CA-04 The tyranny of structurelessness: how consensus gets captured

The pursuit of absolute consensus in the absence of formal governance structures represents one of the most persistent and reliably catastrophic utopias in political history. From the early modern assemblies of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to the general assemblies of Occupy Wall Street, movements that attempt to abolish power dynamics by removing formal leadership consistently recreate those same power dynamics in more opaque, unaccountable forms. The explicit rejection of formal rules, elected representatives, and procedural voting does not eliminate elites; it simply renders them informal, invisible, and immune to democratic recall. This document serves as a foundational analysis for understanding how informal consensus mechanisms operate, how they fail, and how they are predictably captured by individuals exhibiting Dark Triad personality traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy). By examining the historical record across varied cultural contexts—ranging from 17th-century Quaker congregations to 21st-century anarchist encampments—this report distills the structural vulnerabilities of leaderless models. It provides a rigorous evaluation of structured alternatives to guide the design of scalable, resilient self-governance in a post-collapse environment devoid of state apparatuses and industrial supply chains.

The Psychological Mechanics of Capture: Structurelessness and the Dark Triad

The capture of leaderless consensus mechanisms generally follows three distinct pathways: the tyranny of the persistent, the tyranny of the articulate, and the tyranny of the manipulative. Because unstructured consensus requires unanimity or near-unanimity to proceed with any collective action, a single individual or a small, highly coordinated faction can exert outsized leverage over the majority. They achieve this not through the superiority of their arguments, but by weaponizing time, exhaustion, and social friction.

The Dark Triad in Unstructured Environments

Empirical studies on the Dark Triad demonstrate how these traits naturally exploit the vacuum of formal structure. A study involving 127 participants (mean age 40.65) assessing decision-making styles revealed that Machiavellianism correlates significantly positively with spontaneous decision-making and negatively with rational decision-making[1]. Psychopathy similarly correlates with avoidant and spontaneous styles, while narcissism drives a need for center-stage visibility and deference[1]. In a formal system, rational decision-making is enforced by parliamentary procedure, timed debates, and majority thresholds. In an unstructured consensus model, spontaneous, aggressive, and manipulative tactics face no institutional friction, allowing those possessing these traits to dominate the social space[2].

Furthermore, unstructured environments facilitate "trait contagion." Research into Leader Dark Triad (LDT) and Employee Dark Triad (EDT) behaviors in organizations demonstrates that when individuals with Dark Triad traits achieve informal or formal dominance, their manipulative

behaviors are internalized by the broader group. In environments lacking formal ethical guardrails, participants adopt Machiavellian tactics—such as withholding information and engaging in factional sabotage—simply to survive the social milieu[3]. A survey of 837 professionals in accounting and finance further quantified this, showing that managers scoring high on the Dark Triad scale significantly increased the frequency of manipulative reporting and norm violation within their groups[5].

Preference Falsification and Pluralistic Ignorance

The extraction of consensus in these environments is frequently achieved not through genuine agreement, but through "preference falsification," a sociological concept formalized by economist Timur Kuran in 1995 in *Private Truths, Public Lies*. Preference falsification occurs when individuals project a contrived public preference to avoid social ostracization or retaliation, differing fundamentally from their private beliefs[6].

In unstructured consensus meetings, an aggressive minority can loudly assert a radical or uncompromising position. Because the costs of dissenting in a face-to-face setting are high—often resulting in accusations of disloyalty, moral impurity, or ideological weakness—the moderate majority self-censors. This creates a state of "pluralistic ignorance," where the majority falsely believes that everyone else in the room supports the vocal minority[7].

Kuran's framework explains how informal elites use social pressure to turn a minority preference into an inescapable public consensus. Empirical experiments quantifying this dynamic demonstrate that individuals are willing to incur significant costs to avoid social friction; in controlled settings measuring preference falsification, participants were willing to forgo an average of 8.48 tokens (financial penalty) simply to avoid expressing a dissenting view on morally framed issues against a perceived majority[8]. In a post-collapse governance scenario, where social cohesion is directly tied to physical survival, the cost of dissent is existential, making preference falsification highly probable.

Meeting Fatigue and the Illusion of Attrition

Sociologist Francesca Polletta, in her 2002 work *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting*, identified that what passes for consensus in participatory democracies is often merely the exhaustion of the opposition. Meetings that stretch past midnight naturally filter out participants with jobs, caretaking responsibilities, or physical limitations[9]. The "consensus" reached at 2:00 AM is not a reflection of the collective will, but a reflection of the preferences of those who have the privilege, stamina, and stubbornness to remain in the room[10].

