

THE DEMOCRACY OF SORTITION: HEKASTOCRACY AND THE PRINCIPLE OF ROTATION OF OFFICES

LA DEMOCRAZIA DEL SORTEGGIO: HEKASTOCRAZIA E IL PRINCIPIO DI ROTAZIONE DELLE CARICHE

ENRICO GRAZIANI^{*}

Abstract: this article critically examines democracy based on sortition. Lottocracy theorists argue that random selection better represents citizens' opinions and interests than elections, ensuring equal representation and legitimacy grounded in equality. Lottocratic theories face significant challenges: random selection does not directly involve citizens, bypassing the population's need to organize politically and hindering the emergence of a democratically responsible political class. The conclusion highlights potential benefits of «participatory mini-publics», randomly selected citizen assemblies performing auxiliary functions alongside democratic institutions.

Keywords: sortition – democratic theory – lottocracy – mini-publics – political representation

Abstract: questo articolo analizza criticamente la democrazia basata sul sorteggio. I teorici della lottocrazia sostengono che la selezione casuale rappresenti meglio opinioni e interessi dei cittadini rispetto alle elezioni, garantendo una rappresentanza eguale e legittimità al principio di uguaglianza. Le teorie lottocratiche affrontano importanti sfide teoriche. In particolare, la selezione casuale non coinvolge direttamente i cittadini: essa aggira il bisogno della popolazione di organizzarsi politicamente, impedendo l'emergere di una classe politica democraticamente responsabile. Nella conclusione si evidenziano i possibili vantaggi dei «mini-pubblici partecipativi», assemblee di cittadini selezionati casualmente con funzioni ausiliarie accanto alle istituzioni democratiche.

Keywords: sorteggio – teoria democratica – lottocrazia – mini-pubblici – rappresentanza politica

^{*} Enrico Graziani, Associate Professor of Political Theory and Analysis of Political Language GSPS-01/A, Sapienza University of Rome. Email: enrico.graziani@uniroma1.it. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1911-2796>

Introduction

The theme of «democracy by sortition» is situated within a theoretical and political-philosophical framework that accounts for the crisis of democracy that has marked the first decades of the 21st century. The extremes of this crisis have authorized Western political lexicon to introduce new terms into political language that simplify this conceptual register. The polysemic character of the term «crisis» has led democracy theorists to use all its variants in different meanings and specific significations. For this reason, before outlining possible scenarios of the «democracy by sortition» model, it is necessary to proceed with a differential diagnosis of the meaning of the noun «crisis», which assumes different semantic nuances in reference to the concept of democracy. A first perspective is that developed by political theorists who speak of a «democratic recession» based on the discrepancy between normative democratic values and their actual practice¹. Others refer to «regression» in order to define the measurement of intra-regime change²; to «erosion», which undermines the pillars of democratic competition³; or to a democratic «malaise» that has dissolved democracy's normative and pluralistic nature⁴, to cite only a few examples. Other theorists employ the construct of the «pathologies of democracy», identifying in the qualifiers «degenerate»⁵, «disfigured and depoliticized»⁶, «hybrid»⁷, and «anorexic»⁸ the structural drifts produced by changes in the functioning and balance of institutions. Tom Gerald Daly, for example, in his 2019 work *Democratic Decay: Conceptualising an Emerging Research Field*, proposed the term democratic decay to designate a new field of study that investigates «the nature of emerging threats to a wide range of democratic systems»⁹.

A second perspective, by contrast, is developed by legal theorists who, emphasizing the qualitative crisis of democracy due to its mutability and vulnerability¹⁰, speak of a crisis within democracy linked to crises of representation, efficiency, legitimacy, and to the loss of perception of the central role of political elections. Elections are understood as a «structured procedure for the transmission of consent and votes»¹¹, and as a practice capable of ensuring that «democracy rests on the legitimacy that individuals attribute to legal norms and political institutions»¹². Moreover, «the elective method, which remains the foundation of pluralist democratic systems, is considered to be in crisis both with

¹ M. M. Salih, 2023.

² D. Waldner, E. Lust, 2018.

³ M. G. Laebens, A. Lührmann, 2023.

⁴ F. Nasi, 2025.

⁵ M. Bovero, 2002.

⁶ N. Urbinati, 2014.

⁷ I. Diamanti, 2014.

⁸ A. Mastropaolo, 1996.

⁹ T. G. Daly, 2019.

¹⁰ P. Ginsborg, 2006.

¹¹ F. Lanchester, 1984, 1987, 1989.

