ME-08 Separation of powers, veto players and multi-body sortition

The catastrophic failure of industrial supply chains and the permanent recession of state authority inevitably generate vacuums of power. Historically and predictably, these voids are exploited by individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy[1]. These individuals are disproportionately drawn to positions of authority, utilizing superficial charm, ruthless manipulation, and a lack of empathy to capture nascent governance structures. The architectural challenge for communities rebuilding post-collapse—from a single household to a bioregion—is to engineer governance systems that are mechanically resistant to dark-triad capture without inducing the kind of systemic paralysis that prevents adaptation to ecological or social crises.

This report provides a rigorous evaluation of structural separation, veto points, and sortition across deep time and varied cultural scales. It critically examines the theoretical frameworks of the extended republic, veto player theory, and consensus democracy, contrasting them with the historical realities of ancient Athens and the Republic of Venice. Finally, it evaluates the modern theoretical construct of multi-body sortition as a comprehensive anti-capture architecture designed to insulate the legislative process from charismatic psychopaths and entrenched oligarchies.

The Architecture of Separation: From the Extended Republic to Presidential Failure

The debate over structural separation as an anti-capture mechanism is fundamentally a debate about scale, human nature, and the geometry of institutional power. In *The Spirit of the Laws* (1748), Montesquieu argued that a republic could only survive if it remained small in geographic and demographic scale. In a small republic, the public good is easily felt and understood, and governance relies heavily on the shared civic virtue of a homogeneous population. However, modern scholarship demonstrates that Montesquieu's small republic is inherently vulnerable to localized capture; a single charismatic demagogue or a tightly knit faction of Machiavellian actors can easily overwhelm the informal social controls of a small population.

James Madison inverted Montesquieu's logic in *Federalist 10* and *Federalist 51* (1787). Madison abandoned the reliance on civic virtue, operating on the assumption that human nature is inherently prone to self-interest and factionalism. Madison's solution was the "extended republic." By scaling the republic over a vast geography and diverse population, Madison argued that the sheer multiplicity of distinct economic interests, classes, and geographic factions would prevent any single dark-triad individual or cohesive faction from achieving a tyrannizing majority. To reinforce this social fragmentation, Madison deployed the formal structural separation of powers, dividing the state into executive, legislative, and judicial branches to pit "ambition against ambition."

While the Madisonian separation of powers became a global template, its specific manifestation in presidential systems has proven catastrophic for democratic survival,

particularly when combined with multiparty electoral systems. Juan Linz initiated a deep critique of presidentialism, noting its rigid term limits and the peril of dual democratic legitimacy, where both the president and the legislature claim a mandate from the people. This critique was empirically quantified by Jose Antonio Cheibub, Zachary Elkins, and Tom Ginsburg in comprehensive analyses of democratic survival[2].

Cheibub's empirical dataset includes 3,063 annual observations across 140 democratic countries spanning from 1975 to 2012[5]. The statistical findings present a stark warning for structural design: of 25 stable democracies analyzed, only four utilized a presidential system[2]. The data highlights a fatal institutional formula, demonstrating that the combination of a multiparty system and a presidential system is fundamentally inimical to stable democracy[2]. In parliamentary systems, a situation where no single party controls a legislative majority occurs 62.4 percent of the time, resulting in minority governments roughly 30.4 percent of the time[5]. Conversely, under presidentialism, minority governments occur a staggering 51.5 percent of the time[5]. This structure fosters intense executive-legislative gridlock, described as immobilism. Because presidential systems feature independent mandates for both branches, conflicts lack a constitutional resolution mechanism (like a vote of no confidence), frequently precipitating military intervention, democratic breakdown, or executive self-coups[2]. In Cheibub's extensive sample, Chile stood as the singular historical exception of a stable, multiparty presidential democracy[2].

When subjecting the Madisonian extended republic and presidential separation of powers to a capture test, the vulnerabilities to dark-triad actors become apparent. A person exhibiting Machiavellianism and narcissism thrives in majoritarian electoral systems, utilizing the required aggressive campaigning to aggregate a plurality of votes. Once in a presidential office, the dark-triad actor faces the structural gridlock of a separated legislature. Rather than negotiating, the Machiavellian executive manufactures or exploits a crisis, utilizing the resulting paralysis to argue that the legislature is corrupt and inefficient. Historical cases, particularly throughout Latin America in the 20th century, show such executives subsequently utilizing emergency decrees, military alliances, or popular referenda to bypass the legislature, effectively capturing the state[2]. The only features that resist this capture are deep-seated cultural norms of constitutionalism and a highly decentralized, independent judiciary, though these are frequently eroded by sustained executive assault.

Evaluating the perspectives surrounding this architecture reveals a deep divide between intent and outcome. The architects of presidential separation stated that their intent was to prevent tyranny by ensuring no single branch could act unilaterally, preserving liberty through institutional friction. However, the historical record demonstrates that this friction routinely escalates into unresolvable constitutional crises that terminate in authoritarian collapse, particularly in multiparty environments[2]. Modern scholarship infers that the survival of the American presidential system—often held up as the ideal—is a statistical anomaly dependent on its historically loose, non-ideological two-party system, rather than the inherent genius of its separated powers.

