SY-02 The case against sortition and deliberation

Deliberative democracy and selection by lot (sortition) have emerged across contemporary political philosophy as premier structural remedies for the failures of modern electoral representation. Advocates contend that replacing or supplementing competitive elections with randomly selected citizens' assemblies ("mini-publics" or "lottocracies") dismantles political careerism, breaks donor cartels, eliminates party polarization, and secures authentic political equality through descriptive representation.

This report evaluates the systemic, historical, and behavioral critique of these mechanisms. It synthesizes theoretical arguments on democratic legitimacy and institutional incentives, reviews empirical evidence on recruitment attrition and organizer intervention, evaluates the historical record of pre-modern lotteries, subjects sortition bodies to psychological capture tests, maps operational limits across a scale ladder from the household to the global population, and assesses the minimum viable institutional architecture required under conditions of industrial and technological collapse.

1. Theoretical Critiques: Epistemic Failure, Democratic Alienation, and Non-Accountability

The Anti-Democratic Shortcuts: Lafont and Urbinati

The normative defense of sortition depends on an epistemic claim: that a randomly selected sample of citizens, exposed to balanced technical briefings and facilitated debate, produces an accurate counterfactual portrait of what the wider citizenry would conclude if granted identical deliberative conditions.

In *Democracy without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy* (2020), Cristina Lafont demonstrates that delegating binding political authority to mini-publics undermines democratic self-government[1]. In any large society, delegating sovereign decisions to a sorted sample means that the non-selected majority—who neither took part in the deliberation nor authorized the delegates—must defer blindly to an unchosen cohort[1]. Lafont terms this a "shortcut": bypassing the broad, participatory labor of collective will-formation in the public sphere in favor of a synthetic consensus produced in a managed room[1].

In an electoral democracy, an institutional chain of justification links voters, competing parties, programmatic platforms, and accountable officials:

Governance Stage	Electoral-Representative Chain	Lottocratic Mini-Public Dynamic
Selection Mode	Universal suffrage; choice among competing public	Algorithmic draw; passive receipt of civic summons[5].

	programs[4].	
Delegate Agency	Programmatic mandate backed by party organization[4].	Atomized individual conscience; unbonded delegates[4].
Electorate Role	Continuous scrutiny and retrospective sanction[7].	Passive spectatorship; blind deference to unchosen peers[1].
Will-Formation	Discursive competition across civil society and mass media[1].	Enclosed laboratory debate curated by facilitators[5].

This structure generates democratic alienation[1]. Because participants in an intensive deliberative assembly experience an information-dense environment that changes their views, they diverge from the broader population from which they were drawn[5]. When these delegates declare a policy consensus, the wider public has not undergone that cognitive shift[2]. For the non-selected majority, accepting the mini-public's decision requires surrendering their reflective political judgment and trusting a group whose sole qualification is that their numbers were picked by lot[1].

Cristina Lafont and Nadia Urbinati in *The Lottocratic Mentality: Defending Democracy against Lottocracy* (2024) extend this critique, showing that sortition theorists conflate an equal mathematical probability of selection with democratic political equality[4]. In an electoral republic, universal suffrage gives every citizen an equal right to sanction power and shape the ideological spectrum by choosing between programs[4]. Lottocracy replaces this collective, omnilateral political agency with statistical lottery odds[4]. This shift reduces democracy to an allotment where an unelected fraction exercises unilateral power over everyone else without standing before an electorate to justify their decisions[4].

Furthermore, Lafont and Urbinati note that lottocracy reduces politics to technocratic problem-solving[9]. It rests on the technopopulist premise that an objective, non-partisan "common sense" solution exists for structural disputes, waiting to be unlocked once ordinary people are separated from political parties[5]. In doing so, sortition advocates obscure the essential nature of self-governance: negotiating irreconcilable values, conflicting material interests, and rival visions of justice[11].

The Epistemic Defense of Elections: Landa and Pevnick

Sortition proponents argue that electoral systems are corrupted by donor money, short-term electoral pandering, and rational voter ignorance, whereas randomized lots harness cognitive diversity free from electoral pressures. Dimitri Landa and Ryan Pevnick challenge this view in "Representative Democracy as Defensible Epistocracy" (2020) and "Is Random Selection a Cure for the Ills of Electoral Representation?" (2021)[4].

Landa and Pevnick demonstrate that representative democracies generate epistemic benefits through two core mechanisms that lottocracies lack[8]:

First, electoral contests provide selection mechanisms: open campaigns incentivize prospective leaders to demonstrate executive competence, formulate public agendas, and submit their arguments to public scrutiny[8]. While imperfect, competitive elections filter out extreme incompetence more effectively than random selection, which draws individuals indiscriminately from across the entire variance of political skill and emotional stability[8].

Second, regular elections create treatment mechanisms: the ongoing prospect of facing voter approval forces elected representatives to acquire specialized knowledge, build legislative institutions, and monitor administrative bureaucracies[7].

Under sortition, these treatment mechanisms break down[7]. Because sorted delegates serve non-renewable, term-limited tenures and face no re-election test, they have zero electoral incentive to invest the effort required to master complex regulatory matters or resist organized interest groups[7].

Landa and Pevnick emphasize that removing the re-election motive does not eliminate perverse incentives; it removes the primary institutional tool that aligns a representative's interests with the public good[7]. Once a sorted citizen takes office, private corporations, ideological lobbies, and administrative bureaucracies can sway them with post-tenure career opportunities, consultancy retainers, or social prestige—influences that voters cannot punish at the ballot box[7].

As a result, an assembly of randomly selected novices is outmatched by the permanent bureaucracy and professional lobbying apparatus, both of which possess permanent institutional memory, dedicated legal resources, and information monopolies[7].

The Distributive and Relational Critique: Umbers

In "Against Lottocracy" (2021), Lachlan Montgomery Umbers analyzes the moral claim that holding public office is an indivisible social good that should be distributed via an egalitarian lottery[6]. Standard principles of distributive justice require allocating a good by fair lottery only under three conditions:

1. Several individuals hold positive, valid moral claims to the good[6].
2. Their claims are of roughly equal strength[6].
3. The good is indivisible, making an equal distribution of the good impossible[6].

Umbers demonstrates that public office is not an indivisible benefit or consumption good that an individual has a claim to enjoy[6]. Political office is an instrument of coercive power exercised over other people[6]. No individual possesses an egalitarian moral claim to exercise coercive rule over their peers[6].

To show the ethical hazard of treating public power as a lottery prize, Umbers offers an analogy: consider a group where, every day, one randomly selected person is given the legal power to enslave another randomly selected person for 24 hours[6]. The equal statistical odds of being chosen master do not make this relational hierarchy acceptable[6].

