeds Dunbar's number exponentially. The crowd ceases to act as a collection of independent minds and becomes a highly suggestible super-organism susceptible to charismatic contagion.
Town to Planet	Never Tried	Logistically impossible without representation.

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Direct Assemblies

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A narcissist utilizes rhetorical emotional manipulation to synchronize the neurochemistry of the crowd, overriding independent rational assessment. They convert the natural quorum response ($k = 3.2$) into a stampede response ($k = 1$), where citizens merely copy the fervor of the person next to them rather than waiting for independent verification.
- **Historical Cases:** Alcibiades in Athens (415 BC); Cleon urging the massacre of Mytilene.
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** Procedural delays. When assemblies are forced to pause for days between debate and voting, the emotional contagion subsides, allowing the "uninformed" dampener to naturally reset. Athens failed because it voted immediately upon the conclusion of Nicias's bluff.

Historical Failure 2: The Icelandic Commonwealth (930–1262 AD)

A second historical failure is the Icelandic Commonwealth, which attempted to scale a stateless, consensus-based society across a massive geographic area without a central executive to enforce laws.

- **What the people said it did:** The system provided justice, property rights, and conflict resolution for free farmers through regional assemblies (*Things*) and a national parliament (the *Althing*). Justice was mediated by local chieftains (*Goðar*), who acted as advocates rather than feudal lords[33].
- **What the record shows:** The number of *Goðar* was fixed at 36 around the year 930 AD,

later raised to 39, and eventually 48[33]. Over three centuries, farmers technically had the legal right to switch their allegiance from one chieftain to another, maintaining a competitive, fluid balance of power that theoretically prevented despotism[34]. However, by the 13th century, wealth, land, and the ownership of the *Goðorð* (the chieftaincies themselves) concentrated into the hands of six major family clans (the Sturlungar, Haukdælir, Oddaverjar, Ásbirningar, Vatnsfirðingar, and Svínfellingar)[36].

- **What modern scholarship infers:** The system lacked economic mechanisms to prevent the monopolization of resources. Once dark-triad actors within families like the Sturlungar recognized they could permanently buy out or violently subsume neighboring *Goðorð*, the distributed consensus collapsed. Because there was no state apparatus to enforce anti-monopoly laws, the society plunged into a 42-year bloodbath known as the Age of the Sturlungs (Sturlungaöld). The violence only ended when the exhausted population surrendered their sovereignty to the Norwegian King in 1264, signing the Old Covenant (Gamli sáttmáli) to restore basic physical security[36].

Arrangement 5: Stateless Distributed Consensus

Scale (Rung)	**Efficacy**	**Rationale & Historical/Biological Context**
Household to Village (4-500)	Highly Effective	Decentralized justice and mutual aid operate well when social reputation is universally known and ostracism is a lethal threat.
Parish/District (1,500-5,000)	Vulnerable	Requires deep, culturally enforced norms against wealth hoarding.
Town/Region (15,000-500,000)	Fails Catastrophically	The Icelandic population (approx. 50,000 to 80,000) was spread across a region. At this scale, wealthy actors can maintain private retinues large enough to ignore social ostracism, destroying the consensus mechanism.
Nation to Planet	Never Tried	Requires state monopolies

		on violence to prevent warlordism.

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Stateless Consensus

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A Machiavellian actor uses accumulated capital to buy out the decentralized nodes of power. Because allegiance is voluntary, the actor uses a combination of immense bribery and localized violence to force farmers into a feudal arrangement, permanently capturing the formerly fluid network.
- **Historical Cases:** The Sturlungar family during the Age of the Sturlungs (mid-13th century Iceland)[36].
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** Periodic redistribution of wealth or strict prohibitions on the transferability of political office (making the *Goðorð* un-sellable) could have prevented the consolidation of power.

Historical Success: The Venetian Doge Election (1268–1797 AD)

A governance arrangement is only as robust as its ability to withstand capture by individuals with dark-triad traits. To counter clan conspiracies and bribery—the medieval equivalents of dark-triad capture—the Republic of Venice designed an election protocol in 1268 that utilized extreme procedural complexity, sortition (lotteries), and cryptographic-level information hiding[38].