The strongest case against the Madisonian extended republic and presidential separation is articulated by scholars of parliamentary supremacy and coalition theory, who argue that

artificial separation creates zero-sum politics. Critics like Linz and Cheibub argue that parliamentarism, by fusing the executive and legislative functions, ensures that the government always has the capacity to act and can be instantly removed if it fails, replacing dangerous rigidity with necessary flexibility[2].

Scale Ledger: Madisonian Separation / Presidentialism	Applicability and Efficacy
Household (4–10)	Fails. Formal separation of powers at this level destroys natural cooperation.
Hamlet (30–50)	Fails. Unnecessary and highly alienating; face-to-face consensus is optimal.
Village (150–500)	Fails. Dividing a small village into separate "branches" breeds immediate factionalism.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Never tried. Too small to support the administrative overhead of separated branches.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Works poorly. Mayoral systems exist, but executive-legislative gridlock stifles municipal adaptation.
Region (0.5M–5M)	Works conditionally. Requires a strictly two-party system to avoid immobilism.
Nation (50M–500M)	Highly unstable. Statistically prone to collapse when combined with multiparty dynamics[2].
Planet (8 Billion)	Fails. An extended republic at this scale guarantees an infinitely complex gridlock.

Veto Players and the Mechanics of Paralysis

The Madisonian concept of separated powers was formalized into a rigorous mathematical and spatial model by political scientist George Tsebelis in his Veto Player Theory (1995, 2002)[9]. Tsebelis defines a veto player as an individual or collective actor whose agreement is strictly necessary to change the legislative status quo[9]. His framework allows for comparative analysis

across entirely different constitutional regimes by reducing all systems to their specific configuration of veto players.

Tsebelis distinguishes between two categories: institutional veto players, which are generated by the constitution itself (such as a bicameral legislature, a president with veto power, or a supreme court with judicial review), and partisan veto players, which are generated by the political game (such as the specific political parties that make up a governing coalition in a parliamentary system)[10]. The analytical core of the theory is the "winset of the status quo"—defined as the set of all possible policy alternatives that can defeat the current status quo in a vote among the veto players[9].

Tsebelis mathematically demonstrates that policy stability—meaning the inability to change the status quo—increases under three specific conditions. First, policy stability increases as the raw number of veto players increases. Adding a new veto player can never increase the size of the winset; it can only decrease it or leave it unchanged[10]. Second, policy stability increases as the ideological distance between the veto players increases. Third, stability increases as the internal cohesion of collective veto players increases[9]. When the winset of the status quo shrinks to zero, the system enters a state of total immobilism, incapable of generating new laws regardless of external pressures.

Applying the capture test to veto player configurations reveals a double-edged sword regarding dark-triad actors. A system with many veto players (a small winset) is highly resistant to rapid, dictatorial capture. If a psychopath secures the executive branch, they cannot unilaterally alter the legal structure if they face independent legislative chambers, coalition partners, and regional governments. However, this same mechanical friction can be aggressively exploited by Machiavellian actors. A dark-triad individual positioned as a single veto player within a complex coalition can hold the entire system hostage, demanding extreme concessions in exchange for passing routine survival legislation. Historically, minor extremist parties in multiparty coalitions have utilized this exact leverage to punch massively above their electoral weight, extracting rent from the system. The only feature that resists this form of capture is the ability to dissolve the government and call new elections to reshuffle the partisan veto players.

Examining the perspectives on veto points shows a clear divergence. The constitutional designers who install institutional veto points state that they do so to ensure broad consensus, protect minority rights, and prevent the tyranny of the majority. The historical record shows that these mechanisms do exactly what Tsebelis predicts: they lock in the status quo, producing immense policy stability[13]. Modern scholarship infers that while policy stability sounds inherently positive, it is indistinguishable from policy rigidity. In an environment undergoing rapid ecological or economic change, a system with too many veto players cannot adapt, leading to catastrophic systemic failure despite internal legal stability[10].

The strongest case against relying on veto players as a primary governance strategy comes from scholars who argue that it inherently favors conservative outcomes and elite entrenchment. Critics point out that Tsebelis's theory assumes all policy dimensions are equally salient to all players, which is rarely true; players frequently logroll, trading votes across unrelated issues, which can suddenly open the winset in unpredictable ways[11]. Furthermore,

relying on veto players to prevent capture ignores the reality that if the status quo is fundamentally unjust or unsustainable, veto players ensure that it remains so, fostering public resentment that demagogues eventually weaponize to overthrow the system entirely.

Scale Ledger: Veto Player Configurations	Applicability and Efficacy
Household (4–10)	Fails. If every adult is a veto player, the household starves due to indecision.
Hamlet (30–50)	Fails. High transaction costs of finding a winset destroy small-group cohesion.
Village (150–500)	Works conditionally. A council of elders acting as a single veto player can maintain tradition.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Works poorly. Formal veto players at this scale slow down vital infrastructure maintenance.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Works. Partisan veto players in a municipal council prevent unilateral mayoral action.
Region (0.5M–5M)	Works well. Multiple veto players protect distinct geographic and economic sub-regions.
Nation (50M–500M)	Works. Institutional and partisan veto players effectively halt rapid autocratic legal capture.
Planet (8 Billion)	Fails completely. The sheer diversity of interests reduces the winset to absolute zero.

