CA-02 Does power corrupt, or do the corrupt seek power?

The permanent loss of industrial supply chains and the subsequent retreat of the state will force human populations to revert to localized forms of self-governance. Whether rebuilding at the scale of a household, a village of three hundred, or a bioregional district of three thousand, the architects of this new reality will confront the oldest vulnerability in political design: the susceptibility of human institutions to despotic capture. To construct resilient governance after the fall, it is necessary to resolve a foundational debate in political psychology. Does the experience of wielding power fundamentally alter human cognition and morality—a process defined as transformation—or do hierarchical structures inherently attract and reward individuals who already possess malevolent psychological profiles—a process defined as selection?

An exhaustive evaluation of empirical psychology, endocrinology, historical archives, and ethnography demonstrates that transformation and selection are not mutually exclusive paradigms. Rather, they operate as a unified, interactive biological and structural system. Power alters the cognitive architecture of the holder, eroding empathy and increasing hypocrisy, while simultaneously functioning as an evolutionary niche that selects for individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy)[1]. Furthermore, biological predispositions interact dynamically with structural opportunities; the acquisition of unconstrained power acts as a hormonal trigger that activates latent exploitative behavioral strategies[4].

If governance models assume only transformation, they will rely heavily on term limits, rotation, and audits, inadvertently leaving the system vulnerable to a rotating cast of highly screened Machiavellians who can easily manipulate audit metrics. If models assume only selection, they will implement rigorous personality screening and random sortition, leaving ordinary, well-meaning citizens vulnerable to the cognitive corruptions that structural power eventually induces in anyone. This report maps the psychological mechanisms of both routes, analyzes the historical durability of institutional countermeasures through strict quantification, and outlines the principles for nesting resilient governance across escalating demographic scales.

The Transformation Hypothesis: Cognitive and Moral Alteration

The transformation hypothesis posits that the structural acquisition of power directly and predictably modifies human cognitive, emotional, and behavioral regulation. Modern behavioral psychology approaches this not as a theological or moral failing, but as a neurological adaptation to asymmetrical resource control. The foundational empirical demonstration of this phenomenon was conducted by Kipnis in 1972, who established that individuals granted power over others rapidly shift to utilizing coercive tactics, begin to attribute the efforts of subordinates to their own leadership, and subsequently seek psychological distance from those they control[7]. Kipnis's original methodology utilized varied sample sizes, including cohorts of 32 and 28 subjects across multiple sessions, establishing an effect size capable of detecting medium-sized

behavioral shifts ($d = 0.48$) with 80% statistical power[7].

The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power

The most robust theoretical framework for understanding this structural transformation is Keltner, Gruenfeld, and Anderson's (2003) approach-inhibition theory of power[10]. This model suggests that possessing power activates the behavioral approach system (BAS), an ancient neurobiological pathway associated with the neurotransmitter dopamine, which drives reward-seeking behavior, cognitive automaticity, impulsivity, and the perception of social environments in terms of opportunities. Conversely, powerlessness activates the behavioral inhibition system (BIS), driving vigilance, anxiety, systematic cognitive processing, and the perception of social environments in terms of threats and constraints[11].

The "power paradox" emerges directly from this neurological shift. The very traits that typically allow individuals to earn power in egalitarian settings—empathy, social attunement, conflict resolution, and collaboration—are systematically eroded by the neurocognitive effects of holding that power[12]. When individuals are elevated to positions of authority, the activation of the approach system causes severe reductions in perspective-taking, decreased emotion recognition, and heightened tendencies to view subordinates merely as instrumental tools for goal actualization[8].

Action Orientation and Moral Hypocrisy

Because power activates the approach system, it reliably increases action orientation. Galinsky, Gruenfeld, and Magee (2003) conducted a series of three experiments demonstrating that individuals primed with high power are significantly more likely to take decisive action, regardless of the social consequences of that action[11]. Across sample sizes averaging approximately 128 participants per study, those endowed with structural power in simulated tasks (such as a blackjack game) were more likely to act on their environment, demonstrating that power channels behavior toward accomplishing specific goals by removing the psychological constraints of social friction[11].

This liberation from social constraint manifests most destructively in the phenomenon of moral hypocrisy. Lammers, Stapel, and Galinsky (2010) demonstrated that powerful individuals consistently judge others' moral transgressions more strictly while simultaneously increasing their own rate of moral transgressions[7]. In experimental paradigms involving travel expense reporting and a lottery ticket cheating task, high-power participants were significantly more likely to condemn cheating in others while actively cheating themselves[14]. This pattern, dubbed "hypercrisy," is driven by a deep-seated sense of entitlement; the powerful impose rigid normative restraints on the powerless to maintain systemic stability, but feel structurally and cognitively exempt from those same restraints[14]. Replications of these mechanisms have proven robust, with sample sizes in replication studies ranging from $N = 150$ to $N = 208$, maintaining statistical significance for the divergence between moral reasoning and moral behavior in high-power individuals, sometimes yielding massive effect sizes ($d = 1.24$,

95% CI)[16].