Sortition creates an arbitrary power asymmetry: an unvetted fraction of citizens gains coercive legislative authority over millions of their peers without having demonstrated relevant skills,

without advancing public commitments, and without bearing any formal accountability to the people bound by their laws[2]. Universal suffrage, by contrast, preserves political equality by giving every citizen an equal vote to hold rulers accountable, ensuring that public power remains tied to collective consent[4].

Epistemic and Deliberative Pathologies: Sanders and Sunstein

The deliberative model assumes that in an unconstrained setting, participants exchange reasons, evaluate arguments dispassionately, and arrive at the common good. Lynn Sanders, in "Against Deliberation" (1997), showed that this ideal functions as an exclusionary standard[18]. Historically and sociologically, formal deliberation favors an elite conversational style that values detached, linear, academic argumentation while discounting emotional appeals, personal testimony, and expressions of collective outrage[19].

Within deliberative forums, participants possessing higher educational status, managerial confidence, and social capital dominate discussion time and frame conclusions[19]. Working-class participants and marginalized minorities frequently encounter testimonial injustice: their contributions are viewed as subjective complaints, leading them to defer to high-status members[19].

Small-group deliberation also triggers the law of group polarization identified by Cass Sunstein (2002). When individuals who share an initial leaning deliberate together, their views do not moderate toward the political center; they shift toward an extreme version of their starting assumptions. This occurs because internal debate reinforces the dominant pool of arguments, and participants engage in social comparison to signal commitment to group values. Rather than producing epistemic balance, insulated deliberation frequently hardens partisan assumptions, marginalizes dissenting viewpoints, and allows dominant voices to direct the final consensus.

2. Procedural and Empirical Pathologies of Deliberative Mini-Publics

The Non-Response Cliff: The 90–95% Refusal Problem

The empirical case for sortition rests on achieving descriptive representation through random sampling. In actual practice, this claim collapses during recruitment. While algorithms can generate representative rosters of names, they encounter high refusal rates when citizens are asked to serve[5]. Across mini-publics documented by the OECD (2020, 2023), refusal rates regularly fall between 90% and 97%[5].

Deliberative Mini-Public	Initial Invitation Pool	Positive Responses / Contacted	Final Assembly Size	Acceptance / Response Rate	Source

Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat (France, 2019–2020)	255,000–300,000 phone numbers dialed	11,400 screened contacts	150 participants	~4.5% of screened contacts (<0.06% of pool)	[22]
Climate Assembly UK (United Kingdom, 2020)	30,000 invitation letters	~1,500 initial opt-ins	108 participants	~5.0% response rate	[25]
Irish Citizens' Assembly (Ireland, 2016–2018)	Household random walks	Pre-screened telephone pool	99 participants (+1 chair)	3.0%–8.0% general baseline response	[21]
OECD Deliberative Database (Global, 2020/2023)	Multi-jurisdiction	289+ deliberative cases	Variable (avg. 40–150)	In ~90% of cases, ~90% of invitations were declined	[5]

Organizers mitigate this non-response cliff using stratified quota sampling: from the small share (3% to 10%) of the public that agrees to serve, algorithms select a cohort matching census demographics for age, gender, education, and geography[5].

This stratification creates an illusion of descriptive representation[5]. Correcting for observable census categories exacerbates unobservable psychological, temperamental, and ideological self-selection[5]. The 5% of citizens willing to sacrifice weekends, travel to distant venues, and engage in fifty hours of structured debate possess atypical civic efficacy, leisure time, social confidence, and ideological motivation[5].

In the French *Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat* (CCC), academic evaluators found that assembly participants entered the process with a baseline environmental concern rating of 8.95 out of 10, compared to a general population average of 7.87[30].

Stratification disguises this bias behind a cross-section of census metrics[5]. The resulting body

does not reflect a representative public, but an assembly of civic hobbyists, retired professionals, and committed activists whose underlying outlooks diverge from the wider population[5].

Organizer Manipulation: Framing, Expert Selection, and Facilitation

A mini-public is an artificial environment managed by external actors: commissioning governments, unelected secretariats, polling firms, and facilitation consultancies[10]. Because ordinary citizens lack independent staff, legal training, or personal policy expertise, they rely heavily on the cognitive framework designed by these organizers[7].

This dependence introduces systemic vulnerabilities across three distinct operational stages:

Deliberative Stage	Structural Capture Vulnerability	Operational Mechanism	Institutional Consequence
Input Phase: Agenda Framing	Commissioning body and permanent secretariat set the formal remit[10].	Questions are framed to exclude systemic critique or steer debate toward pre-approved options[10].	Topics are restricted to managerial questions, deflecting challenges to political and corporate power[10].
Throughput Phase: Evidence Curation	Permanent secretariat and academic advisory board control witness selection[10].	Deciding which viewpoints count as "expert evidence" vs. "partisan dogma"[10].	Technical options that diverge from elite consensus are excluded from briefings[10].
Throughput Phase: Facilitation Steering	Professional facilitators manage breakout conversations and summaries[10].	Facilitators guide time allocation, rephrase verbal contributions, and control whiteboards[10].	Subtle facilitator intervention steers consensus, operating below participants' conscious threshold[10].
Output Phase: Synthesis & Drafting	Legal advisers and secretariats draft the final statutory language[10].	Translating broad citizen resolutions into concrete legislative text[10].	Complex proposals are altered to fit existing regulatory and administrative priorities[10].

Empirical research on the Ostbelgien Model—a permanent citizens' council in the German-speaking community of Belgium—confirms that agenda setting and evidence selection remain vulnerable to administrative influence[10]. Even where a citizens' council possesses formal authority to pick topics, the permanent secretariat filters submissions, guiding members toward safe bureaucratic subjects and away from decisions that could disrupt established regional arrangements[10].

Furthermore, administrators in Ostbelgien conceded that they struggled to secure diverse outside witnesses, relying on a narrow circle of academics who shared the organizers' baseline policy assumptions[10].

"Deliberative Washing" and Harmless Containment: The Fate of the CCC

Political executives frequently initiate deliberative mini-publics not to surrender authority, but to deploy "deliberative washing" and manage political crises[5]. Faced with civil unrest or unpopular policy choices, governments convene citizens' assemblies to absorb public anger, delay immediate action, and neutralize street mobilizations[5].

The trajectory of France's *Convention Citoyenne pour le Climat* illustrates this dynamic[22]. Convened by President Emmanuel Macron in 2019 to resolve the *Gilets Jaunes* (Yellow Vests) revolt—which was sparked by a fuel tax—the CCC brought together 150 sorted citizens[22]. Macron publicly pledged that the assembly's proposals would be submitted "without filter" (*sans filtre*) to parliament, directly to a public referendum, or enacted through executive decrees[32].

The CCC met over seven weekend sessions, consulted administrative experts, and drafted a 556-page final report containing 149 policy recommendations[22]. The subsequent legislative process systematically pruned these proposals:

Macron immediately invoked three "jokers" to veto proposals establishing a 4% tax on corporate dividends, a 110 km/h speed limit on motorways, and constitutional amendments prioritizing ecological defense over economic growth[23].