Consensus Democracies and Divided Societies

Expanding beyond the spatial modeling of veto players, Arend Lijphart provided the most comprehensive empirical analysis of institutional structures in his seminal work, *Patterns of Democracy* (1999, revised 2012)[15]. Analyzing 36 democratic countries spanning from 1945 to

2010, Lijphart rejected the binary classification of democracies, mapping them instead along a two-dimensional continuum[15].

The first dimension, the Executives-Parties dimension, captures how easily a single party can dominate the government. It contrasts single-party majority cabinets with broad multiparty coalitions, two-party systems with multiparty systems, disproportional plurality electoral systems with proportional representation, and adversarial pluralism with corporatist interest group coordination[15]. The second dimension, the Federal-Unitary dimension, captures the division of power across institutions. It contrasts centralized unitary states with decentralized federal states, unicameralism with strong symmetrical bicameralism, flexible constitutions with rigid ones, and executive supremacy with robust judicial review and independent central banks[15].

Systems clustering toward proportional, decentralized, and multiparty traits are termed "Consensus Democracies" (with Switzerland and Belgium as archetypes), whereas systems concentrating power are "Majoritarian Democracies" (such as the United Kingdom and New Zealand prior to 1993)[17]. Lijphart's central, and highly contested, empirical claim is that consensus democracies are "kinder and gentler"[15]. Through multiple regression analyses, he concluded that consensus democracies do not sacrifice macroeconomic performance—contrary to the belief that coalition governments are economically inefficient—yet they systematically outperform majoritarian systems in democratic quality. They exhibit higher female representation, greater voter turnout, superior environmental protection, more generous foreign aid, and a minimized reliance on incarceration and the death penalty[15].

The debate over majoritarian versus consensus systems becomes existential in deeply divided, multi-ethnic societies. Donald Horowitz argued for consociationalism, a form of extreme consensus democracy that guarantees power-sharing, mutual vetoes, and proportional representation for specific ethnic groups[21]. Benjamin Reilly extends this debate, arguing that while majoritarian systems exclude minorities, consociationalism permanently entrenches ethnic divisions into the architecture of the state, freezing conflict lines[22]. Reilly advocates for "centripetalism" through electoral engineering, specifically utilizing the Alternative Vote (AV)[25]. By requiring candidates to secure secondary and tertiary preference votes from voters outside their own ethnic group to win a majority, AV theoretically forces politicians to pool cross-ethnic votes, moderating their rhetoric and behavior[23].

However, the capture test applied to these deeply engineered electoral systems reveals profound fragility. In a divided society, a Machiavellian ethno-nationalist easily circumvents centripetal mechanisms if demographic clustering allows them to win without cross-ethnic appeal. The historical record provides a grim validation: the 1999 implementation of the Alternative Vote in Fiji was explicitly designed by centripetalists to foster moderation, yet it completely failed to prevent ethnic hardlining and the subsequent political collapse and military coup[25]. When demographic fragmentation aligns with geographic concentration, dark-triad actors simply radicalize their base, ignoring the preferential voting incentives entirely.

Evaluating the perspectives surrounding consensus democracy reveals a complex causal debate. Proponents of consensus models state that requiring broad, multi-party agreement

forces compromise, preventing the disenfranchisement of minorities and generating policies that reflect the true will of the diverse public[15]. The historical record indeed shows that Northern European states utilizing consensus mechanisms boast the strongest welfare states and highest democratic quality indices[19]. However, modern scholarship infers that the causal arrow is likely inverted. It is highly probable that culturally homogeneous, egalitarian, and high-trust societies naturally built consensus institutions, rather than the institutions forging the culture[17].

The strongest case against Lijphart is articulated by empirical researchers such as Nils-Christian Bormann and Detlef Jahn. They argue that Lijphart's methodology suffers from severe inductive bias and endogeneity[17]. Bormann notes that Lijphart's typology is descriptive of his specific historical sample but fails to predict performance when applied to new or democratizing nations[17]. Furthermore, critics demonstrate that majoritarian systems sometimes vastly outperform consensus ones in specific metrics; for example, majoritarian democracies have proven much more effective in equalizing educational opportunities between immigrants and natives, as they can enact sweeping, decisive policy changes without being blocked by conservative coalition partners[18].

Scale Ledger: Consensus & Centripetal Democracy	**Applicability and Efficacy**
Household (4–10)	Fails. Formal proportional representation is meaningless at this scale.
Hamlet (30–50)	Fails. Natural consensus operates well, but formalized consociationalism creates rifts.
Village (150–500)	Works poorly. Electoral engineering for a village breeds unnecessary partisan identities.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Works conditionally. AV voting can encourage moderation among local council candidates.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Works. Proportional representation allows diverse community interests a seat at the table.
Region (0.5M–5M)	Works well. Consensus mechanisms thrive in regional governance (e.g., Swiss

	cantons).
Nation (50M–500M)	Works. Lijphart's data confirms consensus democracies operate effectively at this scale[15].
Planet (8 Billion)	Fails. Consociationalism for 8 billion people would require impossible elite coordination.

The Sortition Defense: Ancient Athens and Oligarchic Venice

To bypass the inherent vulnerabilities of electoral systems—which inherently favor the charismatic, well-funded, and Machiavellian—history offers profound case studies in sortition (selection by lottery) as a primary governance mechanism.