Methodological Corrections and the Replication Crisis

Despite the robust findings regarding cognitive hypocrisy, the broader literature on power transformation has faced severe methodological corrections during the psychological replication crisis. The most prominent casualty was the concept of "power posing," introduced by Carney, Cuddy, and Yap in 2010, which claimed that merely holding physically expansive postures for two minutes could significantly increase testosterone, decrease cortisol, and increase financial risk-taking[18]. The original study relied on a tiny sample size ($N = 42$) and highly questionable exclusion criteria[18]. Ranehill et al. (2015) conducted a rigorously preregistered, high-powered replication using a sample of 200 participants (98 women, 102 men)[20]. The replication found absolutely no effect of expansive posture on testosterone, cortisol, or financial risk-taking ($d = -0.157$), proving only a subjective, self-reported increase in feeling powerful without any corresponding biological or behavioral transformation[20].

Similarly, the Stanford Prison Experiment, long cited as the ultimate, definitive proof that arbitrary structural power automatically transforms ordinary people into sadistic abusers, was comprehensively debunked by Thibault Le Texier in 2019. Archival research into the experiment's audio tapes and notes revealed extreme demand characteristics. The lead researcher, Philip Zimbardo, acted as the prison warden and explicitly instructed the guards to act cruelly, to induce sleep deprivation, and to break the prisoners psychologically. Furthermore, the selection mechanism was inherently biased; the newspaper advertisement sought participants specifically for a "psychological study of prison life," which attracted individuals with significantly higher baseline traits of aggressiveness, Machiavellianism, and social dominance. The failure of these two pillars of the pure transformation narrative requires a rigorous examination of the selection hypothesis.

The Selection Hypothesis: The Magnetism of Authority

The selection hypothesis argues that power does not necessarily corrupt; rather, institutions of power are highly attractive to individuals who are already fundamentally corrupt. Positions of authority, resource control, and minimal oversight serve as perfect evolutionary niches for individuals high in the dark-triad traits: narcissism (characterized by grandiosity and entitlement), Machiavellianism (characterized by strategic manipulation, deceit, and cynicism), and subclinical psychopathy (characterized by callousness, lack of remorse, and extreme impulsivity)[2].

Corporate and Political Psychopathy

While the baseline rate of psychopathy in the general household population is estimated at less than 1%, its prevalence is vastly overrepresented in corporate and political leadership echelons. Babiak, Neumann, and Hare (2010) analyzed corporate professionals and demonstrated that the incidence of corporate psychopathy ranges between 5.75% and 13.5%[1]. Individuals with dark-triad traits mask their profound lack of empathy behind charisma, rapid impression

management, and superficial charm, allowing them to fluidly navigate institutional hierarchies, extract resources, and avoid accountability[1].

In the political sphere, empirical quantification confirms the same alarming trend. Nai and Toros (2020) constructed a comprehensive global dataset measuring the personality profiles of 124 political candidates across 57 elections worldwide, evaluated by 1,030 domestic and international political experts (averaging 6.3 expert evaluations per candidate)[2]. They found that autocrats and populist strongmen score significantly higher on the dark core of personality than non-autocratic, mainstream politicians[2].

Quantitatively, autocrats scored massively higher in psychopathy ($d = 0.60$) and narcissism ($d = 0.59$), while scoring significantly lower in agreeableness ($d = 0.51$) compared to non-autocratic leaders[28]. On a scale from 0 to 4 measuring the dark triad, top political candidates averaged a score of 2.6, indicating that the baseline political candidate is significantly more callous and manipulative than the average citizen[2]. The data indicates that modern electoral selection mechanisms do not filter out the dark triad. In environments characterized by extreme affective polarization, economic anxiety, and institutional crisis, voters actively select highly disagreeable narcissists as aggressive, uncompromising champions for their specific ingroup[3].

The Identity Leadership Vulnerability

The psychological mechanism by which dark-triad individuals successfully capture groups is illuminated by the Social Identity Approach to leadership. Haslam, Reicher, and Platow (2011) demonstrate that effective leadership relies heavily on "prototypicality"—the ability of the leader to represent, embody, and champion the shared social identity of the group ("us") against perceived outgroups ("them")[30].

Dark-triad individuals are masterful identity entrepreneurs. Because they lack internal moral constraints or genuine ideological convictions, they can fluidly adapt their public persona to mirror the most extreme, highly salient grievances of the populace[30]. They manufacture severe outgroup threats, consolidate the ingroup identity through fear, and position themselves as the sole, indispensable protectors of the group. By doing so, they achieve total compliance and buy-in from followers who mistakenly believe they are advancing their own collective interests, when in reality, they are feeding the leader's narcissistic supply.

The Interaction: Endocrinology and the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis

The most advanced empirical scholarship demonstrates that selection and transformation are not mutually exclusive but function instead as an interactive, highly volatile biological system. Structural power serves to activate latent biological predispositions toward malevolence.

This interaction is formally quantified in the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis (Mehta & Josephs, 2010), which posits that the behavioral effects of the androgenic hormone testosterone on social dominance and aggression are entirely dependent on the concurrent levels of the glucocorticoid stress hormone cortisol[5]. In a foundational laboratory study involving 82 participants, Mehta and

Josephs demonstrated that testosterone is positively related to dominance and aggressive status-seeking *only* when the individual's cortisol is low[5]. The statistical interaction between testosterone and cortisol was highly significant ($\Delta R^2 = 4.8\%$, $p < .05$)[5]. For individuals with low cortisol, testosterone powerfully predicted dominance ($\beta = .34$). However, when an individual experienced high cortisol—indicating psychological stress, social anxiety, or the fear of punishment—the dominance-enhancing effects of testosterone were completely blocked or even reversed ($\beta = -.15$)[5].