- **What the people said it did:** They believed it ensured God's will and absolute fairness in selecting the Doge, completely eliminating factional violence, voter bribery, and oligarchic domination.
- **What the record shows:** The process utilized 10 alternating stages of sortition (random lots) and super-majoritarian approval voting[38]. The sequence was executed in a single, continuous session: The Great Council (approx. 480 men) was reduced by lot to 30 $\rightarrow$ reduced by lot to 9 $\rightarrow$ voted to select 40 $\rightarrow$ reduced by lot to 12 $\rightarrow$ voted to select 25 $\rightarrow$ reduced by lot to 9 $\rightarrow$ voted to select 45 $\rightarrow$ reduced by lot to 11 $\rightarrow$ voted to select 41 $\rightarrow$ who finally elected the Doge using colored ballotte[38]. Furthermore, no two members of the same family could serve in the same college, and supermajorities (e.g., 25 out of 41, or roughly 61%) were required for the final vote[40].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The system was an un-gameable mathematical fortress. Bribery and Machiavellian manipulation require predictability and targeting. An oligarch cannot mathematically optimize a bribe if the elector's identity is determined by a random lottery only minutes before a vote[38]. By combining the non-linear quorum threshold of biological systems (supermajorities) with sortition (which effectively simulates the "uninformed" dampener by randomly sampling the population and stripping

away entrenched preference weights), Venice survived for 529 years without succumbing to a despotic coup, only falling to Napoleon's external conquest in 1797[39].

Arrangement 6: Sortition-Supermajoritarianism

Scale (Rung)	Efficacy	Rationale & Historical/Biological Context
Household to Hamlet (4-50)	Inefficient	Procedurally exhausting and unnecessary for groups small enough for direct biological consensus.
Village to District (150-5,000)	Highly Effective	Perfectly suited to mitigate local factionalism and prevent wealthy local families from buying power.
Town/Region (15,000-5M)	Highly Effective	The Great Council of Venice operated effectively over a vast maritime empire, utilizing this exact mechanism to select executives.
Nation/Planet (50M-8B)	Plausible	Could theoretically scale via nested electoral colleges, substituting national elections for tiered sortition assemblies.

CAPTURE TEST: The Dark-Triad Vulnerability in Sortition Systems

- **Mechanism of Takeover:** A psychopath realizes they cannot rig the lottery or bribe the ever-shifting colleges. Therefore, they must corrupt the *input*—controlling who is allowed into the Great Council in the first place, or utilizing extreme physical violence against the final 41 electors before they cast their ballots.
- **Historical Cases:** No internal faction successfully captured the Dogeship through the electoral system between 1268 and 1797.
- **Features that Resisted Capture:** Extreme cryptographic unpredictability. The 10-stage process ensured that the probability of any specific faction retaining control of the

electoral pipeline dropped to statistical zero[39]. The process forced broad consensus and the selection of moderate, compromise candidates.

Avoiding the Naturalistic Fallacy

It is imperative to avoid the naturalistic fallacy: identifying biological mechanisms of group decision-making does not imply that these mechanisms are ethically "good" or universally just. Animal models evolved to maximize genetic fitness and minimize metabolic expenditure[7]. Small does not mean fair, and old does not mean egalitarian. When transferring biological quorum models to human governance, we must account for human theory of mind, abstract language, and the capacity for dark-triad traits, which allow humans to artificially hack the physical cues (like the false consensus effect) that animals rely on. Biological democracy is a mechanic of survival, not a moral triumph.

The Strongest Case Against & Critics

The most stringent critics of the animal decision-making models point to the methodological difficulty of inferring "following" behavior or shared consensus from purely spatial GPS data. Critics argue that observing animals moving in the same direction does not definitively prove a shared cognitive decision-making process; it may simply represent a correlation of independent preferences for a common environmental feature (e.g., two fish independently spotting the same food source, or baboons independently deciding to walk toward a river)[43]. If true, the mathematical models of "leadership" and "quorums" may overstate the degree of social cognition involved. While experimental manipulations (like Couzin's trained golden shiners) control for this[12], wild observational data remain vulnerable to this critique. Furthermore, political theorists studying epistemic democracy (such as Viehoff) caution against assuming that diverse groups will always out-predict experts in highly technical, abstract policy spaces where baseline competence is near zero[25].