Following the disastrous Peloponnesian War and the devastating oligarchic coups of 411 BC (the Council of 400) and 404 BC (the Thirty Tyrants, who brutally executed 1,500 citizens), the restored Athenian democracy (403-322 BC) realized that direct democracy was dangerously unstable[29]. Serving a population of 30,000 to 60,000 adult male citizens, Athens operated as a "dikastic democracy," fundamentally shifting power away from the passions of the Assembly and into the hands of randomly selected juries[32].

The Athenians recognized that charismatic orators (rhetores)—often exhibiting dark-triad traits—could whip the Assembly into a frenzy, passing disastrous decrees. To counter this, they deployed two structural veto players powered entirely by sortition: the *nomothetai* and the *graphe paranomon*[33]. After 403 BC, the Assembly lost the power to pass permanent laws. Any decree proposed in the Assembly had to be ratified by the *nomothetai* (Legislative Commissions), a panel of 500 to 1,000 citizens randomly selected for a single day to hear formal arguments for and against the law[33]. Concurrently, any citizen could initiate a *graphe paranomon* (prosecution for introducing illegal measures) against the proposer of a decree[36]. This immediately suspended the decree until it was tried by a randomly selected jury. If found unconstitutional or contradictory to existing law, the decree was voided, and the proposer was heavily fined or disenfranchised, creating a massive deterrent against demagoguery[34].

To prevent bribery and factional collusion in selecting these juries, the Athenians invented the *kleroterion*, a mechanical randomization device. Marble steles featured vertical slots (kanonides) where citizens inserted their bronze identification tickets (pinakia). A tube attached to the stele was filled with black and white dice. The random release of the dice determined which exact rows of citizens were selected for jury duty or magistracies on that specific day[36]. Combined with strict term limits, sortition achieved unprecedented participation: historian Mogens Herman Hansen calculates that approximately one-fourth of all adult male citizens served as the rotating head of state (President of the Council) for a single day in their lives[31].

The Republic of Venice presents a contrasting historical model where complex structural

separation and sortition failed to prevent oligarchic capture, instead mathematically perfecting it. By 1297, the *Serrata del Maggior Consiglio* (Closing of the Great Council) legally restricted participation in the government to a hereditary aristocracy, excluding minor aristocrats and the entire plebeian class[41]. Following a failed coup in 1310, the *Council of Ten* was established. Initially a temporary emergency committee, it metastasized into a permanent, highly secretive intelligence and judicial organ that operated above the law, utilizing anonymous denunciations to neutralize political threats and enforce strict oligarchic cohesion[43].

To prevent any single aristocratic family from dominating the Doge (the head of state), the Venetians instituted an incredibly complex, ten-stage election process in 1268, alternating between sortition and supermajority voting[45]. The process began with 30 members of the Great Council chosen by lot, reduced to 9 by lot, who then voted for 40 (requiring a 7/9 supermajority). This alternating process of reduction by lot and expansion by supermajority vote continued until a final committee of 41 electors was formed, who then elected the Doge, requiring a minimum of 25 votes (a ~64% supermajority)[44]. Modern political modeling confirms that this 64% supermajority requirement successfully eliminated cyclical voting paradoxes (Condorcet cycles) and made precise bribery or factional engineering statistically impossible[45].

Applying the capture test to these systems reveals stark contrasts. The Athenian model of the blind lot combined with extreme, one-day rotation is the most robust mechanical resistance to dark-triad capture in human history. A psychopath cannot charm a marble lottery machine[36]. If they are selected, short term limits deny them the time required to build patronage networks or consolidate power[33]. Conversely, the Venetian system demonstrates how a Machiavellian faction captures a state: by creating a closed system (the Serrata) and establishing an unaccountable, secretive oversight body (the Council of Ten) that uses terror and surveillance to maintain control[43].

Perspectives on these historical models must avoid the romance of the primitive. The Athenians stated they were maximizing freedom, equality of opportunity, and preventing tyranny[46]. The historical record shows they operated a stable democracy for nearly a century, but modern scholarship infers that this system was entirely parasitic; it functioned only by brutally exploiting slave labor, women, and imperial tribute to generate the leisure time required for male citizens to participate so heavily in daily governance[30]. The Venetians stated their complex Doge election and the Serrata were necessary to prevent civil discord and mob rule[41]. The record shows they achieved centuries of stability and massive wealth[44], but modern inference dictates that supermajority voting rules combined with sortition in a closed system merely mathematically optimizes oppression, completely alienating the vast majority of the population[45].

The strongest case against classical sortition is that randomly selecting leaders in a society where most individuals are unprepared or uneducated leads to profound instability and disastrous decision-making[40]. Critics argue that without the accountability of elections, allotted officials have no incentive to govern well.

Scale Ledger: Classical Sortition &	**Applicability and Efficacy**

Supermajority	
Household (4–10)	Fails. Drawing lots for daily household leadership destroys organic family cohesion.
Hamlet (30–50)	Works conditionally. Useful for assigning highly undesirable, discrete tasks to avoid resentment.
Village (150–500)	Works well. Sortition for a village council prevents a single dominant family from capturing resources.
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Works well. The minimum scale where the Kleroterion mechanism prevents local factionalism.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Works well. The exact scale of the Athenian democracy; statistical sampling is highly accurate here.
Region (0.5M–5M)	Works conditionally. Requires immense logistical overhead to manage physical lotteries across distances.
Nation (50M–500M)	Untried. Never attempted historically at this scale; the logistical barriers in an analog world are immense.
Planet (8 Billion)	Fails. Classical physical sortition is impossible to coordinate globally without digital architecture.