¹² A. Mastropaolo, 2015.

regard to the traditional parliamentary sphere – replaced by forms of executive investiture and by a rethinking and fragmentation of political agency – and with regard to procedural veracity»¹³.

If, therefore, the crisis of democracy is also a «crisis of electoral practice», and consequently a crisis of representative democracy characterized by a profound *deficit* of trust on the part of citizens, what factors have generated this process? What remedies exist? What possible exits are there? The most evident fact is that, at least within our republican constitutional order, democracy has always been traced back to electoral activity, understood as a general principle, also in compliance with Constitutional Court ruling no. 96/1968, which states that electiveness is a general principle of the democratic order.

From the perspective of constitutional theory that links legal analysis to political, historical, and social transformations, the degenerative factors internal to the democratic crisis also rest on the democratic dimension of political parties and on their transformed role. Once instruments for filtering social demands and representing them within parliamentary arenas, parties have diminished the value of democratic participation. As Palano also writes, «parties are in fact reproached for having betrayed their original mission, for having lost the ideals of the past, and for having severed the bond that connected them to society»¹⁴. Within this framework, the crisis of the democratic *topos* is primarily a crisis of legitimacy – also viewed from an intergenerational perspective¹⁵ – and of governability, generating causes and contributing factors that demonstrate how electoral practice is affected by distrust and perceived uselessness. These dynamics attribute only relative importance to political elections for two main reasons: (1) political parties and ruling elites are regarded as corrupt and driven by personal interests; (2) decision-making processes take place outside the national sphere, determined by «technical bodies not legitimated through electoral and consensual means, removed from any political judgment by the electorate according to the traditional canons of political representation»¹⁶.

The theoretical apparatus outlined thus far is based on the awareness that the teleological conception of Western political development is identified with the conjunction of the rule of law – understood as the full realization of the government of laws – and democracy – understood as the full realization of the government of the people. Yet this synthesis «has not been achieved and is inherently problematic [...] legality, rights, and democratic participation continue to be objectives that are astronomically distant within social contexts marked by conditions of precarity»¹⁷. Within this analytical framework, and as a remedy to the crisis of democracy, theories of

¹³ F. Lanchester, 2006.

¹⁴ D. Palano, 2015.

¹⁵ A. Ferrara, 2024.

¹⁶ M. Mandato, 2017.

¹⁷ P.P. Portinaro, 2021.

democracy by sortition emerge, which appear to find new reasons and renewed vitality within contemporary debates on the crisis of democracy. Although the related terms «crisis» and «eclipse» of democracy, when transposed into the language of politics, take on a metaphorical meaning, both have legitimized – as Carlo Galli writes – «a literary genre in which democracy appears disfigured, elusive, and dissolved»¹⁸, confronting a crossroads: whether to allow a condition of crisis and eclipse to persist, or to conjecture a reform agenda involving democratic institutions. If, on the one hand, reforms are increasingly regarded as a necessary response to the crisis afflicting democracy, on the other hand there is a growing perception that democratic communities are progressively less capable of pursuing the desired reforms, because the institutions of representative democracy are under siege and the current crisis within democracy is a crisis of legitimacy that is not merely political but also procedural with regard to electoral practice¹⁹. Within this critical context, theorists of democracy by sortition propose the use of lot both for the appointment of public-law bodies and for the formation of consultative assemblies²⁰. In this specific context, I will first develop a preliminary observation in order to frame the problem; subsequently, from a political-philosophical perspective, attention will turn to the use of sortition in ancient Athenian democracy, a fundamental component for analyzing the method of sortition both with reference to its use for purely consultative functions and as a corrective and/or complementary mechanism to political representation.

1. Framing the problem and legal-political implications

New designations thus gain relevance in the political lexicon, implicitly documenting disaffection with the functioning of contemporary democratic mechanisms and disappointment with the outcomes they produce. Responsibility is attributed to professional politicians or «experts», and to their methods. For this reason, alternative solutions are advocated – choices no longer based on who obtains election or office by virtue of competence, experience, or partisan affiliation, but rather on the random selection of bodies composed of «ordinary» individuals, thereby establishing the premises of a hekastocracy (the government of each individual), as opposed to the government of all, theorized by Bernard Heisterberg in an essay published in 1881, in which he explains the Athenian form of government by contrasting sortition with the principle of majority rule²¹.

Within the political lexicon, neologisms thus acquire prominence: «demarchy», when referring to the relationship between the involvement of the demos in decision-making

¹⁸ C. Galli, 2023.