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Democratic, shared decision-making intrinsically minimizes aggregate metabolic and social consensus costs for groups compared to despotic models.
2. Despotism is only mathematically efficient in very small groups facing severe information asymmetries where the cost of error is catastrophic.
3. The presence of passive, uninformed individuals acts as a mathematical anchor, naturally dampening the influence of highly opinionated, extremist minorities.
4. Forcing universal, high-intensity political engagement destroys this inertial buffer, leaving a society vulnerable to rapid demagogic capture.
5. In socially stratified environments, groups will compromise on a median vector if the angle of disagreement is acute ($< 90^\circ$), but will abandon compromise for strict majority rule if the disagreement is obtuse ($> 90^\circ$).
6. Biological collective decisions optimize the speed-accuracy tradeoff through steep, non-linear quorum thresholds (e.g., $k = 3.2$), requiring a critical mass to trigger a

behavioral cascade.
7. Under conditions of cognitive diversity, a democratic majority will consistently mathematically outperform a homogenous group of elite experts.
8. Direct majoritarian assemblies exceeding Dunbar's number (e.g., Athens, 6,000 citizens) are structurally incapable of resisting emotional contagion and demagoguery without mechanical procedural delays.
9. Distributed consensus systems (e.g., Iceland) that lack state apparatuses to prevent the physical consolidation of wealth inevitably collapse into feudal oligarchy.
10. Alternating random sortition with supermajoritarian voting (e.g., Venice) completely neutralizes the utility of bribery and dark-triad manipulation by destroying tactical predictability.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Noise vs. Navigation Problem:** In wild animal observations, it remains technologically difficult to definitively separate instances of true social "following" from instances where animals simply share the same independent environmental vector.
- **The Threshold of Contagion:** It is unclear exactly at what population density the "uninformed dampener" effect flips into a "contagion" effect—where the uninformed are suddenly panicked by a demagogue into joining a disastrous cascade.
- **Competence in Sortition:** While sortition (lotteries) defeats bribery, the extent to which it degrades the technical competence of a decision-making body in highly complex environments remains fiercely debated by epistemic democrats.

Sources to Read in Full

1. **Conradt, L., & Roper, T. J. (2003). Group decision-making in animals. *Nature*, 421(6919), 155-158.** The foundational mathematical proof that democratic decisions minimize consensus costs.
2. **Couzin, I. D., et al. (2011). Uninformed individuals promote democratic consensus in animal groups. *Science*, 334(6062), 1578-1580.** Essential reading for understanding how passive majorities defeat highly motivated minorities.
3. **Strandburg-Peshkin, A., et al. (2015). Shared decision-making drives collective movement in wild baboons. *Science*, 348(6241), 1358-1361.** Detailed GPS analysis proving that hierarchical primates utilize democratic vector-compromise.
4. **Ward, A. J., Krause, J., & Sumpter, D. J. (2012). Quorum Decision-Making in Foraging Fish Shoals. *PLoS ONE*, 7(3).** Deep dive into the non-linear math of quorum responses.
5. **Landemore, H. (2013). *Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence, and the Rule of the Many*.** The definitive modern text on the epistemic superiority of diverse democratic bodies.
6. **Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War* (Books 6 & 7).** The primary historical account of the Sicilian Expedition and the vulnerability of direct assemblies.
7. **Sigurðsson, J. V. (1999). *Chieftains and Power in the Icelandic Commonwealth*.** The best analysis of how a stateless, consensus-based society functioned and collapsed.
8. **Lines, M. (2007). *Approval Voting and the Venetian Doge Election*.** A mathematical

deconstruction of why the 1268 Venetian sortition algorithm was practically invincible to capture.