Multi-Body Sortition: The Bouricius Architecture

To adapt the principles of Athenian sortition to modern, large-scale governance, political scientist Terrill Bouricius (2013) proposed a comprehensive theoretical architecture: Democracy Through Multi-Body Sortition[48]. Bouricius argues that a single allotted

chamber—often proposed as a replacement for a senate—remains highly vulnerable to capture by charismatic experts, dominant personalities within the chamber, or the unelected administrative staff who control the flow of information. To counter this, he fractures the legislative process across six distinct bodies, strictly separating the right to propose, the right to draft, and the right to vote[48].

The architecture operates sequentially. First, an *Agenda Council* (~150 members, drawn by lot) sets the topics for legislation, insulating the agenda from the electoral need to mobilize voters through polarizing "hot-button" issues[51]. Second, *Interest Panels* (open to self-selected volunteers) draft proposals on these agenda items, allowing passionate experts and affected citizens to contribute without needing to win an election[51]. Third, a *Review Panel* (~150 members, drawn by lot) reads the proposals, calls expert witnesses, and merges or edits them into final draft bills[52]. Fourth, a *Policy Jury* (400+ members, drawn by lot for a few days) hears the final arguments and votes Yes or No by secret ballot. Crucially, the Policy Jury cannot amend the bill; they only judge it, preventing internal dominant personalities from hijacking the final language[51].

To prevent institutional rot, Bouricius includes two meta-legislative bodies. A *Rules Council* (drawn by lot) constantly monitors and proposes improvements to the rules of the sortition process, which must then be ratified by a Policy Jury[51]. Finally, an *Oversight Council* (drawn by lot from a pool of citizens who have previously served) handles allegations of corruption, monitors the impartiality of facilitators, and hires or fires staff[51]. This is specifically designed to defeat Robert Michels' "Iron Law of Oligarchy," which states that any complex organization will eventually be captured by its administrative class[51].

The closest empirical implementation of this architecture is the Ostbelgien Model in the German-speaking community of Belgium, initiated in 2019[53]. It institutionalized a permanent Citizens' Council of 24 randomly selected citizens serving 18-month terms. To prevent these citizens from becoming an entrenched political class, one-third of the Council rotates every six months[56]. This Council sets the agenda and oversees ad hoc Citizens' Assemblies (50-200 members) that deliberate on specific policies[57].

Running the capture test on the Bouricius architecture reveals strong structural defenses but specific points of vulnerability. The self-selected *Interest Panels* are highly vulnerable; a well-organized faction of Machiavellian actors can flood the panels with drafted legislation designed to benefit their interests[51]. Bouricius counters this by ensuring the Interest Panel has absolutely no voting power; they merely suggest. The randomly selected Review Panel and the massive, randomly selected Policy Jury act as an impermeable firewall against this factional flooding[52]. A dark-triad actor cannot bribe or intimidate a Policy Jury because they are chosen at the last minute and vote by secret ballot[51].

Evaluating the perspectives on multi-body sortition requires separating theory from practice. Bouricius states that this system breaks the iron law of oligarchy, eliminates partisan polarization, and aligns legislation with the considered, deliberative will of the people[48]. The historical record shows that this exact configuration has only been tested in micro-environments (such as internal DSA chapter governance[52]) and partial implementations

like Ostbelgien[53]. The empirical record of a fully sovereign multi-body sortition state does not yet exist. Modern scholarship infers that while the system is theoretically airtight against electoral capture, it shifts the battleground entirely to the curation of information.
The strongest case against multi-body sortition is articulated by democratic theorists like Cristina Lafont and researchers like Dimitri Courant (2022). They argue that regular citizens, once subjected to intense expert briefings and multi-day deliberations in a mini-public, cease to be "ordinary"[48]. They develop an "epistocratic claim" to legitimacy based on their enlightened view, disconnecting them from the masses who did not undergo the deliberation process[48]. Furthermore, without the feedback loop of elections, allotted citizens face no direct accountability for disastrous decisions[50]. The most profound vulnerability is informational asymmetry: lay juries may become entirely dependent on the expert staff who brief them, simply shifting autocratic capture from elected politicians to unelected, highly educated bureaucrats who manipulate the deliberation process[48].

Scale Ledger: Multi-Body Sortition	Applicability and Efficacy
Household (4–10)	Fails. Six distinct bodies in a household of 8 people is functionally impossible.
Hamlet (30–50)	Fails. The administrative overhead of rotating panels destroys necessary labor efficiency.
Village (150–500)	Works conditionally. Can be condensed into a two-body system (agenda setters and a jury).
Parish (1,500–5,000)	Works well. The exact scale where statistical sampling accurately reflects demographic diversity.
Town (15,000–50,000)	Works perfectly. The Ostbelgien model successfully operates at this exact scale (77,000 pop.)[54].
Region (0.5M–5M)	Works well. Sortition assemblies (e.g., British Columbia Citizens' Assembly) achieve high deliberative quality here[36].
Nation (50M–500M)	Untried / Theoretical. The logistical

	complexity of managing millions of lottery pools is massive but theoretically possible.
Planet (8 Billion)	Fails. The sheer disconnect between a 400-person planetary jury and the 8 billion unselected citizens destroys systemic legitimacy.