When mapped onto the architecture of institutional governance, the implications of the Dual-Hormone Hypothesis are profound. Gaining structural power fundamentally reduces an individual's cortisol levels by removing physical constraints, mitigating resource scarcity, and neutralizing threats of punishment[32]. If an individual has a naturally high baseline of testosterone (a selection factor linked to ambition), placing them in a position of unconstrained, absolute power drastically lowers their cortisol (a transformation factor). This hormonal combination—high testosterone and low cortisol—unleashes severe anti-social dominance behaviors, eradicates empathy, and fuels predatory risk-taking[34].

Bendahan, Zehnder, Pralong, and Antonakis (2015) confirmed this dynamic interaction in a highly controlled laboratory simulation involving 162 appointed leaders[4]. Leaders were assigned varying levels of structural power (ranging from 1 follower to 3 followers) and varying levels of systemic constraint (options for resource extraction). The researchers found that simply granting power increased outright corruption—defined as leaders extracting financial resources from followers to enrich themselves while destroying overall public wealth[4]. Crucially, this corruptive effect was highly moderated by the leaders' baseline endogenous testosterone[4]. Leaders endowed with high power and low institutional constraint exhibited a predicted probability of 0.61 of making a purely antisocial, corrupt decision, compared to a probability of only 0.39 for leaders constrained by lower power[4]. Therefore, the empirical conclusion is synthesized: the corrupt do seek power, and power provides the biological and psychological safety required to actualize their corruption.

Institutional Case Studies: Mechanisms of Resistance and Capture

If transformation dominates human behavior, governance must rely heavily on rapid rotation and stringent audit to limit tenure and monitor behavior before neurological adaptation occurs. If selection dominates, governance must rely on psychological screening and sortition (selection by lot) to prevent ambitious dark-triad personalities from campaigning for entry. To objectively evaluate the efficacy of these structural countermeasures across different population sizes, we must examine five historical governance arrangements, subjecting each to a tripartite view, a Scale Ledger, and a Capture Test.

Case 1: The Kleroterion and Athenian Sortition (Athens, ~370 BC)

Following the restoration of democracy in 403 BC, the Athenians recognized that electoral

politics inherently favored wealthy, charismatic, and manipulative aristocrats (validating the selection hypothesis). To counter this, they instituted massive, daily random selection (sortition) using a highly sophisticated randomization machine called the *kleroterion*[37].

Evaluation Metric	Analysis of the Athenian Kleroterion
Tripartite View	**What they said:** Sortition was the only true mark of democracy. Elections were oligarchic because they favored the prominent. The lot ensured that the gods decided, and that every citizen ruled and was ruled in turn[38]. **What the record shows:** The *kleroterion* was a massive stone slab containing up to 1,000 slots (*kanonides*) for bronze citizen ID tokens (*pinakia*). It utilized a funnel of black and white dice (*kyboi*) to select entire rows of citizens at random. This system manned the 500-seat *Boule* (Council) and daily juries of up to 501 citizens[37]. Systematic fraud and organized factional oppression were rendered mechanically impossible[40]. **What modern scholarship infers:** Sortition was a brilliant mathematical countermeasure to dark-triad coalition building. By randomizing power daily and strictly limiting tenure (most offices could be held only once for a single year), it neutralized both the selection pathway (ambition could not campaign for a randomized slot) and the transformation pathway (tenure was too short for neuro-cognitive corruption to take root)[38].
Scale Ledger	**Household (4–10):** Untried. Too small for statistical randomness to be effective.

	Village (150–500): Functional for dispute resolution, but overly bureaucratic. **Parish (1,500–5,000):** Highly effective. **Town/Watershed (15,000–50,000): Optimal.** Athens operated at this scale (approximately 30,000 eligible male citizens). **Region to Planet (0.5m–8b):** Untried as a sovereign legislature. Modern citizen assemblies operate at national scales but strictly as advisory bodies.
Capture Test	**Tactics of Capture:** A dark-triad individual cannot rig the *kleroterion*. Therefore, they must bypass it by capturing the few offices that remained electoral, specifically the military generals (*strategoi*)[41]. **Historical Cases:** Alcibiades, exhibiting textbook narcissism and Machiavellianism, bypassed the allotted councils by using his charisma in the Assembly and his elected generalship to drag Athens into the catastrophic Sicilian Expedition. **Features Resisting Capture:** The primary defense against popular, elected demagogues was *ostracism*—an annual negative election where the populace could exile any individual for ten years, acting as a direct purge of hyper-ambitious dark-triad threats.

Case 2: The Landsgemeinde (Glarus and Appenzell, Switzerland)

The *Landsgemeinde* is one of the oldest continuing forms of direct democracy, originating in the 14th century, where citizens gather in an open-air assembly annually to vote on laws, budgets, and magistrates by physically raising their hands or swords[42].