Modern workplace data provides a baseline for understanding the cognitive toll of extensive meetings. A 2026 benchmark report analyzing knowledge workers noted an average of 21.7 meetings per week (comprising 11.3 hours), with average meeting lengths of 47 minutes. Even at these relatively short durations, 76% of workers reported feeling drained, and 70% of decisions were forgotten within 24 hours without formal, written follow-up[11]. When applied to the grueling, multi-hour general assemblies of unstructured social movements, the cognitive load guarantees high attrition rates, functionally handing decision-making power to the most persistent and obsessive individuals.

Case Study 1: Second-Wave Feminism and Informal

Elites

Jo Freeman's seminal 1972 essay, *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*, emerged from her observations of the women's liberation movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Feminist consciousness-raising groups deliberately eschewed formal leadership, viewing hierarchical organization as inherently patriarchal.

- **What they said it did:** The movement's participants claimed that removing presidents, voting, and formal rules created a perfectly egalitarian space where all women had an equal voice, fostering sisterhood and preventing the replication of oppressive power dynamics[2].
- **What the record shows it did:** The absence of explicit rules generated intense, hidden power struggles. Influence accrued to those with preexisting friendships, social capital, superior rhetorical skills, and independent wealth (which provided free time). Because these elites were informal, they could not be voted out, criticized, or held accountable; any challenge to their authority was framed as an attack on the sisterhood itself[2].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Freeman established a sociological axiom: structurelessness is organizationally impossible. A group must decide whether to have a formally structured system or an informally structured one. Informal structures serve to mask power, usually benefiting those who already possess it. To democratize power, rules must be explicit, transparent, and available to everyone[2].

Scale Ledger: Informal Feminist Groups	**Status**	**Analysis**
Household (4-10)	Worked	Intimate consciousness-raising circles functioned well for personal support, relying on pre-existing bonds.
Hamlet/Band (30-50)	Failed	Informal elites consolidated power; cliques formed, leading to bitter schisms and the eventual dissolution of many chapters.
Village to Planet (150+)	Never Tried	Purely unstructured consciousness-raising cannot scale beyond the local chapter.

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	Covert narcissists and Machiavellians utilized gossip, social exclusion, and tone-policing to silence rivals. They dictated the implicit rules of the group while denying that any rules existed.
Historical Evidence	The rapid fragmentation of the radical feminist movement into hostile splinter groups in the mid-1970s.
Defenses / Reversals	None. Freeman argued that the only defense is to abandon structurelessness and implement democratic, formal delegation.

Case Study 2: Occupy Wall Street and the General Assembly

From September 17 to November 15, 2011, Occupy Wall Street (OWS) established an encampment in Zuccotti Park, New York City, attempting to model a prefigurative utopian society. Its primary decision-making body was the General Assembly (GA), operating on strict consensus[14].

- **What they said it did:** Organizers, heavily influenced by anarchist theory and prominent figures like anthropologist David Graeber (who championed the movement in *The Democracy Project*), claimed the GA was a pure, horizontal democracy. Mechanisms like the "progressive stack" (prioritizing marginalized speakers), "hand signals" (twinkling fingers for agreement), and "consensus blocking" were implemented to ensure absolute egalitarianism and prevent the tyranny of the majority[14].
- **What the record shows it did:** The GA rapidly bogged down in procedural quagmires. The group spent disproportionate time "going meta"—arguing about how consensus decisions should be achieved rather than making strategic decisions[14]. As the camp swelled, the GA became mathematically unworkable. In late October and November 2011, organizers proposed a "Spokes Council" model to delegate tasks and streamline operations. This triggered intense ideological friction; purists viewed any delegation as a betrayal of horizontality and blocked the proposal[16]. Participation plummeted. A longitudinal study tracking 25,000 core Occupy Twitter users documented an 80.8% decrease in movement-related engagement in the second half of the year[20]. The

movement was unable to pivot, leading to its forcible eviction by the NYPD[16].

- **What modern scholarship infers:** Critics like Jonathan Smucker (*Hegemony How-To*, 2017) point out that OWS failed because it fetishized process over power[21]. By demanding consensus on minutiae, the movement allowed tiny splinter factions—often comprising provocateurs or individuals with antagonistic personalities—to veto strategic adaptations[14]. Graeber's romantic view of the assemblies ignored the reality that the absence of formal delegation allowed informal cliques (those controlling the movement's media accounts, funds, or working groups) to exercise disproportionate, unaccountable power[2].

Scale Ledger: OWS General Assembly	**Status**	**Analysis**
Household to Band (4-50)	Worked	Early planning meetings operated effectively before the encampment scaled up.
Village (150-500)	Failed	Once the park population exceeded Dunbar's number, anonymity allowed bad actors to block consensus without facing reputational consequences.
Parish to Planet (1,500+)	Failed / Never Tried	Efforts to scale globally relied on mimicking the aesthetic of OWS, but actual cross-camp decision-making never materialized.