The remaining proposals were routed to ministries, where business lobbies altered their implementation timelines. When the *Loi Climat et Résilience* passed in 2021, legal analysts and assembly members determined that fewer than 10% to 20% of the recommendations were enacted in their original, substantive form, while over 70% were diluted, delayed, or stripped of enforcement mechanisms[23]. In February 2021, an evaluation conducted by the citizens gave the French government a score of 2.5 out of 10 for its fidelity to their work[32].

The CCC revealed the structural weakness of advisory sortition[23]. The assembly allowed the executive to defuse street protests under the banner of civic dialogue, while preserving the state's unilateral authority to reject, edit, or adopt proposals to suit its existing policy agenda[5]. Mini-publics act as shock absorbers: they channel popular unrest into managed deliberative rooms, while leaving final legislative veto power in elite hands[5].

3. Historical Sortition: Myth, Practice, and Modern

Historiography

Sortition advocates regularly cite Classical Athens, Renaissance Venice, and Renaissance Florence as historical evidence that civic lotteries reliably prevent oligarchy. A closer examination of primary documents and modern historiography reveals that historical sortition was paired with elite filtering, designed to protect aristocratic interests, or captured by disciplined factions.

Historical Polity	The Stated Ideological Ideal	Archival & Primary Record	Modern Historiographical Finding
Classical Athens (5th–4th C. BCE)	Universal equality; "to rule and be ruled in turn"; lottery as the definitive democratic selection mechanism.	Strict pre-lottery judicial exam (*dokimasia*); post-tenure audit (*euthynai*); self-selection of participants; complete exclusion of women, metics, and slaves (85% excluded).	Formal sortition operated under the informal epistocracy of elite rhetoricians (*rhetores*); administrative dependence on wealthy magistracies (Hansen 1991; Ober 1989).
Republic of Venice (1268–1797)	Gasparo Contarini's *Mito di Venezia*: interleaved lot and ballot eliminates ambition, stabilizes the mixed constitution, and checks factionalism[34].	Confined to the hereditary patriciate (*Serrata* of 1297); open vote-brokering on the *broglio*; supreme power concentrated in the secret Council of Ten (*I Primi*)[34].	Sortition functioned as an intra-oligarchic pacification mechanism, distributing offices among poor nobles (*Barnabotti*) to prevent revolts within the ruling caste (Finlay 1981)[34].
Republic of Florence (1328–1530)	Leonardo Bruni's republican defense of civic liberty (*libertas*); broad guild participation	Severe pre-screening (*scrutinio*); partisan electoral committees	The *tratte* dismantled corporate guild autonomy; sortition provided an

	in the *Signoria* via allotment from bags (*borse*)[37].	(*accoppiatori*) tampered with bags and suspended lots under executive decree (*a mano*)[37].	egalitarian front for the Medici patronage machine to dominate communal offices (Najemy 1982; Rubinstein 1966)[37].

Classical Athens (5th–4th Century BCE)

Athenian democracy is widely cited as the historical blueprint for egalitarian sortition, where citizens were selected using mechanical allotment stones (*kleroteria*) to staff the Council of 500 (*Boule*), the courts (*dikasteria*), and civic boards[36].

Athenian democratic ideology, articulated in Pericles' Funeral Oration (Thucydides, Book II) and Aristotle's *Politics* (Book VI), proclaimed that every citizen was equally capable of sharing in civic rule (*en merei archein kai archesthai*). Allotment was celebrated as the defining mechanism of the demos, neutralizing aristocratic lineage and wealth, whereas election was recognized as an aristocratic procedure favoring social status.

The primary institutional record (Aristotle, *Constitution of the Athenians*; Hansen 1991) demonstrates that allotment operated within strict exclusionary parameters:

First, civic participation excluded women, resident aliens (*metics*), and enslaved populations; the governing citizen body comprised only 30,000 to 40,000 adult males within an Attica population exceeding 250,000 to 300,000 (an inclusion rate of roughly 12% to 15%).

Second, the lot was drawn only from citizens who voluntarily submitted their bronze name-plates (*pinakia*), creating a self-selected pool of participants.

Third, before taking an allotted seat, every nominee had to pass a judicial examination (*dokimasia*) assessing tax payments, military service, and ancestral background. Upon completing their annual tenure, every magistrate was subjected to a financial audit and political review (*euthynai*), during which any citizen could bring criminal accusations punishable by exile, heavy fines, or execution.

Crucially, the offices requiring specialized expertise—the board of ten military generals (*strategoi*) and the senior financial overseers (*tamiai*)—were strictly filled by election, never by lot.

Modern scholarship by Mogens Herman Hansen (1991) in *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* and Josiah Ober (1989) in *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens* establishes that Athenian governance relied on an informal division of labor. While sorted citizens sat in passive judgment in the *Boule* and courts, the public agenda was set by an elite tier of wealthy orators (*rhetores*). Wealthy patricians trained in rhetoric shaped debate and drafted statutory decrees. Rather than establishing cognitive equality, Athenian sortition created a theatrical stage where competing elite factions vied for the approval of a non-expert, lottery-selected audience.

Renaissance Venice: The Myth of the Serenissima (1268–1797)

The Republic of Venice implemented a complex system of alternating sortition and indirect

balloting to select the Doge, senators, and public councils, an architecture celebrated across Europe as a model of mixed constitutional stability[34].

Gasparo Contarini's *De Magistratibus et Republica Venetorum* (1543) popularized the "Myth of Venice" (*Mito di Venezia*): the claim that the republic had eliminated factionalism and personal ambition by combining random selection with secret balloting[34]. This procedure was said to prevent any single lineage from establishing a dictatorship, securing civic balance across centuries[34].

The archival records, notably the diaries of Marino Sanuto and Girolamo Priuli, reveal that sortition did not prevent factional manipulation or eliminate hierarchy[34]. The selection machinery functioned entirely inside a closed hereditary patriciate created by the *Serrata* ("Lock-out") of 1297, which legally disenfranchised over 95% of the Venetian population[34].

Within this closed elite, selection was shaped by backstage maneuvering:

In the open loggia outside the Ducal Palace, known as the *broglio*, wealthy nobles openly traded votes, political promises, and money to influence subsequent electoral stages[34].

Real authority was concentrated in the Council of Ten (*Consiglio dei Dieci*) and the *Collegio*, which met in secret, bypassed larger assemblies, maintained domestic informant networks, and preserved patrician privilege[34].

Robert Finlay (1981) in *Politics in Renaissance Venice* demonstrated that Venetian sortition did not equalize power, but preserved an oligarchy[34]. By randomizing initial nominations, the constitution prevented any single dynasty from seizing power, while keeping authority concentrated within an inner circle of roughly one hundred patrician families (*i Primi*)[34]. Sortition was an intra-elite pacification mechanism: it granted impoverished nobles (*Barnabotti*) an equal statistical shot at administrative offices, securing elite unity while keeping the rest of the city excluded[34].