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Presidentialism combined with a multiparty system is structurally inimical to democratic stability and statistically prone to collapse through executive-legislative gridlock[2].
2. Increasing the number of veto players successfully restricts policy volatility and prevents rapid autocratic capture, but exponentially increases the risk of fatal systemic paralysis during crises[9].
3. Majoritarian electoral systems systematically select for and reward individuals possessing dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism) through the mechanics of competitive campaigning[1].
4. Consensus democratic institutions heavily correlate with stronger welfare states, lower incarceration, and higher environmental standards, though cultural endogeneity makes causation uncertain[15].
5. Sortition (the blind lot) serves as the only historically proven mechanical firewall against the initial acquisition of power by charismatic sociopaths[36].
6. Splitting the legislative process—strictly separating the power to propose, draft, and vote into distinctly populated bodies—prevents the consolidation of elite factions[51].
7. Long terms and secrecy in allotted or selectively elected bodies, such as the Venetian Council of Ten, inevitably result in tyrannical oligarchic capture[43].
8. To prevent bureaucratic capture (the Iron Law of Oligarchy), the administrative staff supporting a deliberative body must be continually monitored, hired, and fired by a frequently rotating, randomly selected citizen oversight council[51].
9. Supermajority thresholds of approximately 64% successfully neutralize cyclical voting paradoxes and drastically increase the mathematical cost of bribery[45].
10. Structural separation requires minimum demographic thresholds; it fails entirely in households and hamlets where informal, face-to-face consensus is absolutely required for survival and cohesion.

Contested or Open Questions

Does structural separation actually create "kinder" outcomes, or do culturally homogeneous, high-trust societies simply have the luxury to build consensus institutions? In a multi-body sortition system, can lay citizens truly evaluate complex technical legislation independently, or will they inevitably become deferential puppets of the expert briefers and administrative staff? How can participation in a sortition system be compelled post-collapse without relying on the

coercive violence of a centralized state? Can the Alternative Vote and centripetal engineering ever successfully overcome deep ethnic divisions if the minority populations are geographically isolated?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Tsebelis, George (2002). *Veto Players: How Political Institutions Work*.[9]
2. Lijphart, Arend (1999/2012). *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*.[15]
3. Bouricius, Terrill (2013). *Democracy Through Multi-Body Sortition: Athenian Lessons for the Modern Day*.[48]
4. Hansen, Mogens Herman (1991). *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*.[31]
5. Cheibub, Jose Antonio (2007). *Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Democracy*.[8]
6. Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2006). *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work*.[1]
7. Reilly, Benjamin (2001). *Democracy in Divided Societies: Electoral Engineering for Conflict Management*.[22]
8. Coggins, J. S., & Perali, C. F. (1998). *64% Majority rule in Ducal Venice: Voting for the Doge*.[45]

Implementability after the Fall

Implementing structural separation post-collapse requires adjusting for the total absence of state apparatus, grid electricity, and internet architecture. The minimum viable versions of these systems scale drastically differently depending on the community size.

For a **Household (4 to 10 people)**, there is no viable version of structural separation. Governance must rely on natural hierarchy, parental authority, or organic consensus. Attempting to install formal veto players or sortition at this scale will cause immediate, lethal paralysis in crisis scenarios where rapid decision-making dictates survival.

For a **Village of 300**, a simplified two-body sortition system is the minimum viable product. An *Assembly* of all adults meets monthly to raise grievances. A *Council of 12*, drawn by lottery using colored stones from a bag, serves for a single agricultural season (6 months) to execute decisions, adjudicate disputes, and assign labor. Crucially, no one can serve twice until all eligible adults have served once, ensuring total rotation.

For a **District of 3,000**, a rudimentary three-body sortition system becomes necessary to manage complexity.

1. An *Agenda/Drafting Council* of 30 people is drawn by lot for 1 year to field community grievances and draft basic rules.
2. A *Policy Jury* of 100 people is drawn by lot per specific rule to hear arguments and vote by a secret token drop (dropping black or white stones into an urn).
3. An *Oversight/Justice Panel* of 15 people is drawn by lot for 3 months to hear trials and monitor the Drafting Council for corruption.

What it needs to start: To initiate this architecture without a state or digital grid, four assets are mandatory. First, **literacy and records**: a physical ledger of all adults must be maintained to ensure the lottery pool is accurate and to track who has already served. Second, a **shared calendar**: required to synchronize assembly times and rotation schedules (e.g., utilizing

equinoxes and solstices for lot-drawing ceremonies). Third, a **meeting place**: a physical space large enough to hold the 100-person Policy Jury out of the weather, and acoustic enough for unamplified speaking. Finally, **physical tokens**: an analog randomization device (a bag with painted stones or wooden lots) and voting urns designed for blind dropping.