Capture Test	**Mechanism & Defenses**
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	The "block" function was weaponized by narcissists to hold the entire assembly hostage until their demands were met. Psychopaths utilized attrition, forcing meetings to last into the early hours of the morning until the moderate majority

	abandoned the park[14].
Historical Evidence	Working groups acting autonomously with general funds; the blocking of the Spokes Council proposal by a small minority[18].
Defenses / Reversals	None internal to the system. The movement's structural paralysis was only resolved by external state force (police eviction)[16].

Case Study 3: The Polish Liberum Veto

The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth operated an extreme form of consensus democracy among its nobility (*szlachta*), which comprised roughly 8% of the population[24]. The operational mechanism was the *liberum veto* (free veto). Any single deputy could halt the proceedings of the national *Sejm* (parliament) or local *sejmik*, which automatically nullified all legislation previously passed during that six-week session[25].

- **What they said it did:** The nobility claimed the *liberum veto* was the cornerstone of their "Golden Liberty" (*aurea libertas*). It guaranteed absolute political equality among peers, preventing the tyranny of the majority and safeguarding regional minority interests in a vast, multiethnic decentralized federation[27].
- **What the record shows it did:** The mechanism paralyzed the state. It is commonly but erroneously believed the veto was first used maliciously in 1652 by Władysław Siciński; in truth, he merely protested the prolongation of the session beyond statutory limits[27]. However, the precedent rapidly escalated. During the reign of John III Sobieski (1674–1696), half of the Sejm proceedings were scuttled[27]. Under the 30-year reign of Augustus III (1733–1763), only one single session successfully passed legislation[27]. From 1573 to 1763, approximately 150 Sejms were held; 53 failed entirely, 32 explicitly broken by the *liberum veto*[27].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The *liberum veto* institutionalized state vulnerability and guaranteed collapse. Neighboring absolute monarchies—chiefly Russia under Catherine II and Prussia under Frederick the Great—recognized that bribing a single impoverished deputy (the *gołota*, or landless nobility) was cheaper than waging war[28]. It allowed foreign powers to maintain Polish military weakness, capping the Commonwealth's standing army at 24,000 troops during the "Silent Sejm" of 1717, while Russia maintained 300,000[29]. The pursuit of absolute consensus ultimately resulted in the total partition and erasure of Poland from the map in 1795[32].

Scale Ledger: Liberum Veto	**Status**	**Analysis**

Household to Village (4-500)	Never Tried	The veto was an instrument of the aristocratic elite, not applied to peasant governance.
Parish to Town (1,500-50k)	Failed	Applied at the local *sejmik* level, it routinely caused the collapse of provincial administration[26].
Region to Nation (0.5M-500M)	Failed	At the national level, the probability of at least one out of hundreds of deputies being corrupt, malicious, or acting as a foreign agent approached 100%[32].

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	Machiavellians accepted foreign bribes to block national defense reforms. Narcissists utilized the veto to demonstrate personal power or extort concessions[27].
Historical Evidence	Russian ambassadors routinely dictating the dissolution of Sejm sessions to prevent the modernization of the Polish army[29].
Defenses / Reversals	**Confederated Sejms:** Late in the Commonwealth's existence, reformers bypassed the veto by forming "confederations" that operated on majority voting, culminating in the progressive Constitution of May 3, 1791 (shortly before the final partition)[28].

Case Study 4: Quaker "Sense of the Meeting"

The Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) uses a collective discernment process historically misidentified by secular movements as unstructured consensus. In reality, it is a highly structured, rigorous process overseen by a designated formal authority: the Clerk[34].

- **What they said it did:** Quakers explicitly deny that they are seeking a negotiated, secular

consensus or compromise. They seek unity in the will of God[35]. The process involves silent worship, speaking out of the silence without responding directly to previous speakers, and collective discernment.

- **What the record shows it did:** It allowed Quaker congregations to govern complex, enduring institutions, including banks, schools, and transnational abolitionist networks, for over three centuries[36]. Unlike OWS, Quaker governance utilizes explicit structural guardrails. The Clerk is not a passive facilitator but an active editor who distills the "sense of the meeting"[34]. If consensus cannot be reached, the status quo is maintained, or the issue is delegated to smaller "threshing sessions" designed to separate emotional conflict from spiritual alignment[34].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The Quaker model succeeds because it demands high barriers to entry (long-term acculturation in spiritual discipline) and utilizes a trusted, formal authority to cut through pluralistic ignorance and filibustering[35]. Furthermore, empirical studies on Quaker Business Methods (QBM) suggest these tools counter deficits in natural human reasoning, acting as an evolutionary cognitive mechanism for ethical decision-making[38].