Evaluation Metric	Analysis of the Swiss Landsgemeinde
Tripartite View	**What they said:** It is the purest expression of popular sovereignty, civic duty, and community cohesion. **What the record shows:** It maintained robust local autonomy in Appenzell and Glarus from the 14th century (e.g., Appenzell allied with St. Gallen in 1401 to resist the Abbot Kuno von Stoffeln) to the present day[44]. However, participation rates have historically suffered, and the public nature of the voting inherently suppresses dissent. **What modern scholarship infers:** Open-air assemblies are highly vulnerable to social conformity pressures, elite framing, and charismatic domination. The lack of secret ballots allows powerful local employers to intimidate economic dependents.
Scale Ledger	**Household to Village (4–500): Optimal.** Operates identically to a tribal council. **Parish to Town (1,500–50,000):** Functional but strained. Glarus successfully merged 25 municipalities into 3 via the Landsgemeinde in 2006[46], but cantons larger than 50,000 have universally abandoned it due to logistical collapse and demographic exclusion. **Region to Planet (0.5m–8b):** Failed/Impossible. Physical assembly and direct deliberation cannot scale without representative abstraction.

Capture Test	**Tactics of Capture:** A dark-triad faction utilizes the transparency of the vote to enforce social sanctions against dissenters. Machiavellian elites pre-determine the agenda behind closed doors, presenting the assembly with binary, emotionally manipulative choices. **Historical Cases:** The continuous exclusion of women from the Appenzell Innerrhoden Landsgemeinde until 1990 (when it was finally forced by the Swiss Federal Supreme Court) demonstrated how a dominant faction can capture the assembly to maintain absolute structural dominance over an outgroup. **Features Resisting Capture:** The ultimate check is the physical presence of the entire martial body of the populace. A leader who pushes the assembly too far risks immediate, physical revolt.

Case 3: The Tribunate of the Plebs (Roman Republic)

Established in 494 BC following a general strike (*Secessio Plebis*) by the plebeians, the Tribunate was designed as a hard constitutional check against the patrician aristocracy[47].

Evaluation Metric	Analysis of the Roman Tribunate
Tripartite View	**What they said:** The Tribune was the sacred protector of the common people, endowed with *sacrosanctity* (making it a capital religious crime to lay hands on them) and the *veto* (the right to halt any state action)[47]. **What the record shows:** The Tribunate effectively protected plebeian rights for centuries, forcing the integration of the Roman constitution. However, by the Late

	Republic, it became the primary weapon for ambitious warlords to paralyze the state. **What modern scholarship infers:** Veto points are highly effective at preventing state tyranny, but they are easily captured by bad-faith actors. When norms of restraint evaporated, the Tribunate became an instrument of constitutional suicide.
Scale Ledger	**Household to Village (4–500):** Failed. Absolute vetoes in small groups lead to immediate ostracism or violence against the veto-holder. **Parish to Town (1,500–50,000):** Functional. **Region to Nation (0.5m–500m): Optimal.** Rome operated this across a massive Mediterranean empire. The immense scale necessitated a single magistrate capable of freezing the vast bureaucratic machinery to protect minority classes. **Planet (8b):** Untried, though directly analogous to the UN Security Council veto structure.
Capture Test	**Tactics of Capture:** A Machiavellian operator purchases the loyalty of one of the ten Tribunes. Because any one Tribune can veto the actions of the others, buying a single Tribune completely paralyzes the entire class. **Historical Cases:** In 133 BC, the populist reformer Tiberius Gracchus attempted to pass radical land reform. The conservative Senate bought off another Tribune, Marcus Octavius, to continuously veto Tiberius[49].

	Unable to break the gridlock, Tiberius utilized his own dark-triad traits (narcissism, cognitive rigidity), organized a mob, and unconstitutionally voted Octavius out of office[49]. This shattering of constitutional norms led directly to Tiberius being beaten to death by senators, initiating a century of civil wars that destroyed the Republic[47]. **Features Resisting Capture:** Collegiality (having ten tribunes) was initially meant to prevent individual capture, but instead multiplied the vectors for bribery. The only true resistance was the religious terror of sacrosanctity, which vanished entirely the moment elite political violence was normalized.

Case 4: The Council of Ten (Venetian Republic)

Following the near-successful coup d'état by the charismatic patrician Bajamonte Tiepolo on June 15, 1310 (triggered by Doge Pietro Gradenigo closing the Great Council), the Venetian state realized its broad, slow-moving legislative bodies were vulnerable to fast, violent takeovers[50]. They established the Council of Ten (*Consiglio dei Dieci*) on July 10, 1310[51].