Renaissance Florence: The Accoppiatori and the Medici (1328–1530)

Florence introduced selection by lot (*tratte*) in 1328 for the *Signoria* (the executive council) and other communal offices, storing the names of eligible citizens in leather pouches (*borse*) held in the sacristy of Santa Croce[37].

Florentine humanists, led by Leonardo Bruni, celebrated the *tratte* as the protector of republican liberty (*libertas*) and guild equality. Any citizen enrolled in the guilds who paid his civic taxes could see his name placed in the pouches, supposedly ensuring that public authority rotated fairly and remained free from factional control.

Communal records and tax rosters show that this sortition process was repeatedly circumvented by political screening (*scrutinio*)[37]:

Every few years, an electoral committee vetted the population, deciding whose names could enter the bags[37].

Following Cosimo de' Medici's return from exile in 1434, the Medici faction captured this selection system through the *accoppiatori*—the officials appointed to oversee the draws[37].

Rather than drawing names impartially, the *accoppiatori* employed multiple pouches, set aside unfavorable chits under manufactured tax pretexts, or discarded the lottery entirely (*a mano*) under armed pressure from the Medicean *Balia*[37].

John M. Najemy (1982) in *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics, 1280–1400* showed that Florentine sortition was initially adopted by the commercial elite to undermine guild independence[37]. By shifting appointment away from internal guild election to individual lots, communal elites atomized the artisan class and broke guild solidarity[37].
Nicolai Rubinstein (1966) in *The Government of Florence under the Medici* proved that sortition served as a facade for autocratic rule. By preserving the public spectacle of drawing names from pouches, the Medici maintained the illusion of republican equality while handpicking who filled every key post, transforming the civic lottery into a tool of personal rule[37].

4. The Dark-Triad Capture Test

Governance systems must be evaluated by their capacity to resist individuals and factions exhibiting dark-triad psychological traits: narcissism (grandiose entitlement, performative exhibitionism, pursuit of dominance), Machiavellianism (strategic manipulation, deceit, exploitative calculation), and psychopathy (lack of empathy, risk tolerance, disregard for institutional norms).

Dark-Triad Trait	Target Vulnerability in Sortition & Deliberation	Primary Infiltration & Subversion Vector	Documented Historical Manifestation
Narcissism	Informal conversational dynamics; absence of institutionalized partisan opposition in small groups[10].	Dominates speaking time; weaponizes performative empathy; shames dissenting members into silence[19].	Athenian demagogues: Cleon and Alcibiades swaying the *ekklesia* and *boule* through charismatic rhetoric.
Machiavellianism	The structural accountability vacuum; non-renewable, term-limited tenures; lack of re-election checks[7].	Co-opts sorted delegates through post-tenure commercial contracts, career promises, and back-channel favors[7].	Florentine *accoppiatori*; Cosimo de' Medici extending loans to guildsmen entering the *Signoria*[37].
Psychopathy	Reliance on permanent	Infiltrates the unelected	Venetian Council of Ten (*I Primi*); covert

	secretariats, facilitation firms, and expert advisory panels[10].	administrative apparatus to control the agenda, expert testimony, and drafting[10].	security organs directing broad councils[34].

Infiltration Vector 1: Informal Conversational Hierarchy

Sortition assemblies replace structured political debate with informal conversational deliberation[10]. In unconstrained small-group deliberation, space is quickly dominated by narcissistic individuals[19]. Without an organized opposition party to scrutinize assertions, ordinary delegates regularly defer to assertive, high-status peers[19].

A narcissistic or charismatic actor exploits this unconstrained setting through targeted conversational tactics:

By intervening early, speaking with unearned confidence, and claiming their personal preferences reflect the consensus, they frame the group's agenda[19].

They weaponize emotional anecdotes to capture the room's moral sympathies, sidelining dry technical data or economic constraints[19].

When other participants disagree, the narcissistic actor frames that dissent as a lack of solidarity, bad faith, or civic apathy, using peer pressure inside the room to suppress objections[19].

Thucydides illustrates this vulnerability in his account of the Sicilian Expedition (415 BCE). Alcibiades used his aristocratic pedigree, charisma, and narcissism to push the Athenian assembly into an expedition that ended in disaster. Similarly, Cleon used aggressive, theatrical rhetoric to sideline moderates like Nicias, proving that without institutionalized parties to maintain opposition discipline, lottery-selected or mass deliberative assemblies defer to dominant personalities.

Infiltration Vector 2: The Accountability Vacuum and Post-Tenure Payoffs

A Machiavellian operator exploits the core institutional flaw of sortition: *delegates face zero electoral consequences for their votes*[7].

An elected official planning to seek re-election must defend their record before a broad constituency, creating an incentive to avoid overt betrayals of public trust[7]. A sorted citizen serves a single, non-renewable term, leaving office without facing a public performance review[7].

A Machiavellian faction targets this vulnerability through back-channel incentives:

Agents approach selected delegates privately, offering post-service employment, corporate consulting contracts, or business assistance that takes effect after the assembly concludes[7].

Factional operators provide compliant delegates with targeted research, talking points, and draft language, helping them influence uncommitted peers in closed sessions.

Because delegates do not face voters, the personal cost of endorsing special-interest measures approaches zero[2].

This dynamic characterized the Medici subversion of the Florentine *tratte*[37]. Cosimo de' Medici extended financial loans and business alliances to lesser guildsmen whose names were in the eligibility pouches[37]. When their chits were drawn for the *Signoria*, these officials supported Medici interests, knowing that once their two-month terms ended, their personal fortunes depended on the Medici banking network[37].

Infiltration Vector 3: Capture of the Administrative Apparatus

A psychopathic or Machiavellian actor recognizes that lobbying hundreds of individual assembly members is inefficient compared to controlling the permanent administrative machinery: the secretariat, the facilitator coordinators, and the advisory boards[10].

Administrative capture proceeds through quiet institutional positioning:

Operators secure positions within the permanent secretariat that selects expert witnesses, frames briefing books, and schedules sessions[10].

They choose "independent" experts whose testimonies share a specific policy orientation, framing dissenting empirical findings as fringe positions to guide non-expert participants toward a pre-selected outcome[10].

During the final drafting phase, when participants face fatigue and information overload, administrative staff offer pre-written statutory text, ensuring that the final output aligns with the bureaucracy's goals[10].

This administrative dominance matched the methods of the Venetian Council of Ten[35]. While the Great Council and its complex lotteries maintained an appearance of broad patrician participation, a small circle of oligarchs (*I Primi*) controlled the judicial bureaucracy, intelligence apparatus, and state secretariats, running an administrative oligarchy behind an elaborate procedural facade[34].