Scale Ledger: Quaker Method	Status	Analysis
Household to Band (4-50)	Worked	Highly effective for small committees and local worship groups.
Village (150-500)	Worked	The Monthly Meeting operates efficiently at this scale, relying on tight social bonds and shared theological framing[34].
Parish to Region (1,500-5M)	Worked	The Yearly Meeting delegates representatives. It succeeds by segregating local operations from broader doctrinal alignments[34].
Nation to Planet (50M+)	Never Tried	Too slow and requires too high a threshold of shared cultural/spiritual conditioning to operate

		globally among diverse populations.

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	A narcissist might attempt to continuously speak "out of the silence" to dominate the theological direction of the group.
Historical Evidence	Occasional localized schisms over doctrinal purity (e.g., the Hicksite–Orthodox split), though rarely pure Machiavellian power grabs.
Defenses / Reversals	**The Clerk and the Elders:** The Clerk has the authority to declare that a speaker is "not speaking in the Light" and shut them down. Threshing sessions isolate disruptive members, and the principle of unity prioritizes the collective over individual grandstanding[34].

Case Study 5: Sociocracy and the Consent Alternative

Developed in the Netherlands by Gerard Endenburg in the 1970s, Sociocracy (the Sociocratic Circle-Organization Method) explicitly rejects both majority-rule voting and unanimity-based consensus, replacing them with *consent*.

- **What they said it did:** Sociocracy replaces the grueling demand for total agreement (consensus) with the threshold of "no paramount objections" (consent). It argues that organizations function best when they are structured as interlocking circles with double-linked representation.
- **What the record shows it did:** It provided a highly scalable, structured alternative to the endless meetings of the 1960s counterculture. By clearly defining domains of authority, sociocracy allows individuals and sub-circles to act autonomously without seeking permission from a general assembly, provided they do not violate the core aim of the organization.
- **What modern scholarship infers:** Sociocracy succeeds where unstructured consensus fails because it formalizes hierarchy while maintaining egalitarian feedback loops. The requirement that an objection must be *reasoned* and directly related to the organization's aim prevents individuals from blocking proposals purely out of personal preference, ideological purity, or spite.

Scale Ledger: Sociocracy	Status	Analysis
Household to Village (4-500)	Worked	Highly effective in intentional communities, ecovillages, and progressive businesses.
Parish to Town (1,500-50k)	Worked	Corporate scaling demonstrates efficacy via nested circles.
Region to Planet (0.5M+)	Never Tried	Requires intensive training in the methodology; unproven at the level of state governance.

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	A Machiavellian actor attempts to define their personal preference as a "paramount objection" related to the organization's aim.
Historical Evidence	Occasional organizational stagnation when facilitators fail to rigorously test the validity of objections.
Defenses / Reversals	**Reasoned Objections & Double-Linking:** Objections cannot be mere vetoes; the objector is forced to collaborate on a solution. The double-linking mechanism ensures transparency between the top and bottom of the hierarchy.

Case Study 6: The Dutch Poldermodel and Waterschappen

Dating back to the Middle Ages, the Netherlands developed a unique form of consensus governance necessitated by their geography. The *Waterschappen* (water boards) originated

around 1255, compelling diverse, often antagonistic groups to cooperate to prevent catastrophic flooding[40].

- **What they said it did:** It forged pragmatic cooperation among bitter rivals (farmers, citizens, nobles) because a failure to agree meant everyone drowned. It forms the basis of the modern *Poldermodel*, characterized by slow, methodical consensus-building among employers, unions, and the state.
- **What the record shows it did:** It successfully managed complex hydraulic engineering and social stability for eight centuries. The *Waterschappen* were among the earliest institutions to maintain continuous archives to support their administrative processes[40].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** The Poldermodel is not horizontal consensus; it is *corporatist* consensus. It works precisely because it does not rely on a general assembly of individuals. Instead, it relies on formal representatives of highly organized interest groups negotiating behind closed doors. It is structured, bounded, and driven by an existential external threat.

Scale Ledger: Poldermodel	**Status**	**Analysis**
Household to Band (4-50)	Never Tried	Too bureaucratic for small groups.
Village to Nation (150-50M)	Worked	Scaled efficiently from local water boards to national tripartite economic negotiations.

Capture Test	**Mechanism & Defenses**
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	Representatives colluding to extract rents from the populace while maintaining the illusion of adversarial negotiation.
Historical Evidence	Periodic modern critiques of the Poldermodel as an opaque, elitist cartel that suppresses radical but necessary economic reform.
Defenses / Reversals	**Existential Feedback Loops:** If the water

	board fails, the land floods. The physical reality of the threat forces Machiavellian actors to prioritize systemic survival over total extraction[40].

Case Study 7: Zapatista Juntas de Buen Gobierno

Following their 1994 uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, the Zapatistas developed autonomous governance mechanisms scaling from local villages to entire regions[41].