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Product (MVP)

- **The Household (4–10 people):** Requires no formal procedure. Operates on biological vector-compromise. If life-or-death disputes arise, the household defaults to the member with the most asymmetrical information (e.g., medical knowledge).
- **The Village (300 people):** Requires a physical meeting space (a commons) to allow visual confirmation of quorum responses. Decisions on resource allocation must require a non-linear supermajority (e.g., 65% as seen in primates) to prevent constant oscillation. Voting is done with the feet (standing on different sides of the commons) to utilize spatial biological cues and force public accountability.
- **The District (3,000 people):** Direct democracy must be permanently abandoned to prevent Athenian-style contagion. Requires the immediate implementation of a 3-step sortition protocol (e.g., randomly select 50 citizens from the 3,000, who then require a 75% supermajority to select 5 temporary executives).

Prerequisites to Start (No State, No Grid, No Internet)

The District level requires basic literacy to record laws, a universally agreed-upon shared calendar to schedule assemblies, and a central, defensible meeting place. Most importantly, it requires an analog random-number generator (e.g., physically identical colored balls drawn from an opaque sack, exactly as used in Venice) that is entirely transparent to the public to prevent accusations of rigging during sortition.

The First Failure to Expect

At the Village level (300), the first systemic failure will occur when a charismatic, dark-triad individual forces a polarizing crisis (e.g., a debate over hoarding food versus sharing with a neighboring settlement). The dark-triad actor will attempt to shame the "uninformed/undecided" individuals into choosing a side, destroying the mathematical dampener. If the village leadership allows the debate to occur in a single, un-delayed session, the quorum will fracture, leading to a violent schism.

Principles

1. Democratic decision-making minimizes the aggregate metabolic and social costs of synchronization within any group.
2. Despotic control only optimizes group survival when the group is very small and the despot possesses critical, asymmetrical information.
3. The presence of passive, uninformed individuals inherently dampens the influence of highly opinionated, extremist minorities.
4. Forcing universal, high-intensity political engagement destroys the inertial buffer of a society, leaving it vulnerable to demagogic capture.
5. Groups will compromise on a median vector if the angle of disagreement is acute, but will abandon compromise for majority rule if the disagreement is obtuse.
6. Collective decisions balance speed and accuracy through non-linear quorum thresholds,

requiring a critical mass to trigger a cascade.

7. A cognitively diverse majority will consistently mathematically outperform a homogenous group of highly intelligent experts in complex environments.
8. Direct majoritarian assemblies exceeding Dunbar's number are structurally incapable of resisting emotional contagion without mechanical procedural delays.
9. Distributed consensus systems without enforcement mechanisms to prevent the physical consolidation of wealth will inevitably collapse into feudal oligarchy.
10. Alternating random sortition with supermajoritarian voting completely neutralizes the utility of bribery, as the targets of manipulation cannot be predicted.

Works cited

1. Full article: Leaders, followers, and group decision-making, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.4161/cib.7562
2. Conflicts of interest and the evolution of decision sharing - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2689720/
3. Democracy in animals: the evolution of shared group decisions, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6193151_Democracy_in_animals_the_evolution_of_shared_group_decisions
4. Consensus decision making in human crowds, https://d-nb.info/1139641077/34
5. Group decision-making in animals - Princeton CS, https://www.cs.princeton.edu/~chazelle/courses/BIB/group-decision-making.pdf
6. Collective decision-making and social foraging behavior in cohesive, https://escholarship.org/content/qt6dr675k9/qt6dr675k9_noSplash_8f96a7e7e33523bad20bc7efafaab556.pdf
7. Democracy in animals: the evolution of shared group decisions, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rspb/article/274/1623/2317/76636/Democracy-in-animals-the-evolution-of-shared-group
8. Group decisions in humans and animals: a survey | The Royal Society, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rstb/article/364/1518/719/57794/Group-decisions-in-humans-and-animals-a-survey
9. Effective leadership and decision-making in animal groups on the, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/8042596_Effective_leadership_and_decision-making_in_animal_groups_on_the_move
10. Group decision-making in animals - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12520299/
11. (PDF) Uninformed Individuals Promote Democratic Consensus in, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/51884215_Uninformed_Individuals_Promote_Democratic_Consensus_in_Animal_Groups
12. Potential Leaders Trade Off Goal-Oriented and Socially Oriented, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086%2F681988
13. Iain COUZIN F.R.S. | Director | BSc, MA(Oxon), PhD - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Iain-Couzin-Frs/3
14. Supporting Online Material for, https://pdodds.w3.uvm.edu/teaching/courses/2009-08UVM-300/docs/others/201