5. The Scale Ledger: Scope and Failure Thresholds

Governance structures function within definite demographic limits. Procedures that resolve conflicts in face-to-face communities break down when scaled to regional watersheds; systems designed for millions prove dysfunctional inside a village.

The ledger below maps the operational limits of sortition and deliberation across eight demographic tiers:

Scale Rung	Population Span	Operational Status	Working Historical & Contemporary Mechanics	Primary Failure Mode & Limiting Bottleneck
Household	4–10 people	**Inapplicable / Failed**	Sortition never sustained; direct informal kin-negotiation and elder	**Sample size failure (N too small).** Random draws

			authority dominate.	undermine parental responsibility, yield zero cognitive diversity, and spark personal friction.
Hamlet / Band	30–50 people	**Inapplicable / Failed**	Face-to-face consensus assemblies and elder councils. Sortition historically absent.	**Informational redundancy.** In an immediate band, everyone's character and skills are known; deciding matters by lot is viewed as an evasion of judgment.
Village	150–500 people	**Marginal / Rotational Only**	Allotment used solely for low-discretion civic burdens (fire-watch, ditch clearance, pasture rotation).	**Competence asymmetry & interpersonal faction.** Strategic choices require technical skill; selecting leaders by lot yields erratic, unvetted leadership.
Parish / District	1,500–5,000 people	**Marginal Operation**	Selection of local jury panels, parish constables,	**Elite evasion & substitution.** Wealthy landholders

			and road wardens from landholder rosters.	pay fines to avoid service, leaving onerous burdens on vulnerable neighbors.
Town / Watershed	15,000–50,000 people	**Historically Viable (With Constraints)**	Classical Athens (*Boule* of 500, *dikasteria*); Renaissance Florence (*Signoria*); pre-modern city-states.	**Exclusion requirement & demagogic capture.** Demands an excluded underclass (85%) to fund stipends; open to manipulation by elite orators (*rhetores*).
Region / Bioregion	500,000–5,000,000 people	**Consultative Only / Failed Lawmaking**	Regional mini-publics (Ostbelgien Model, British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform)[10].	**Administrative capture.** Total dependence on permanent secretariats; 90%+ non-response bias; zero autonomous enforcement power[5].
Nation / Continent	50,000,000–500,000,000 people	**Symbolic Only / Executive Veto**	National citizens' assemblies (French CCC, UK Climate Assembly, Irish	**Democratic illegitimacy & executive pruning.** The 99.999% non-selected

			Citizens' Assembly)[22].	public rejects blind deference; executives dilute or discard proposals[1].
Planet	8,000,000,000 people	**Impossible / Never Tried**	Hypothetical Global Citizens' Assemblies (experimental COP side-events).	**Total operational breakdown.** Irreconcilable cultural conflicts; reliance on elite global secretariats; complete democratic alienation.

Analysis of Scaling Thresholds

At the micro-scale (household to village, 4 to 500 people), human interaction is governed by direct observation, reputation, and ongoing relationships. Choosing leaders by lottery is avoided here because it is counterproductive.

In a village of 300, residents know who handles livestock well, who understands water management, and who loses their temper during disputes. Resorting to a lottery discards this local knowledge, replacing demonstrated competence with a dice roll. Small communities have historically reserved sortition for allocating unpleasant chores—such as night watches or ditch maintenance—never for military command, judicial arbitration, or resource leadership.

At the meso-scale (town to watershed, 15,000 to 50,000 people), sortition reached its historical peak, exemplified by Classical Athens. Here, the citizenry is small enough to assemble in a single theater, while the ratio of offices to citizens remains high (in Athens, roughly one in six adult male citizens held an allotted post during their lifetime).

Even here, sortition depended on three specific structural conditions:

- Disenfranchisement of women, metics, and slaves, which freed male citizens from manual labor to participate in politics.
- State stipends (*misthophoria*) funded by public silver mines and imperial tribute.
- An informal epistocracy of wealthy orators who framed every major policy choice.

At the macro-scale (region to planet, 500,000 to 8 billion people), sortition faces a mathematical breakdown. The ratio of assembly seats to the general population approaches zero: an assembly of 150 members in a nation of 60 million encompasses roughly 0.00025% of

the citizenry[22].
This severing of the link between the citizen and the state means the broader public cannot hold delegates accountable, because delegates are unchosen individuals who return to private anonymity once their term ends[7].
At the same time, managing modern regulatory complexity requires expertise that lay citizens cannot acquire during a few weekend retreats[7]. Real power moves into the hands of the permanent bureaucracy: the unelected organizers, facilitators, and academic advisers who select the materials, run the meetings, and draft the final reports[10].

6. Proponent Defenses, Concessions, and Unresolved Counters

A rigorous analysis of sortition must weigh the core arguments advanced by its leading advocates—including Hélène Landemore, James Fishkin, Alexander Guerrero, and Samuel Bagg—and identify where the critique holds versus where sortition literature provides compelling answers.

Core Critical Objection	Proponent Counter-Argument	Critical Resolution & Analytic Reality
Accountability Deficit: Voters cannot remove or sanction sorted representatives who fail them[7].	Samuel Bagg (2024): Restrict sortition to negative veto and oversight duties rather than positive lawmaking[40].	**Valid concession.** Sortition works as an anti-corruption veto, but this abandons the broader claim for full sovereign lottocracy[40].
Competence Deficit: Lay citizens cannot master technical modern policy matters[8].	James Fishkin (2018): Deliberative Polling shows citizens learn quickly when given balanced briefing packs[38].	**Incomplete defense.** Deliberation changes minds, but this creates an epistemic gap between delegates and the public[1].
Non-Response Bias: 90%–95% refuse invitations, destroying sample representativeness[5].	Hélène Landemore (2020): Stratified quota sampling secures greater diversity than billionaire parliaments[4].	**Flawed defense.** Stratification fixes census demographics while concentrating atypical, high-efficacy participants[5].
Democratic Alienation: The non-selected majority must blindly defer to an unelected few[1].	Alexander Guerrero (2014, 2024): Specialized single-issue assemblies develop deep	**Unresolved.** Specialized single-issue bodies are vulnerable to industry capture and lack

	competence[3].	budget-balancing coordination[3].

Concessions Made by Critics

Critics of sortition concede several genuine defects in contemporary electoral systems:

- **Aristocratic Bias of Elections:** As Bernard Manin (1997) proved, competitive elections favor candidates with greater personal wealth, higher social status, and professional polish[3]. Sortition regularly delivers wider descriptive diversity across class, gender, and ethnicity than modern parliaments[22].
- **Elimination of Campaign Finance Corruption:** Sortition eliminates the need for political fundraising, shielding delegates from donor pressure and corporate political action committees during their tenure.
- **Reduction of Interpersonal Polarization:** In small-group settings removed from partisan media, citizens listen to one another and often modify their initial positions in good faith[28].
- **Gerrymandering Immunity:** Random lotteries cannot be geographically manipulated or suppressed through voting-district boundary packing.