- **What they said it did:** They govern by the principles of *mandar obedeciendo* (to lead by obeying), *preguntando caminamos* (asking, we walk), and *para todos todo, para nosotros nada* (everything for everyone, nothing for us)[41].
- **What the record shows it did:** To prevent the emergence of informal elites or a permanent bureaucratic class, the Zapatistas utilize extreme rotation of administrative duties. Members of the *Juntas de Buen Gobierno* (Councils of Good Government) serve incredibly short terms—sometimes rotating every two weeks. This ensures that administrative knowledge is dispersed throughout the entire community rather than hoarded by specialists[41].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** This system effectively blocks Machiavellian capture by removing the mechanism of tenure. However, it requires immense reserves of time, literacy, and continuous participation, making it highly vulnerable to civic exhaustion in contexts where survival requires continuous, specialized labor[41].

Scale Ledger: Zapatista Juntas	Status	Analysis
Household to Village (4-500)	Worked	Deeply embedded in Indigenous communal traditions.
Parish to Region (1,500-5M)	Worked	Achieved via federated councils representing broader geographic zones in Chiapas[41].
Nation to Planet (50M+)	Never Tried	Logistically incompatible with globalized, highly specialized industrial civilization.

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	Machiavellian actors capturing the informal advisory networks, acting as "permanent experts" who guide the constantly rotating, inexperienced public officials.
Historical Evidence	Criticisms regarding the opacity of the EZLN military command structure relative to the civilian Juntas.
Defenses / Reversals	**Extreme Rotation & Public Accounting:** Narcissists are forcibly rotated out of power before they can consolidate a cult of personality[41].

Case Study 8: Mietshäuser Syndikat

Originating in Freiburg, Germany, the Mietshäuser Syndikat (MHS) solved the problem of cooperative housing reverting to private ownership through generational drift or economic pressure[42]. It currently oversees 191 housing collectives serving over 3,800 residents[44].

- **What they said it did:** MHS claims to decommodify housing permanently, ensuring spaces are run autonomously by their residents while contributing to a solidarity fund for future projects[44].
- **What the record shows it did:** It relies on an ingenious, rigorous, and narrow legal architecture. Each project is organized as a *GmbH* (limited liability company) with exactly two shareholders: the local residents' association (*Hausverein*) and the central Syndikat[44]. The central Syndikat holds only one voting right, strictly limited to a single domain: it can veto the sale, reprivatization, or commercialization of the property. It has zero say in the daily consensual operations of the house[44].
- **What modern scholarship infers:** MHS is a masterclass in bounded consensus. By placing the most critical, existential threat (capital capture) under a structured, centralized veto, the local group is free to practice horizontal, unstructured consensus safely within its walls. It proves that solidarity requires structural enforcement, not just good intentions[43].

Scale Ledger: Mietshäuser Syndikat	Status	Analysis
Household to Village (4-500)	Worked	Average project houses dozens of people; collectively manages nearly

		4,000 across the network[44].
Parish to Planet (1,500+)	Never Tried	Operates purely in the domain of real estate and housing, not general municipal governance.

Capture Test	Mechanism & Defenses
Dark Triad Capture Pathway	A Machiavellian faction of residents decides the property has appreciated in value, organizes a local consensus, and attempts to sell the building for personal profit.
Historical Evidence	Routine failures of standard housing co-ops in the 1970s and 80s where the second generation of residents sold the assets.
Defenses / Reversals	**The Structural Veto:** The external Syndikat automatically deploys its single veto, blocking the sale. The Machiavellian faction is structurally neutralized[44].

The Strongest Case Against: Mansbridge and the Limits of Unitary Democracy

The most robust theoretical and empirical critique of consensus democracy comes from political scientist Jane Mansbridge in her 1980 work, *Beyond Adversary Democracy*[47]. Mansbridge disrupts the binary that pits direct democracy against representative democracy. Instead, she categorizes governance into two distinct modes: "Unitary" democracy (based on common interests, equal respect, and consensus) and "Adversary" democracy (based on conflicting interests, equal protection, and majority rule)[47].

Through a detailed ethnographic study of a New England town meeting ("Selby") and a participatory crisis center ("Helpline"), Mansbridge observed that consensus is highly effective—and deeply fulfilling—when interests naturally align[47]. However, when interests fundamentally conflict, demanding consensus is a recipe for tyranny. If a group must distribute a finite resource (e.g., cutting a budget, assigning a difficult chore, or choosing an irreversible strategic path), forcing consensus requires one party to surrender under social duress. In such cases, adversary democracy—specifically voting by secret ballot—protects the minority from the emotional blackmail, coercion, and preference falsification inherent in face-to-face consensus