Evaluation Metric	Analysis of the Venetian Council of Ten
Tripartite View	**What they said:** It was a temporary, emergency committee of elite patricians designed strictly to root out the remnants of the Tiepolo conspiracy and prevent *signoria* (one-man princely rule)[50]. **What the record shows:** It was extraordinarily effective at state security. It uncovered plots and executed the treasonous Doge Marino Faliero in 1355 and the mercenary general Count of Carmagnola in 1432[51]. It was made a permanent body in 1339[50]. Over centuries, it expanded its jurisdiction into a terrifying,

	shadow intelligence agency. **What modern scholarship infers:** The Ten represent the ultimate triumph of auditing and monitoring. However, it demonstrates the "watch the watchers" dilemma. To protect a republic from dark-triad individuals, Venice created an institution whose secrecy, speed, and lethal authority perfectly mimicked psychopathic traits on an institutional level.
Scale Ledger	**Household to Parish (4–5,000):** Untried. Too small to require or tolerate a secret police apparatus. **Town to Region (15,000–5m): Optimal.** Venice at its height was a massive maritime empire. The Ten effectively policed a highly complex, wealthy aristocratic class spread across the Mediterranean. **Nation to Planet (50m–8b):** Highly unstable. At this scale, secret executive committees universally transition into totalitarian politburos.
Capture Test	**Tactics of Capture:** A faction uses the Council's secrecy and anonymous informant boxes (*Bocche dei Leoni*) to wage lawfare, purging political rivals under the guise of state security. **Historical Cases:** The Ten largely resisted individual capture because of its obsessive internal rotation (members served one-year terms and could not immediately run again) and its integration with the Doge and his six councillors. However, it suffered from *class capture*; by the 18th century, it was used primarily by the poorest, most reactionary

	nobles to suppress dissent and maintain an ossified oligarchy[51]. **Features Resisting Capture:** Extreme rotation, severe prohibitions against members of the same family serving simultaneously, and the complex dispersion of executive power among multiple overlapping councils.

Case 5: The Haudenosaunee Confederacy (Great Law of Peace)

Formed centuries before European contact through the efforts of the Peacemaker and Hiawatha, the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy united the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca nations under the *Kaianere'kówa* (Great Law of Peace)[53].

Evaluation Metric	Analysis of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy
Tripartite View	**What they said:** Governance is a spiritual, ecological, and kinship-based responsibility. Peace is not just the absence of war, but the active, affirmative objective of government, enforced through the Condolence Ceremony which heals the grief that drives perpetual blood revenge[56]. **What the record shows:** It provided unparalleled stability, diplomatic sophistication, and military resilience across vast territories. It maintained a highly decentralized structure with 50 *Hoyaneh* (sachems/chiefs) sitting on the Grand Council, voting by nation. **What modern scholarship infers:** The Confederacy is a masterpiece of separated powers. It structurally decouples executive execution from executive appointment. The male sachems held the titles, but the female

	Clan Mothers (*Ka'nisténhsera*) held the absolute power to nominate, monitor, and formally recall (impeach) the sachems if they violated the Great Law[53].
Scale Ledger	**Household to Village (4–500): Optimal.** Grounded directly in literal longhouse kinship fires. **Parish to Region (1,500–5m): Optimal.** The Confederacy scaled across the vast Northeast of North America by nesting longhouse governance into village councils, nation councils, and the Grand Council. **Nation to Planet (50m–8b):** Untried. The system relies heavily on intense, face-to-face kinship ties and slow, consensus-based deliberation, which struggles under the speed and anonymity of globalized populations.
Capture Test	**Tactics of Capture:** A psychopathic warrior, gaining immense prestige and wealth in combat, attempts to leverage his martial popularity into political authority on the Grand Council, bullying the civil sachems. **Historical Cases:** The structure heavily resisted formal capture. Charismatic war chiefs (like Joseph Brant during the American Revolution) could raise autonomous raiding parties and influence policy, but they were formally barred from sitting on the Grand Council as sachems. The separation between "Pine Tree Chiefs" (meritocratic wartime leaders) and Sachems (peacetime civil leaders) prevented martial dictatorships. **Features Resisting Capture:** The Clan Mothers' absolute veto over leadership[53]. If

	a sachem exhibited dark-triad traits (selfishness, failure to seek consensus), the Clan Mother gave him three warnings. On the third, he was literally stripped of his horns of office. This represents the ultimate synthesis of selection (Clan Mothers select for empathy and patience) and transformation-prevention (continuous behavioral auditing by the nominators).

The Strongest Case Against Structural Over-Engineering

The strongest critique against designing institutions purely to thwart dark-triad capture comes from institutional realists and state-capacity theorists, prominently articulated by political scientists such as Francis Fukuyama. The core argument posits that obsessing over despotic capture leads inevitably to "vetocracy"—a hyper-constrained system equipped with so many checks, balances, lotteries, and rotating committees that the government cannot execute basic, necessary functions, such as building infrastructure or responding to emergencies.
Furthermore, evolutionary psychologists (such as Mark Van Vugt) argue vigorously against the pure pathologization of the dark triad. In times of extreme existential crisis (e.g., invasion, famine, resource collapse), a highly disagreeable, Machiavellian, and low-empathy leader is often exactly what a biological group requires to survive brutal inter-group competition. Winston Churchill’s narcissism, cognitive rigidity, and belligerence were significant liabilities in peacetime governance but became absolute adaptive necessities in the existential crucible of 1940. If a post-fall village perfectly engineers its governance to screen out all aggressive, dominant individuals, they will inevitably be conquered and assimilated by the neighboring village that did not. Avoiding the romance of the primitive is crucial here: small and egalitarian does not mean physically secure. Over-engineering for internal peace creates systemic vulnerability to external violence.