Proponent Counter-Arguments and Why the Critique Holds

Samuel Bagg (*The Dispersion of Power*, 2024; AJPS 2022) concedes to Lafont, Landa, and Pevnick that giving sorted assemblies full legislative power leads to bureaucratic capture, competence gaps, and democratic illegitimacy[2]. Bagg instead advocates using sortition as an anti-corruption check:

Rather than sovereign lawmakers, sorted citizen panels should serve as targeted veto bodies to block elite conflicts of interest[40].

These juries can oversee campaign finance rules, draw electoral district lines, audit administrative regulators, and exercise vetoes where elected politicians face obvious self-dealing incentives[40].

Bagg's model represents a well-grounded adaptation of sortition theory. By shifting the role of the lot from sovereign lawmaking to a regulatory check, it avoids the hardest objections regarding policy competence and the accountability deficit[40].

However, this is an explicit retreat from the broader claims of "lottocracy" and "open democracy" advanced by theorists like David Van Reybrouck and Hélène Landemore. It concedes that sortition cannot serve as the foundation of sovereign governance, operating only as a specialized check inside an established constitutional architecture[40].

Hélène Landemore (*Open Democracy*, 2020) and James Fishkin (*Democracy When the People Are Thinking*, 2018) argue that political representation should be understood as a descriptive, deliberative reflection of the polity rather than an electoral sanctioning contract[4]. Fishkin shows across dozens of Deliberative Polls that when ordinary citizens receive balanced briefings and cross-examine panels of experts, they master policy trade-offs and moderate their partisan reflexes[38].

While Fishkin's empirical data on in-room learning is sound, it illustrates the exact problem identified by critics: the participants learn because they are placed in a high-resource

educational enclosure curated by professional organizers[38].
This deliberation creates an epistemic gap between the assembly and the wider electorate[5]. When these delegates present their final consensus, the 95% of citizens outside the room, who did not experience that intensive briefing, view the assembly's output as an out-of-touch compromise[1].
Deliberation changes minds, but in doing so, it destroys the assembly's claim to represent the contemporary outlook of the wider public[5].
Alexander Guerrero (*Lottocracy: Democracy Without Elections*, 2024) addresses the competence critique by proposing to replace general parliaments with twenty or more single-issue legislative assemblies (covering agriculture, healthcare, trade, energy), each staffed by hundreds of sorted citizens serving multi-year terms[3].
This single-issue specialization worsens capture vulnerabilities[3]. As Landa and Pevnick demonstrate, a single-issue assembly focused solely on food policy or mining regulation, composed of ordinary citizens serving single terms without party backing, is vulnerable to concentrated corporate lobbying[7].
Lacking party support or an organized constituency, delegates face post-tenure career incentives from the very industries they are assigned to regulate[7].
Furthermore, fracturing legislation across isolated single-issue panels prevents trade-offs across priorities: it makes balancing national budgets, trading off defense against social programs, and establishing coherent public spending impossible.

7. Ten-Line Summary of Robust Findings

1. Sortition severs the core mechanism of democratic accountability: citizens cannot remove or sanction sorted representatives who betray their interests[7].
2. Mini-public recruitment encounters a severe refusal cliff, with 90% to 95% of invited citizens declining to participate[5].
3. Stratified quota sampling balances observable demographics while concentrating atypical participants with high civic efficacy and leisure time[5].
4. Intensive deliberation changes participants' views, creating an epistemic gap between delegates and the broader public they were chosen to mirror[5].
5. Requiring the wider public to accept the binding decisions of a tiny, randomly chosen cohort demands blind deference rather than democratic self-determination[1].
6. Real decision-making power in modern mini-publics concentrates in the unelected secretariats and facilitation consultancies that frame agendas and curate evidence[10].
7. Governments routinely deploy advisory citizen assemblies for "deliberative washing," using them to diffuse street protests while retaining veto power over actual policy[5].
8. Historical sortition in Athens, Venice, and Florence depended on structural exclusions, elite orator control, or subversion by organized factions[34].
9. In the absence of institutionalized partisan opposition, unconstrained deliberative groups are vulnerable to domination by narcissistic and charismatic personalities[19].
10. Selection by lot is viable only for distributing low-discretion, rotational tasks within small

face-to-face communities, failing as a mechanism for sovereign lawmaking at regional and national scales.

8. Contested or Open Questions

- Does a mini-public's deliberated output reflect what the general public would choose under idealized conditions, or is it an artificial outcome created by the specific briefing materials selected by organizers[1]?
- Can institutional regulations, such as lifetime post-service income bans or revolving-door restrictions, prevent private interests from capturing sorted legislators through post-tenure career offers[7]?
- Can Samuel Bagg's model of negative, sortition-based anti-corruption vetoes scale up to regional administrations without paralyzing necessary public infrastructure decisions[40]?
- If sortition were made legally mandatory, would it eliminate non-response bias, or would it flood assemblies with disengaged, resentful, and easily manipulated delegates[5]?
- Can non-digital, low-technology lottery selection mechanisms be designed to resist tampering while remaining fully transparent to an illiterate or suspicious public?

9. Core Reading List

- **Lafont, Cristina (2020).** *Democracy without Shortcuts: A Participatory Conception of Deliberative Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  Develops the foundational philosophical critique of sortition, demonstrating that empowering mini-publics forces blind deference on the excluded public and short-circuits democratic self-governance[1].
- **Landa, Dimitri, and Ryan Pevnick (2020).** "Representative Democracy as Defensible Epistocracy." *American Political Science Review*, 114(1): 1–13.
  Provides a formal political-economy defense of elections, showing that competitive campaigns generate unique selection and treatment mechanisms that foster policy competence without violating political equality[8].
- **Landa, Dimitri, and Ryan Pevnick (2021).** "Is Random Selection a Cure for the Ills of Electoral Representation?" *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 29(1): 46–72.
  Examines the institutional vulnerabilities of sortition, demonstrating how the elimination of re-election incentives leads to bureaucratic dominance and special-interest capture[4].
- **Umbers, Lachlan Montgomery (2021).** "Against Lottocracy." *European Journal of Political Theory*, 20(2): 312–334.
  Dismantles the normative claim that political office is an indivisible consumption good that should be distributed by lottery; outlines the moral harms of arbitrary, unchosen rule[6].
- **Lafont, Cristina, and Nadia Urbinati (2024).** *The Lottocratic Mentality: Defending Democracy against Lottocracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  Analyzes the technopopulist roots of sortition and shows how replacing competitive elections with civic lotteries depoliticizes value conflict and weakens popular sovereignty[9].
- **Sanders, Lynn M. (1997).** "Against Deliberation." *Political Theory*, 25(3): 347–376.