assemblies[50].
Francesca Polletta reinforces this critique, noting that by the mid-1960s, participatory consensus in the civil rights (e.g., SNCC) and student movements shifted from a functional tactic into a cultural marker of ideological purity[10]. Consensus morphed into an exclusionary practice, prioritizing the emotional and moral satisfaction of the participants (the "endless meeting") over tangible political outcomes and strategic efficacy[9].
Jonathan Smucker, reflecting on the failures of Occupy Wall Street, argues in *Hegemony How-To* that "prefigurative politics"—the attempt to perfectly model a future utopian society in a micro-encampment—inevitably cedes the larger terrain of power to the existing establishment[21]. By refusing to engage in structured, hegemonic struggle (building institutions, electing leaders, enforcing discipline), structureless movements guarantee their own marginalization. Smucker insists that the Left must overcome its allergy to power and leadership if it intends to actually govern[22].
Crucially, any application of these findings to a post-collapse setting must avoid the naturalistic fallacy and the romance of the primitive. The anthropological record does not demonstrate that small, ancient groups are inherently peaceful, egalitarian, or fair. Early egalitarian bands maintained consensus through intense, sometimes violent, social coercion, utilizing mockery, exile, and assassination to suppress dominant Dark Triad individuals. "Old" does not mean "good," and "small" does not mean "fair." Informal structure in small groups frequently enables unchecked abuse, precisely because the victim has no formal appellate mechanism or institutionalized right to a secret ballot.

Summary of Robust Findings

1. There is no such thing as a structureless group; removing formal rules inevitably creates unaccountable, invisible informal elites[2].
2. Unstructured consensus heavily favors those with Dark Triad traits, specifically Machiavellianism and psychopathy, due to their willingness to exploit spontaneous decision-making and social fatigue[1].
3. Consensus models devolve into wars of attrition, where decisions are ultimately made by those willing to outlast others in endless, cognitively draining meetings[10].
4. Preference falsification allows a vocal, aggressive minority to project an illusion of unanimous support, silencing moderate majorities through the threat of social ostracization[6].
5. Absolute individual veto powers (e.g., the *liberum veto*) scale disastrously, guaranteeing institutional paralysis and inviting capture by hostile external entities[32].
6. Unitary democracy (consensus) functions effectively only in groups with deep ideological/spiritual alignment and a shared baseline of trust[47].
7. Where interests fundamentally conflict, consensus mechanisms resort to emotional coercion; majority voting and secret ballots act as necessary safeguards against social bullying[50].
8. Bounded consensus (e.g., Mietshäuser Syndikat) succeeds by combining horizontal daily operations with rigid, structural vetoes protecting against existential threats[44].

9. Extreme rotation of duties (e.g., Zapatistas) prevents elite entrenchment but suffers from high transaction costs, inefficiency, and civic exhaustion[41].
10. The most resilient historical consensus models (e.g., Quakerism, Sociocracy) utilized active facilitators (Clerks) armed with formal authority to cut off disruption and distill unity[34].

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Scalar Threshold:** At what precise demographic tipping point does face-to-face unitary democracy inherently require transition into adversary/representative democracy? Is it strictly bound by Dunbar's number (~150)?
- **Technological Sorting:** Can algorithmic sortition (randomly selected citizens' assemblies) bypass the vulnerability of consensus to Dark Triad actors by removing the performative element of self-selected face-to-face debate?
- **Enforcement without the State:** How can post-collapse communities permanently encode the "Mietshäuser Syndikat" structural veto against land monopolization or reprivatization without a overarching state legal apparatus (e.g., the German *GmbH* laws) to enforce the contract?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Freeman, Jo. (1972). *The Tyranny of Structurelessness*. Berkeley Journal of Sociology.
2. Mansbridge, Jane. (1980). *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. University of Chicago Press.
3. Kuran, Timur. (1995). *Private Truths, Public Lies: The Social Consequences of Preference Falsification*.
4. Polletta, Francesca. (2002). *Freedom is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*.
5. Smucker, Jonathan. (2017). *Hegemony How-To: A Roadmap for Radicals*. AK Press.
6. Endenburg, Gerard. (1998). *Sociocracy: The Organization of Decision-Making*.
7. Frost, J. William. (Various). Historical analyses of Quaker Business Method and the "Sense of the Meeting."
8. Jędruch, Jacek. (1998). *Constitutions, Elections and Legislatures of Poland, 1493–1977*.
9. Mietshäuser Syndikat documentation and core statutes (available via the UK CLT Network or original German archives).