Design Conclusions: Synthesizing Lot, Screening, Rotation, and Audit

Because empirical evidence definitively proves that power transforms the healthy, and the corrupt actively seek power, post-fall governance must deploy a comprehensive four-quadrant defense matrix.
If transformation dominates human behavior, the structural answers are **Rotation** (strictly limiting the time dopamine and lowered cortisol can rewire the brain's approach system) and **Audit** (continuous, independent monitoring of behavioral outcomes).
If selection dominates human behavior, the structural answers are **Screening** (utilizing psychological profiles or community elder-vetoes to block entry) and **Lot** (sortition removes the primary mechanism by which Machiavellians achieve power: campaigning, manipulation, and

coalition-building).
No single mechanism is sufficient in isolation. The Roman Republic utilized Rotation (annual consulships) and Audit (the Censors), but eventually collapsed into autocracy because they relied exclusively on elections, which succumbed to the Selection biases of immense wealth and military patronage. Venice utilized intense Audit and Rotation via the Council of Ten, but its lack of Lot and Screening allowed complete class-based oligarchic capture. Athens successfully utilized Lot and Rotation, but failed to Screen for demagogues in their unprotected legislative Assembly. The Haudenosaunee utilized perfect Screening and Audit via the Clan Mothers, creating perhaps the most psychologically stable and robust governance system in human history.

Summary of Robust Findings

1. **Transformation:** Wielding structural power neurologically activates the approach system, increasing reward-seeking and hypocrisy while severely suppressing empathy.
2. **Endocrinology:** Elevated testosterone increases anti-social dominance only when cortisol (stress/constraint) is structurally lowered by positions of power.
3. **Selection:** Dark-triad traits (psychopathy, narcissism, Machiavellianism) are vastly overrepresented in corporate and political leadership compared to base population rates.
4. **Interaction:** Granting absolute power removes the stress-constraints (cortisol) that keep latent dark-triad traits in check, actively catalyzing corruption.
5. **Replication Failures:** Quick-fix psychological interventions (e.g., power posing) do not reliably alter endocrinology or risk tolerance, proving that physical posturing cannot replace structural constraint.
6. **Sortition:** Random selection (the lot) effectively neuters the Machiavellian selection pathway by making ambition and charisma irrelevant to acquiring executive office.
7. **Separation of Powers:** Decoupling the authority to *nominate/audit* (e.g., Clan Mothers) from the authority to *execute* (e.g., Sachems) prevents despotic consolidation.
8. **Veto Vulnerability:** While vetoes protect minorities, single-point vetoes (e.g., Roman Tribunes) are easily purchased or weaponized by dark-triad actors to cause systemic gridlock.
9. **Identity Hijacking:** Psychopaths capture democratic assemblies by manufacturing existential outgroup threats, manipulating the human instinct for ingroup prototypicality.
10. **Scale:** Direct, transparent deliberation optimizes at the village level but rapidly becomes vulnerable to elite framing and conformity beyond 5,000 citizens.

Contested or Open Questions

- Can a society survive an external existential military threat if it perfectly screens all dark-triad (highly aggressive, Machiavellian) traits out of its leadership?
- Does the random selection of sortition inevitably result in epistemic failure (incompetence) in highly technical, post-collapse resource management?
- At what precise demographic scale does face-to-face shame cease to constrain a dark-triad leader from exploiting their community?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). *Power, approach, and inhibition.* Psychological Review.
2. Mehta, P. H., & Josephs, R. A. (2010). *Testosterone and cortisol jointly regulate dominance: Evidence for a dual-hormone hypothesis.* Hormones and Behavior.
3. Nai, A., & Toros, E. (2020). *The peculiar personality of strongmen: Comparing the Big Five and Dark Triad traits of autocrats and non-autocrats.* Political Research Exchange.
4. Bendahan, S., Zehnder, C., Pralong, F. P., & Antonakis, J. (2015). *Leader corruption depends on power and testosterone.* The Leadership Quarterly.
5. Le Texier, T. (2019). *Debunking the Stanford Prison Experiment.* American Psychologist.
6. Babiak, P., Neumann, C.S. & Hare, R.D. (2010). *Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk.* Behavioral Sciences & the Law.
7. Haslam, S.A., Reicher, S.D. & Platow, M.J. (2011). *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power.*
8. Headlam, J. W. (1891). *Election by Lot at Athens.*
9. Ranehill, E., et al. (2015). *Assessing the Robustness of Power Posing: No Effect on Hormones and Risk Tolerance in a Large Sample of Men and Women.* Psychological Science.
10. Basic Call to Consciousness (1978). *Akwesasne Notes.*

Implementability after the Fall

The structural viability of these governance mechanisms varies drastically based on population scale in a post-collapse environment devoid of digital infrastructure.

For a Household (4 to 10 people): The minimum viable version is direct consensus decision-making on rationing and labor distribution.

- **What it needs to start:** A shared calendar, a physical ledger of caloric output/intake, and basic numeracy.
- **First failure to expect:** The most physically dominant or valuable asset provider (e.g., the sole hunter or mechanic) will weaponize their indispensability to bypass consensus, demanding a larger caloric share through the implicit threat of withdrawal.

For a Village of 300 people: The minimum viable version is a Haudenosaunee-style split nomination system. A council of 5 operational coordinators (handling water, defense, agriculture) is selected *only* from a pool nominated by a separate council of 5 post-menopausal women or community elders who do not hold operational power.