Foundational critique of deliberative dynamics, explaining how formal deliberation functions as an exclusionary discourse style that silences marginalized groups and reinforces informal hierarchies[19].

- **Finlay, Robert (1981).** *Politics in Renaissance Venice.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
  Comprehensive historical study of Venetian political practice, showing that complex lotteries coexisted with open vote-brokering and served to preserve an aristocratic oligarchy[34].
- **Najemy, John M. (1982).** *Corporatism and Consensus in Florentine Electoral Politics, 1280–1400.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
  Archival analysis of Florentine civic lotteries, revealing how communal elites deployed sortition to break guild independence and enable factional capture by the Medici network[37].
- **Bagg, Samuel (2024).** *The Dispersion of Power: Thinking Radically About Democratic Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  Develops the strongest contemporary defense of sortition by abandoning sovereign lottocracy and redefining civic lotteries as contestatory, anti-corruption vetoes[40].

10. Implementability after the Fall

Following the collapse of industrial supply chains, electrical grids, digital networks, and centralized administrative states, human communities must govern themselves using local physical resources. Under these conditions—where messages move at the speed of a runner, records are kept on parchment or stone, and subsistence depends on local agriculture—sortition and deliberation face immediate physical constraints.

Governance Level	Viable Architecture (Sortition / Deliberation)	Minimum Starting Prerequisites	Primary Early Structural Failure
Household (4–10 people)	Informal kin council; direct consensus negotiation. Sortition is completely excluded.	Common shelter; shared food storage; oral communication.	Kinship fracture; using lotteries for survival tasks is seen as an evasion of parental and familial duty.
Village (300 people)	Open plenary assembly (*ting*); sortition restricted to low-discretion	Shared calendar (sundial/lunar marker); meeting circle; three literate	Competence failure in survival tasks; drawing an incompetent food

	rotational manual duties.	record keepers.	overseer or defense coordinator leads to collapse.
District (3,000 people; 10 villages)	Bicameral system: elected village delegates paired with a sortition audit jury holding negative veto power[40].	Secure records chest (three-key lock); parchment ledger; neutral fortified crossroads hall.	Inter-village predation and bribery; unmonitored temporary jurors accept bribes to approve unfair water/tax policies.

The Household (4 to 10 People)

In a post-collapse household, sortition has no operational role. Governance is informal, shaped by kinship ties, shared survival needs, and parental authority.

The physical infrastructure required is minimal: a shared hearth, basic oral communication, and common subsistence chores.

The first structural failure to expect is relational breakdown. If a household attempts to allocate scarce food rations, defense duties, or child-rearing responsibilities by lottery, members view the process as an evasion of personal responsibility, generating internal conflict.

The Village (300 People)

At the village scale, governance can center on an open plenary assembly (a *folkmoot*, *thing*, or *palaver*) that combines direct community deliberation with a mechanical allotment engine (*kleroterion*) made of notched wood, clay tokens, or marked chits.

Sortition must be prohibited for strategic leadership, judicial arbitration, and defense command.

The lottery is viable only for distributing low-discretion, shared manual duties: night watches, ditch clearing, timber hauling, and well maintenance.

Legislative and judicial conflicts are handled by an assembly of all households, guided by elected or customary elders whose decisions are subjected to open community review.

To establish this village architecture, the community requires four basic starting assets:

- **Literacy & Record-Keeping:** At least two or three trusted scribes to maintain a physical communal ledger on parchment, slate, or bark, recording boundary lines, grain storage contributions, and rotation lists.
- **A Shared Calendar:** A central sun dial and lunar observation post to establish reliable schedules for planting, harvesting, and regular assembly days.
- **A Dedicated Physical Meeting Space:** A circular, weather-protected meeting shelter or stone ring large enough to accommodate all adult members with clear sightlines and acoustics.
- **A Visible Allotment Mechanism:** A mechanical device (a marked wooden box or marble

chute) whose physical operation can be inspected by every villager to prevent sleight-of-hand tampering.

The first structural failure to expect is the competence mismatch in survival tasks. If the village attempts to use sortition to select its master of the granary, irrigation engineer, or defense leader, the draw will eventually select an inexperienced or reckless individual. In an environment with zero margin for error, an improperly maintained seed store or mismanaged irrigation ditch means crop failure and hunger. When this occurs, the village will abandon sortition for operational leadership and return to elected, customary, or strongman authority.

The District (3,000 People: A Federation of 10 Villages)

Across a district of ten confederated villages, direct plenary democracy becomes impractical due to travel distances and labor demands.

The viable institutional design is a bicameral council that separates positive leadership from anti-corruption oversight:

The First Chamber (The Board of Delegates) consists of twenty elected representatives—two chosen from each village by open voice-vote. This body meets monthly to negotiate inter-village disputes, coordinate watershed maintenance, and organize trade security.

The Second Chamber (The Sortition Audit Jury) consists of thirty citizens—three selected by lot from each village's household rosters using local *kleroteria*. These jurors serve for a single forty-day cycle. This body has no power to initiate legislation; its sole authority is negative: auditing the accounts of the first chamber, hearing accusations of corruption, and holding veto power over district-wide taxes or resource allocations[40].

The required physical infrastructure at the district scale includes:

- **Secured Records:** A central records chest secured by three separate iron locks (the keys held by delegates from three different villages), containing double-entry account rolls written with iron gall ink on durable vellum.
- **Synchronized Communications:** A scheduled runner network to coordinate assembly dates across the watershed based on equinox, solstice, and full-moon cycles.
- **A Neutral Meeting Ground:** A fortified district hall located at a central crossroads, supplied with its own grain stores so that visiting delegates do not burden the host village.

The first structural failure to expect is Machiavellian inter-village bribery. Wealthy villages located on fertile river bottomlands will attempt to bribe or pressure the unmonitored sortition jurors from poorer, upland hamlets. Because these jurors are ordinary farmers serving single, non-renewable forty-day terms without long-term political careers to protect, they can accept covert gifts (livestock, seed grain, forged iron tools) to approve unfair water diversions or unbalanced road maintenance taxes. Lacking the institutional backing of a political organization to support them, the audit jury fractures along village lines, and the confederation risks breaking down into inter-communal conflict.

11. Principles

1. A political system that deprives the governed of the regular power to sanction and remove their rulers cannot maintain democratic legitimacy over time[7].
2. Selection by lot achieves demographic representativeness only within the fraction of

citizens who accept the summons, concentrating power among atypical, high-efficacy participants[5].