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Version (No State, No Grid, No Internet)

- **What it needs to start:** Literacy, a shared physical ledger (to record decisions and structural vetoes), a timekeeping mechanism (shared calendar/clock to limit meeting attrition), and a dedicated meeting space immune to weather.
- **The Household (4 to 10 people):** Unstructured consensus remains viable. Decisions are made at a shared meal. Social cohesion is maintained through immediate interdependency and kin selection.
  - *First failure to expect:* Generational conflict as children reach adulthood and reject the founders' implicit rules, leading to household fracture.
- **The Village (300 people):** Requires the **Quaker/Sociocratic Hybrid Model**. Direct

democracy is too slow and cognitively draining for 300 people regarding daily logistics. Establish a village council organized in concentric domains of responsibility. A designated Clerk prepares a written agenda. The Clerk synthesizes the "sense of the meeting," explicitly asks for *reasoned objections* rather than total consensus, and has the absolute authority to table deadlocked issues.
    - *First failure to expect:* A charismatic narcissist attempting to exhaust the meeting through filibuster; the village must formally authorize the Clerk to silence individuals or eject them from the space.
- **The District (3,000 people):** Requires the **Mietshäuser/Poldermodel** hybrid. The district cannot meet in one place. It requires an assembly of delegated representatives (adversary democracy). To protect critical infrastructure (e.g., a shared water mill, granary, or defensive wall), a rigid, unbreakable structural veto must be inscribed in the district ledger, requiring a supermajority of all villages to alter. This prevents any single village or emerging Machiavellian warlord from privatizing the commons.
    - *First failure to expect:* Representatives becoming an entrenched elite; this must be countered with Zapatista-style randomized rotation or strict term limits.

Principles

- Structurelessness does not abolish power; it merely masks it and hands it to the most privileged or ruthless.
- Unstructured consensus is inherently vulnerable to capture by actors with Dark Triad traits who weaponize stamina and social friction.
- Consensus is the correct mechanism for groups with common interests; adversary voting is the necessary safeguard for groups with conflicting interests.
- The requirement of absolute unanimity in populations exceeding the Dunbar threshold is structurally fatal and guarantees institutional paralysis.
- Preference falsification allows aggressive minorities to dictate group consensus by exploiting pluralistic ignorance.
- Resilient consensus requires a formalized, trusted facilitator empowered to interrupt disruption, test objections, and synthesize intent.
- Delegating specific, existential veto powers to a structural document protects daily horizontal operations from permanent capture or reprivatization.

Works cited

1. The Effect of Dark Triad Traits on Decision-Making Styles, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/351282090_THE_EFFECT_OF_DARK_TRIAD_TRAITS_ON_DECISION-MAKING_STYLES
2. Unequal power relations in the governance of the World Social, http://www.interfacejournal.net/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Issue-7-2-Rigon.pdf
3. the influence of leader dark triad on em, https://tpmap.org/submission/index.php/tpm/article/download/607/478
4. (PDF) THE INFLUENCE OF LEADER DARK TRIAD ON EMPLOYEE,

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/394525809_THE_INFLUENCE_OF_LEADER_DARK_TRIAD_ON_EMPLOYEE_DARK_TRIAD_IN_HIGHER_EDUCATION_INSTITUTIONS
5. Dark Triad Managerial Personality and Financial Reporting, https://en.wiwi.uni-paderborn.de/fileadmin-wiwi/cetar/TAF_Working_Paper_Series/TAF_WP_056_MutschmannHassoPelster2020_rev.pdf
6. Preference falsification - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Preference_falsification
7. Pluralistic Ignorance: When Everyone Stays Silent - Yu-kai Chou, https://yukaichou.com/behavioral-analysis/pluralistic-ignorance-katz-allport-private-public-attitudes/
8. Moral Content Diminishes Preference Falsification, https://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1407&context=esi_working_papers
9. Democratizing Inequalities: Dilemmas of the New Public, https://dokumen.pub/democratizing-inequalities-dilemmas-of-the-new-public-participation-9781479800223.html
10. FIELD Issue 1 | PDXScholar, https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/context/field_art_criticism/article/1000/viewcontent/FIELD_01_FULL_ISSUE.pdf
11. The State of Meetings 2026: Benchmark Report on Meeting Volume, https://www.laxis.com/blog/state-of-meetings-2026/
12. Learning from Activists What Taking a Deliberative Stance Means, https://lirias.kuleuven.be/retrieve/753818
13. Feminist Philosophies of Love and Work | Hypatia | Cambridge Core, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/hypatia/article/feminist-philosophies-of-love-and-work/D8D5238F475C23A9A919699BF6C5877B
14. Occupy Wall Street and Consensus Decision Making, https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8Z89PHW/download
15. General assembly (Occupy movement) - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_assembly_(Occupy_movement)
16. Occupy Wall Street - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupy_Wall_Street
17. Civil Society, Second Edition: The Critical History of an Idea, https://dokumen.pub/civil-society-second-edition-the-critical-history-of-an-idea-9781479815401.html
18. Occupy Wall Street Shutdown - Crooked Timber, https://crookedtimber.org/2011/11/15/occupy-wall-street-shutdown/
19. The Rise of the Masses - dokumen.pub, https://dokumen.pub/download/the-rise-of-the-masses-spontaneous-mobilization-and-contentious-politics-0226826813-9780226826813.html
20. The Digital Evolution of Occupy Wall Street - PMC - NIH, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3667169/
21. Taking the Helm: Hegemony How-To and Left Strategy, https://convergencemag.com/articles/taking-helm-hegemony-left-strategy/
22. An International Perspective on Jonathan Smucker's Hegemony,