- **What it needs to start:** Literacy, agricultural yield records, and a central meeting fire capable of holding 300 people.
- **First failure to expect:** An operational coordinator achieves a massive localized success (e.g., repelling a raider attack) and uses the resulting temporary charisma to ignore the elder council's audits, establishing a localized warlord dynamic.

For a District of 3,000 people: The minimum viable version is an Athenian *kleroterion* system. A standing assembly of 300 individuals is rotated every 6 months via drawing physical lots (painted stones) from regional pots, handling inter-village disputes and macro-resource allocation.

- **What it needs to start:** Strict census records of every living adult, physical identity tokens

for the lottery, and a secure, weather-proof meeting hall.

- **First failure to expect:** Because 3,000 is too large for everyone to intimately know each other's competencies, the randomly allotted citizens will lack technical expertise in complex grid-repair or water-management, leading to subtle manipulation of the assembly by a small, unelected technocratic faction who actually understand the district's remaining infrastructure.

Principles

1. **The Activation Principle:** Placing an individual in a position of unconstrained authority structurally reduces their stress hormones (cortisol), which biologically activates and amplifies latent dominance and aggression (testosterone).
2. **The Hypercrisy Principle:** The acquisition of structural power causes an individual to consciously enforce stricter moral codes on subordinates while granting themselves psychological exemptions to those exact same codes.
3. **The Sortition Principle:** Random selection is the only mathematical mechanism capable of severing the link between dark-triad ambition and the acquisition of executive authority.
4. **The Separation of Nomination Principle:** To prevent factional capture, the demographic body that holds the power to audit and remove an executive must be structurally distinct from the body that executes policy.
5. **The Prototypical Hijack Principle:** Psychopathic individuals achieve democratic capture not by demanding submission, but by mirroring the deepest shared grievances of a population and positioning themselves as the sole avatar of the ingroup's survival.

Works cited

1. [PDF] Corporate psychopathy: Talking the walk. - Semantic Scholar, https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Corporate-psychopathy%3A-Talking-the-walk.-Babiak-Neumann/e39960b1a4b6d43feb7511a6acd6e9f280d4c0ec
2. Who Are the ``Dark'' Politicians? Insights From Self-Reports of, https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/88371/ssoar-politicsgovernance-2022-4-maier_et_al-Who_Are_the_Dark_Politicians.pdf?sequence=2
3. Ripping the public apart? Politicians' dark personality and affective, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/european-journal-of-political-research/article/ripping-the-public-apart-politicians-dark-personality-and-affective-polarization/6683C3E9B6A8B00A83DCC4A70739F8FC
4. Leader corruption depends on power and testosterone - SciSpace, https://scispace.com/pdf/leader-corruption-depends-on-power-and-testosterone-315ux0ddhj.pdf
5. Testosterone and cortisol jointly regulate... : Hormones and Behavior, https://www.ovid.com/journals/horabe/fulltext/10.1016/j.yhbeh.2010.08.020~testosterone-and-cortisol-jointly-regulate-dominance
6. Evidence for a dual-hormone hypothesis, http://home.cerge-ei.cz/lanchava/Literature_part1/11.%20Hormones,%20Chemicals,%20Parasites/mehta10.pdf

7. Normative Acceptance of Power Abuse - EconStor, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/330204/1/KYKL_KYKL12474.pdf
8. Does Power Corrupt or Enable? When and Why Power... - Ovid, https://www.ovid.com/journals/japsy/fulltext/10.1037/a0026811~does-power-corrupt-or-enable-when-and-why-power-facilitates
9. Does the Sense of Power Influence Reputational Concern? Tests, https://kar.kent.ac.uk/100360/1/7779-Article-91759-1-10-20230301.pdf
10. The Approach-Inhibition Theory of Power : Psychological Bulletin, https://www.ovid.com/journals/plbul/fulltext/10.1037/bul0000500~the-approach-inhibition-theory-of-power-a-meta-analytic-test
11. (PDF) From Power to Action - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/9089313_From_Power_to_Action
12. Does Power Corrupt? Psychology, Morality & the Power Paradox, https://www.psykholoh.com/en/post/does-power-corrupt-psychology-morality-behavior-and-the-power-paradox
13. Sense of Personal Control Intensifies Moral Judgments of Others, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02261/full
14. Power Increases Hypocrisy: Moralizing in Reasoning, Immorality in, https://www.academia.edu/31801223/Power_Increases_Hypocrisy_Moralizing_in_Reasoning_Immorality_in_Behavior
15. People show moral hypercrisy in close relationships Al, https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/fakultaeten/psychologie/abteilung/arbeitseinheiten/05/personen/wissenschaftl.personal/weiss/Weiss_Burgmer_(2021)_Moral-hypercrisy-in-close-relationships.pdf
16. Power Increases Anchoring Effects on Judgment - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313146931_Power_Increases_Anchoring_Effects_on_Judgment
17. The Effect of Intuitive Processing Modes and Negative Moods ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12729938/
18. My position on “Power Poses” - Meet the Berkeley-Haas Faculty, https://faculty.haas.berkeley.edu/dana_carney/pdf_my%20position%20on%20power%20poses.pdf
19. Power Posing | Encyclopedia MDPI, https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/37582
20. Assessing the Robustness of Power Posing: No Effect on Hormones, https://www.zne.uzh.ch/dam/jcr:e5fc4c3c-d50e-4aa9-96ab-4389e426d20d/Psychological%20Science-2015-Ranehill-0956797614553946.pdf
21. The Power of Posing: Do Body Display Instructions Have an Impact, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12177200/
22. Revisiting the Power Pose Effect - University of Guelph, https://www.uoguelph.ca/psychology/sites/uoguelph.ca.psychology/files/public/2017%20Crede%20et%20al..pdf
23. The peculiar personality of strongmen: comparing the Big Five and, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338429098_The_peculiar_personality_of_strongmen_comparing_the_Big_Five_and_Dark_Triad_traits_of_autocrats_and_