3. Deliberation in the absence of structured political opposition amplifies informal hierarchies, empowering individuals with dominant, charismatic, and narcissistic traits[19].
4. Any assembly of non-expert citizens tasked with evaluating complex technical policy becomes dependent on, and vulnerable to steering by, the administrative apparatus that curates its evidence, schedule, and framing[10].
5. Political executives will selectively convene advisory citizen assemblies whenever the consultative process can be used to dilute popular opposition, delay structural action, and shield the government from direct accountability[5].
6. Sortition functions effectively as an anti-corruption check only when limited to a negative oversight veto, failing systematically whenever it is granted positive, sovereign lawmaking authority[40].
7. The operational viability of selection by lot decreases as the ratio of assembly seats to the general population drops toward zero, resulting in democratic alienation at regional and national scales[1].
8. In low-surplus, high-risk survival settings, assigning high-discretion operational or defense authority through random selection leads to system failure by prioritizing statistical balance over demonstrated competence.

Works cited

1. Democracy without Shortcuts - Revista Pensamiento Penal, https://www.pensamientopenal.com.ar/system/files/2021/07/doctrina89336.pdf
2. Debating Sortition - Deliberative Democracy Digest |, https://www.publicdeliberation.net/debating-sortition/
3. Reading List - Rethinking Representation, https://rethinking-representation.org/reading.html
4. The Oasis and the Mirage. Lottocracy as a Test for Democratic Theory, https://journals.openedition.org/oeconomia/19690
5. A Critical Analysis of Democratic Minipublics - ePrints Soton, https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/id/eprint/502922/1/s9.pdf
6. umbers-against-lottocracy.pdf - Equality by lot, https://equalitybylot.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/umbers-against-lottocracy.pdf
7. Is Random Selection a Cure for the Ills of Electoral Representation?, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341660776_Is_Random_Selection_a_Cure_for_the_Ills_of_Electoral_Representation
8. Representative Democracy as Defensible Epistocracy - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335701698_Representative_Democracy_as_Defensible_Epistocracy
9. The Lottocratic Mentality - Cristina Lafont; Nadia Urbinati, https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-lottocratic-mentality-9780192890627

10. What about elite manipulation in deliberative mini-publics, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/european-political-science-review/article/what-about-elite-manipulation-in-deliberative-minipublics-examining-threats-and-resilience-in-the-ostbelgien-model/BE66BB7E5A57604FB569A7E5178C562B
11. The lottocratic mentality: defending democracy against lottocracy, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23248823.2025.2605883
12. The Oasis and the Mirage. Lottocracy as a Test for Democratic Theory, https://journals.openedition.org/oeconomia/19690?lang=en
13. Philosophy and Law – Dimitri Landa, https://wp.nyu.edu/dimitrilanda/philosophy-and-law/
14. Representative Democracy as Defensible Epistocracy, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-political-science-review/article/representative-democracy-as-defensible-epistocracy/3995E0628DF98B83D75E896BA00673A8
15. Should We Be Lottocrats? | Free & Equal, https://freeandequaljournal.org/article/23191/galley/42639/download/
16. Political Equality | Democratic Theory | Cambridge Core, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/democratic-theory/article/political-equality/8EC659DB652E24CFE9773027A02795E0
17. Political Equality in: Democratic Theory Volume 11 Issue 2 (2024), https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/democratic-theory/11/2/dt110209.xml
18. Against Deliberation? Addenda to the Limits of Deliberation in, http://www.afsp.info/archives/congres/congres2013/st/st22/st22poama.pdf
19. Deliberative Democracy and the Problem of Power - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283613954_Deliberative_Democracy_and_the_Problem_of_Power
20. Twelve Key Findings in Deliberative Democracy Research | Daedalus, https://direct.mit.edu/daed/article/146/3/28/27148/Twelve-Key-Findings-in-Deliberative-Democracy
21. A hunger for democratic innovation: the Irish Citizens' Assembly and, https://trustdemocracy.nz/2023/07/democratic-innovation-hunger/
22. Convention Citoyenne Pour Le Climat: What Can We Learn From, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2020-01-17/convention-citoyenne-pour-le-climat-what-can-we-learn-from-the-french-citizens-assembly-on-climate-change/
23. Briefing No.13, https://cdn.prod.website-files.com/65b77644e6021e9021de8916/68627aa486c48ed7c60064d4_Policy%20impact%20of%20the%20French%20Citizens_WITH%20EXECUTIVE%20(19.06.25)-kombineret%20(1).pdf
24. (PDF) “Co-construction” in deliberative democracy: lessons from the, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361478947_Co-construction_in_deliberative_democracy_lessons_from_the_French_Citizens'_Convention_for_Climate
25. Thousands of Britons invited to climate crisis citizens' assembly, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/nov/02/thousands-britons-invited-take-part-climate-crisis-citizens-assembly

26. UK Climate Assembly - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UK_Climate_Assembly
27. Who took part? - Climate Assembly UK, https://www.climateassembly.uk/detail/recruitment/
28. Ireland Participatory Democracy Pilot 'We the Citizens' - Participedia, https://participedia.net/case/1251
29. Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions, https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/innovative-citizen-participation-and-new-democratic-institutions_339306da-en/full-report/component-6.html
30. Deliberating on Climate Action: Insights from the French Citizens, http://adrien-fabre.com/Documents/CCC_Giraudet_et_al.pdf
31. Citizens' assemblies and panels on the rise - Go Vocal, https://www.govocal.com/blog/citizens-assemblies-and-panels-on-the-rise-catching-the-deliberative-wave
32. French Citizens' Convention on the Climate - National Assembly, https://www.knoca.eu/national-assemblies/french-citizens-convention-on-the-climate
33. (PDF) Reforming Institutionalised Citizen Deliberation: An Update, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/409458831_Reforming_Institutionalised_Citizen_Deliberation_An_Update_on_the_Permanent_Citizens'_Dialogue_in_East belgium
34. Politics in Renaissance Venice 9780813508887 - DOKUMEN.PUB, https://dokumen.pub/politics-in-renaissance-venice-9780813508887.html
35. Full text of "(The Short Oxford History Of Italy) John M. Najemy Italy, https://archive.org/stream/TheShortOxfordHistoryOfItalyJohnM.NajemyItalyInTheAgeOfTheRenaissance13001550Oxf/%28The+Short+Oxford+History+of+Italy%29+John+M.+Najemy-Italy+in+the+Age+of+the+Renaissance_+1300-1550-Oxford+University+Press%2C+USA+%282005%29_djvu.txt
36. Reti Medievali E-Book 21 - OAPEN Library, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/55167/9788866556633.pdf;jsessionid=BAB0625DB90075AE95E7867BC5EC6A41?sequence=1
37. THE POLITICS OF LAW IN LATE MEDIEVAL AND RENAISSANCE, https://dokumen.pub/download/the-politics-of-law-in-late-medieval-and-renaissance-italy-9781442686021.html
38. 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
39. Citizens' Assembly, https://www.citizensinformation.ie/en/government-in-ireland/irish-constitution-1/citizens-assembly/
40. Is Random Selection a Cure for the Ills of Electoral Representation, https://scispace.com/papers/is-random-selection-a-cure-for-the-ills-of-electoral-1gibdq5icd
41. Research - Ryan Pevnick, https://ryanpevnick.com/research/