https://berkeleyjournal.org/2017/05/an-international-perspective-on-jonathan-smuckers-hegemony-how-to-a-roadmap-for-radicals/
23. The Limits of Hegemony: A Review of Hegemony How-To, https://www.blackrosefed.org/the-limits-of-hegemony/
24. Nobility of Poland - Part I - Almanach de Gotha, https://www.almanachdegotha.org/id221.html
25. History of Poland | Key Events, Important People, & Dates - Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/topic/history-of-Poland
26. Szlachta - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Szlachta
27. Liberum veto - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberum_veto
28. What happened in 1652 with the Liberum veto in the Polish ... - Quora, https://www.quora.com/What-happened-in-1652-with-the-Liberum-veto-in-the-Polish-Lithuanian-Commonwealth
29. Deterrence Deferred. For Now. | The Republic, https://therepublicjournal.com/essays/deterrence-deferred-for-now/
30. How the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth saved Europe and, https://learnorbis.com/blog/polish-lithuanian-commonwealth-saved-europe
31. 20 - Poland–Lithuania in the Age of Atlantic Revolutions: Dilemmas, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-history-of-the-age-of-atlantic-revolutions/polandlithuania-in-the-age-of-atlantic-revolutions-dilemmas-of-liberty/E30610ECA1857DA7C4DF5EF7B8BF7CD9
32. The liberum veto and attempts at reform - Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/place/Polish-Lithuanian-Commonwealth/The-liberum-veto-and-attempts-at-reform
33. Poland-Lithuania, Commonwealth of, 1569–1795 | Encyclopedia.com, https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/poland-lithuania-commonwealth-1569-1795
34. Enacting Truth: The Dynamics of Quaker Practice, https://quakertheology.org/enacting-truth-dynamics-of-quaker-practice/
35. How do Baptists discern the 'mind of Christ' at the church meeting?, https://chesterrep.openrepository.com/bitstreams/31975f10-03ea-47af-bad7-cde432e18efd/download
36. reflections on leadership and decision-making challenges during, https://repository.upenn.edu/bitstreams/9eaafd0e-3a8d-472a-bc5e-be318e2e27b7/download
37. Practicing Virtues: Moral Traditions at Quaker and Military Boarding, https://publishing.cdlib.org/ucpressebooks/public/book/practicing-virtues-moral-traditions-at-quaker-and-military-boarding-schools.html
38. A Cognitive Science Analysis of the Quaker Business Method, https://quakerstudies.openlibhums.org/article/id/15708/
39. The Heterotopian Nature of a Contemporary Quaker Spiritual Practice, https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/3076/1/Meads11PhD.pdf
40. Archiving People. A Social History of Dutch Archives, https://familiearchieven.nl/archiving-people_eric-ketelaar_2020_webversion.pdf
41. A Beginner's Guide to Building Better Worlds: Ideas and Inspiration,

https://dokumen.pub/a-beginners-guide-to-building-better-worlds-ideas-and-inspiration-from-the-zapatistas-9781447362173.html
42. Mietshäuser Syndikat - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mietsh%C3%A4user_Syndikat
43. Translocal Mobilization of Housing Commons. The Example of the, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sustainable-cities/articles/10.3389/frsc.2022.759332/full
44. Mietshäuser Syndikat (MHS). Living Library - ToGather, https://togatherproject.eu/library/mietshauser-syndikat
45. Praise for Free, Fair and Alive - Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, https://www.boell.de/sites/default/files/free_fair_and_alive_book.pdf
46. Mietshäuser Syndikat - Architecture is Climate, https://architectureisclimate.net/practice/mietshauser-syndikat/
47. Beyond Adversary Democracy - The University of Chicago Press, https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/B/bo3618381.html
48. Unitary & Adversary: The Two Forms Of Democracy - Context Institute, https://www.context.org/iclib/ic07/mansbrdg/
49. Beyond Adversary Democracy, https://williamwoods.ecampus.com/beyond-adversary-democracy-reprint/bk/9780226503554
50. Commentaries - Social Science Computing Core, https://www.sscc.wisc.edu/soc/faculty/pages/wright/Published%20writing/DD-Part%20III-commentaries.pdf
51. (PDF) The Place of Self-Interest and the Role of Power in, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229548797_The_Place_of_Self-Interest_and_the_Role_of_Power_in_Deliberative_Democracy