non-autocrats
24. Successful Psychopaths: A Contemporary Phenomenon - IntechOpen, https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/56941
25. Psychopathic Traits of Corporate Leadership as Predictors of Future, https://oro.open.ac.uk/57126/3/57126.pdf
26. A dark side of leadership: Corporate psychopathy and its influence, https://nopsychos.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/b-scan-a-dark-side-of-leadership-corporate-psychopathy-mathieu-et-al-2013.pdf
27. a new dataset to measure the personality of candidates worldwide, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327512050_Disagreeable_narcissists_extroverted_psychopaths_and_elections_a_new_dataset_to_measure_the_personality_of_candidates_worldwide
28. The peculiar personality of strongmen: comparing the Big Five and, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2474736X.2019.1707697
29. (Don't) fear the bad leader: three influential myths about ... - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1589496/full
30. Rethinking the Psychology of Leadership: From Personal Identity to, https://direct.mit.edu/daed/article-pdf/145/3/21/1830754/daed_a_00394.pdf
31. The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342289113_The_New_Psychology_of_Leadership_Identity_Influence_and_Power
32. The Interaction of Testosterone and Cortisol Is Associated With, https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstreams/7312037d-b02f-6bd4-e053-0100007fdf3b/download
33. Beyond the Challenge Hypothesis: The Emergence of the Dual, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7311256/
34. The Association of Cortisol and Testosterone Interaction With ... - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11955093/
35. Testosterone, Cortisol and Empathy - Behavioral Biology Lab, http://primate.uchicago.edu/2015AHBPb.pdf
36. Leader corruption depends on power and testosterone | Request PDF, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264418541_Leader_corruption_depends_on_power_and_testosterone
37. Kleroterion - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kleroterion
38. Sortition in politics: from history to contemporary democracy, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02606755.2025.2530916
39. Brill's Companion to the Reception of Athenian Democracy, https://brill.com/display/book/9789004443006/BP000020.pdf
40. Sortition - Cloudfront.net, https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/sortitionfoundation/pages/675/attachments/original/1607614921/Sortition_Foundation_Resource_Guide_for_Educators.pdf?1607614921
41. Ancient Athenian kleroterion randomization device - Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/groups/archeologyandcivilizations/posts/275821009314

56736/
42. DEMOCRACY AT THE LOCAL LEVEL - International IDEA, https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/democracy-at-the-local-level-handbook.pdf
43. Federalism and Direct Democracy in Switzerland: Competing or, https://utppublishing.com/doi/10.3138/9781487509002.006
44. Appenzell Innerrhoden - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appenzell_Innerrhoden
45. THE EFFECT OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY ON INCOME ... - ifo Institut, https://www.ifo.de/DocDL/cesifo1_wp1837.pdf
46. Latent Political Engagement: Insights from New Measures for Local, https://michaelstrebel.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/schibstrebelstutzer_latentpolengagement_wwz_wp03-2025.pdf
47. Breaking the Roman Republic: The Tragedy of Tiberius Gracchus, https://www.steelsnowflake.org/post/tiberius-gracchus
48. What was a Tribune in Ancient Rome? - Roman Empire Times, https://romanempiretimes.com/what-was-a-tribune-in-ancient-rome/
49. 130340026.pdf, https://dspace.cuni.cz/bitstream/handle/20.500.11956/177273/130340026.pdf?sequence=1
50. Tiepolo conspiracy - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiepolo_conspiracy
51. Istria on the Internet - 1000 A.D. to 1799 A.D. - Republic of Venice, https://www.istrianet.org/istria/history/venice/council_of_ten.htm
52. Venice - Maritime, Republic, Lagoon | Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/place/Venice/The-commune
53. Governance - CAID, https://caid.ca/RRCAP2.3.pdf
54. anthropology of relating and belonging in Rotinonhsión:ni alliances, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/404091552_Sailing_down_parallel_paths_anthropology_of_relating_and_belonging_in_Rotinonhsionni_alliances
55. Kayanerenkó:wa: The Great Law of Peace 9780887558214, https://dokumen.pub/kayanerenkowa-the-great-law-of-peace-9780887558214-9780887551932-9780887555565-9780887555541-g-4650488.html
56. The Case for Government Reform within the Six Nations of the, https://digitalcommons.law.buffalo.edu/context/buffalolawreview/article/1437/viewcontent/2qsppdwch7fong5zyjlsgig89ksy1avz.pdf
57. Encyclopedia of The Haudeno - (Z-Library) | PDF | Iroquois - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/853165543/Encyclopedia-of-the-Haudeno-Z-Library