The First Failure to Expect: The first failure to anticipate is *Administrative Capture*. Because widespread literacy, complex reasoning, and meticulous record-keeping may be scarce post-collapse, the few individuals capable of writing the laws, reading the historical precedents, and maintaining the lottery ledger will quietly usurp power. The randomly allotted citizens, exhausted by physical labor and unaccustomed to legislative language, will naturally defer to these literate clerks. Without an aggressive Oversight Council actively rotating these clerks, the "democratic" lottery will quickly transform into a rubber stamp for a bureaucratic, literate oligarchy.

Principles

- **Principle of the Extended Republic:** Scaling a governance architecture over a larger, more diverse population dilutes the power of any single faction but exponentially increases the logistical friction of administration.
- **Principle of Veto Players:** Increasing the number of actors whose agreement is required to change policy increases stability against rapid capture but simultaneously increases the risk of fatal systemic paralysis during a crisis.
- **Principle of Presidential Instability:** Combining an independently elected executive with a multiparty legislature mathematically guarantees severe, and often regime-ending, institutional gridlock.
- **Principle of Consensual Endogeneity:** Institutional frameworks that require broad consensus correlate with higher social welfare, but these institutions are likely the product, rather than the cause, of high-trust, homogenous cultures.
- **Principle of the Blind Lot (Sortition):** Random selection is the only proven mechanical filter that entirely neutralizes the initial advantage of narcissistic and Machiavellian traits in acquiring power.
- **Principle of Process Fracture:** Separating the power to propose, the power to draft, and the power to vote into distinctly populated bodies prevents the consolidation of factions and elite collusion.
- **Principle of Temporal Limitation:** Allotted power must be strictly temporary; extended or lifetime appointments drawn by lot will inevitably transition into unaccountable, oppressive oligarchies.
- **Principle of Oversight Rotation:** The administrative staff supporting a deliberative body will capture that body unless they are constantly monitored and dismissed by a frequently rotating, randomly selected citizen oversight council.
- **Principle of Supermajority Stability:** Raising the threshold of victory significantly above a simple majority (e.g., to 64%) eliminates cyclical voting paradoxes and drastically increases the mathematical cost of bribery.

Works cited

1. Perspective Chapter: The Dark Triad in the Organization - IntechOpen, https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/1132404
2. (PDF) Presidentialism, multiparty systems, and democracy, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/253966997_Presidentialism_multiparty_systems_and_democracy_the_difficult_equation
3. Constitutional Frameworks and Democratic Consolidation, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/world-politics/article/constitutional-frameworks-and-democratic-consolidation-parliamentarianism-versus-presidentialism/F848B32B3B47A084208EF067F878A8E7
4. yarı başkanlık sistemi, https://acikerisim.tbmm.gov.tr/bitstreams/8ada4b7f-0bd5-4904-ade3-5af5bb142b10/download
5. Policy differences among parliamentary and presidential systems., https://socialsciences.ucsd.edu/~ssaiegh/oxford_pc_chapter.pdf
6. Participatory Governance and the Millennium Development Goals, https://desapublications.un.org/file/1116/download
7. Government Systems and Turkey - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322523353_Government_Systems_and_Turkey
8. Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, and Redistribution, https://qaps.princeton.edu/document/59
9. Journal of Theoretical Politics - University of Michigan, https://sites.lsa.umich.edu/tsebelis/wp-content/uploads/sites/246/2015/03/veto_players_and_referendums_2002_j_of_theo_politics.pdf
10. Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism, https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/default/files/document/files/2022/07/sbdecisionmakingposystems1995j.pdf
11. Veto player theory and reform making in Western Europe - PMC, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5900944/
12. (PDF) Coalition theory: a veto players' approach - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272011637_Coalition_theory_a_veto_players'_approach
13. Promises and Pitfalls of Veto Player Analysis - MPG.PuRe, https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_1234451_3/component/file_2049678/content
14. Institutions, Veto Players and Policy Change, https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=1321264&fileOId=1321265
15. Arend Lijphart Patterns of Democracy - can be, http://digamo.free.fr/lijphart99.pdf
16. Patterns of Democracy - Arend Lijphart | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/322634822/Patterns-of-Democracy-Arend-Lijphart
17. Patterns of Democracy and Its Critics,