1/couzin2011a_supp.pdf
15. Shared decision-making drives collective movement in wild baboons, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278784703_Shared_decision-making_drives_collective_movement_in_wild_baboons
16. 'Democratic' Decision-Making Drives Baboon Troop Movements, https://www.sci.news/biology/science-democratic-decision-making-olive-baboons-02933.html
17. shared movement decisions in wild vulturine guineafowl - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10787764/
18. Quorum Decision-Making in Foraging Fish Shoals - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3296701/
19. Quorum Decision-Making in Foraging Fish Shoals | PLOS One, https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0032411
20. Key Factors for the Emergence of Collective Decision in Invertebrates, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neuroscience/articles/10.3389/fnins.2012.00121/full
21. Quorum decision-making facilitates information transfer in fish shoals, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.0710344105
22. Quorum responses and consensus decision making - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/23654384_Quorum_responses_and_consensus_decision_making
23. Democratic Reason: The Mechanisms of Collective Intelligence in, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228284138_Democratic_Reason_The_Mechanisms_of_Collective_Intelligence_in_Politics
24. An Epistemic-Democratic Defense of Diversity and Inclusion, https://academic.oup.com/isq/article-pdf/60/3/400/7503744/sqw027.pdf
25. Epistemic democracy and the role of experts - SciSpace, https://scispace.com/pdf/epistemic-democracy-and-the-role-of-experts-3vb283y9dy.pdf
26. THE RHETORIC OF ATHENIAN PUBLIC FINANCE IN, https://www.repository.cam.ac.uk/bitstreams/bc28c040-b300-4cc1-bd46-b30eeb3dc1b7/download
27. Sicilian Expedition - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sicilian_Expedition
28. How Athens Lost the Peloponnesian War With the Sicilian Expedition, https://www.thecollector.com/sicilian-expedition-athens-peloponnesian-war/
29. Nicias - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicias
30. The Sicilian Expedition: a second Brexit footnote - gwallter, https://gwallter.com/history/the-sicilian-expedition-a-second-brexit-footnote.html
31. Siege of Syracuse (415–413 BCE) | Description & Outcome, https://www.britannica.com/event/Siege-of-Syracuse-213-BCE
32. On Justice, Power, and Human Nature Selections From The History, https://www.scribd.com/document/669807963/On-Justice-Power-And-Human-Nature-Selections-From-the-History-of-the-Peloponnesian-War-by-Thucydides-Paul-Woodruff-Z-lib-org

33. goði - Nordic Lexicon, https://www.dhi.ac.uk/lmnl/nordicheadword/displayPage/1775
34. Medieval Icelandic Government - World History Encyclopedia, https://www.worldhistory.org/Icelandic_Government/
35. Icelandic Commonwealth - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Icelandic_Commonwealth
36. Age of the Sturlungs - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_the_Sturlungs
37. Medieval Scandinavia: The Rise and Fall of the Icelandic, https://www.medievalists.net/2020/09/medieval-icelandic-commonwealth/
38. Genesis No. 8: The Venetian “Chess” Elections, https://iacassembly.org/en/genesis-no-8-the-venetian-chess-elections/
39. Electing the Doge of Venice: analysis of a 13th Century protocol, https://rangevoting.org/HPL-2007-28R1.pdf
40. The election of the doge - The Generalist Academy, https://generalist.academy/2020/11/06/the-election-of-the-doge/
41. The election of the Doge of the Republic of Venice - Veneto Inside, https://www.venetoinside.com/en/news-and-curiosities/the-election-of-the-doge-of-the-republic-of-venice
42. The Early History of Approval Voting - The Center for Election Science, https://electionscience.org/education/early-history
43. Inferring influence and leadership in moving animal groups - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5882976/
44. Inferring influence and leadership in moving animal groups, https://royalsocietypublishing.org/rstb/article/373/1746/20170006/30363/Inferring-influence-and-leadership-in-moving