https://cis.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/cis-dam/CIS_DAM_2015/WorkingPapers/Living_Reviews_Democracy/Bormann.pdf
18. A Kinder, Gentler Democracy? The Consensus Model and Swedish, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229928367_A_Kinder_Gentler_Democracy_The_Consensus_Model_and_Swedish_Disability_Politics
19. Summary of Lijphart: Patterns of democracy, https://adambrown.info/p/notes/lijphart_patterns_of_democracy
20. Taking the multidimensionality of democracy seriously: institutional, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/european-political-science-review/article/taking-the-multidimensionality-of-democracy-seriously-institutional-patterns-and-the-quality-of-democracy/C80BD0957DB1EEF809FD2051FCF79E08
21. Electoral choices for divided societies:, https://aceproject.org/ero-en/topics/elections-security/bogaards.pdf
22. Democracy in divided societies: Electoral engineering for conflict, https://www.academia.edu/3601020/Democracy_in_divided_societies_Electoral_engineering_for_conflict_management
23. Cross-Ethnic Voting: An Index of Centripetal Electoral Systems, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/government-and-opposition/article/crossethnic-voting-an-index-of-centripetal-electoral-systems/D70A516989249E79FB418FBA2FB15378
24. Power Sharing in the Asia-Pacific - EconStor, https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/103652/1/798142227.pdf
25. Conciliatory Institutions and Constitutional Processes in Post, https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2516&context=faculty_scholarship
26. DEMOCRACY IN DIVIDED SOCIETIES:, https://aceproject.org/ero-en/topics/elections-security/Reilly_Electoral_Systems_and_conflict_management.pdf
27. Electoral Systems for Divided Societies, https://researchportal.murdoch.edu.au/view/pdfCoverPage?instCode=61MUN_INST&filePid=13136711860007891&download=true
28. Sustainable policy performance and types of governance, https://epub.ub.uni-greifswald.de/frontdoor/deliver/index/docId/10704/file/European_Policy_Analysis_2022_Jahn.pdf
29. How Athens Created Democracy (And Broke It Twice) - Spoken Past, https://spokenpast.com/articles/rise-fall-athenian-democracy-lessons-today/
30. [DOC] The Challenges to Athenian Democracy.docx - Academia.edu, https://www.academia.edu/33601478/The_Challenges_to_Athenian_Democracy_docx
31. The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes - dokumen.pub, https://dokumen.pub/the-athenian-democracy-in-the-age-of-demosthenes-structure-principles-and-ideology-0631138226-1631180176.html
32. Rethinking Athenian Democracy - DASH (Harvard), https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstreams/7b597d3d-2b72-4be1-a1a9-d4b28bb037ed/download

33. Democracy When the People Are Thinking, https://www.amphilsoc.org/sites/default/files/2020-03/attachments/Fishkin.pdf
34. Scienze dell'economia civile. Governance, istituzioni e storia, https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/server/api/core/bitstreams/62952a6b-58e9-41ad-8d4b-0a0c974def75/content
35. 2 Democratic Collapse and Recovery in Ancient Athens (413–403), https://academic.oup.com/book/56192/chapter/443479365
36. Sortition in politics: from history to contemporary democracy, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02606755.2025.2530916
37. Untitled - OAPEN Library, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/20.500.12657/117345/1/9798216286967.pdf
38. Athenian Democracy and Legal Change | American Political, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/athenian-democracy-and-legal-change/782142CB282929702E739FD92B20014A
39. MANIN, Bernard The Principles of Representative Government, https://presencial.moodle.ufsc.br/pluginfile.php/1568277/mod_resource/content/0/MANIN%2C%20Bernard%20The%20Principles%20of%20Representative%20Government%20Themes%20in%20the%20Social%20Sciences%20%201997.pdf
40. Sortition in politics: from history to contemporary democracy, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02606755.2025.2530916
41. New Venice - MicroWiki, https://micronations.wiki/wiki/New_Venice
42. Studies in the history of Venice, https://dn790001.ca.archive.org/0/items/historyofvenice01browiala/historyofvenice01browiala.pdf
43. Republic of Venice - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Republic_of_Venice
44. How did the Republic of Venice manage to control Athens ... - Quora, https://www.quora.com/How-did-the-Republic-of-Venice-manage-to-control-Athens-and-Greece-in-general
45. 64% Majority rule in Ducal Venice: Voting for the Doge, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226938965_64_Majority_rule_in_Ducal_Venice_Voting_for_the_Doge
46. The History and Structure of Athenian Democracy (Chapter 1), https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/ancient-and-modern-democracy/history-and-structure-of-athenian-democracy/AE1D0B53110E298A719DB0B034C506E3
47. The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes - Open Library, https://openlibrary.org/books/OL383946M/The_Athenian_democracy_in_the_age_of_Demosthenes
48. Institutionalizing deliberative mini-publics? Issues of legitimacy and, https://democracyinstitute.osu.edu/sites/default/files/2024-04/Courant%20%282022%29%2C%20Institutionalizing%20deliberative%20mini-publics%5B88%5D.pdf
49. Multi-Body Sortition - Participedia, https://participedia.net/method/multi-body-sortition

50. Sortition - Cloudfront.net, https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/sortitionfoundation/pages/675/attachments/original/1607614921/Sortition_Foundation_Resource_Guide_for_Educators.pdf?1607614921
51. Embedding Multi-Body Sortition, https://democracyrd.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/PDF-Guia3-Proposals-2-Multi-bodySortition.pdf
52. Bulls-Eye: Why Democracy by Lottery is Right for DSA - New Politics, https://newpol.org/bulls-eye-why-democracy-by-lottery-is-right-for-dsa/
53. Assembly Guide Overview, https://assemblyguide.demnext.org/
54. Shortcut 7 - The Ostbelgien Model - Bertelsmann Stiftung, https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/en/our-projects/democracy-and-participation-in-europe/shortcut-archive/shortcut-7-the-ostbelgien-model
55. Permanent Sortition in Eupen, Belgium - Participedia, https://participedia.net/case/permanent-sortition-in-belgiumongoing
56. 'Deliberative democracy makes citizens happy' – Interviews, https://www.ips-journal.eu/interviews/deliberative-democracy-makes-citizens-happy-3470/
57. Citizens Assemblies an international comparison - Scottish Parliament, https://www.parliament.scot/chamber-and-committees/research-prepared-for-parliament/research-briefings/redirect/2022/2/1/12a76138-5174-11ea-8828-000d3a23af40