¹⁹ C. Lafont, N. Urbinati, 2024.

²⁰ A. Zei, 2023.

²¹ A. Zei, 2023.

and the random selection of citizens against their will²²; «lottocracy», which adopts the criterion of collective effectiveness in order to rethink democracy as self-government²³; «statistical democracy»²⁴, which discusses the applicability of Rawls's theory of justice to the analysis of democratic phenomena by examining alternatives of indirect government based on statistical democracy and electronic municipalities; the «Athenian» model, which proposes the selection of citizen juries for legislative decisions²⁵, in opposition to representative «electocracy», understood as a system of government that combines the election of representatives with popular sovereignty²⁶.

These neologisms are thus situated within a discourse that challenges representative democracy from the standpoint of its procedures. The legitimacy derived from popular voting, grounded in the golden principle of democracy – namely, majority rule – is deemed inadequate to bridge the gap between representatives and the represented. Sortition concerns not only the selection of rulers but also the manner in which they govern. In essence, constitutional and representative democracy itself is placed under attack when the method of election is opposed by sortition – whether in cases involving the partial composition of one of the two chambers, the designation of party candidates on electoral lists, the appointment of judges, or the creation of assemblies granted the opportunity to articulate their claims, aspirations, and competencies within bodies embedded in decision-making processes. However, lottocrats do not aspire to a return to direct democracy when they propose sortition. What they seek is to revitalize representation by altering the system of selection, with the aim of making citizens feel less subject to a political class that is insulated from legitimate demands for publicity and often self-referential. Returning to sortition thus signifies a critique of political parties and of the agents of electoral representation²⁷.

2. Philosophical-Political Perspectives on the Use of Sortition in Politics

The scope assumed by the theory of democracy by sortition calls for a comparison between central categories of the philosophical-political lexicon and those of public-law discourse. The lack of uniformity in the semantic field that characterizes it allows us to designate, on the one hand, democracy by sortition as an instrument within electoral practice, and, on the other, as a tool of innovation in the sphere of participatory reforms. The features of Greekness – from ethnic chaos to polis-based identity, from *ethnos* to *demos*, which form the democratic foundation of fourth- and fifth-century Athens –

²² J. Burnheim, 1985.

²³ L. Guinier, 2008.

²⁴ M. Schmidt, 2001.

²⁵ A. Barnett, P. Carty, 2008.

²⁶ D. Courant, 2019.

²⁷ N. Urbinati, L. Vandelli, 2020.

constitute the constant point of reference for lottocrats. Evidence of this is provided by the 2008 conference *Selection by Lot: Theory and Practice*, held at the Paris Institute of Political Studies (Sciences Po), where, as Antoine Vergne writes, a «new school of political philosophy that addresses and advocates the use of random selection in politics» was systematized²⁸. The study conducted by Antoine Vergne showed that the literature on sortition in the two aforementioned domains contains a concentration of theses and texts of a philosophical-political nature. This aspect also emerges from the collective volume *Returning Deliberative Democracy to Athens: Deliberative Polling for Candidate Selection* (2008)²⁹, which includes contributions by James Fishkin. In *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation* (2009), Fishkin, in elaborating the model of the «deliberative microcosm», in which he outlines projects of deliberative democracy as a concrete practice for revitalizing contemporary democracies, emphasizes that the model is «a modern social science-based version of the Athenian aspiration». Athens is described by Fishkin as a city governed by «representative» bodies selected by lot, in which «random sampling or the process of selection by lot, conducted on a list of volunteer citizens [...] offered a form of representative democracy that gave ordinary citizens strong incentives to pay attention once selected»³⁰.

The philosophical-political reflection on sortition developed in parallel across different national contexts, as demonstrated by contributions that, drawing on the same classical heritage, extended the debate into continental European scholarship. In 2009, Yves Sintomer's volume *Le pouvoir au peuple. Jurys citoyens, tirage au sort et démocratie participative* was translated into Italian. In this work, the author proposes assigning consultative functions to randomly selected citizen bodies. This method, he argues, «refers back to a philosophical-political model that carries within it something of the Greek Heliastia and the Boulē»³¹. The volume *Democrazia a sorte, ovvero la sorte della democrazia (Democracy by Lot, or the Fate of Democracy)*, edited by the Catania group and written by a diverse team of scholars, conducted research on randomized representation, bringing sortition back to the fore as an antidote to distrust and contempt toward Western democracies, and retracing the practice of sortition, from a philosophical-political perspective, from Athenian assemblies to Renaissance city-states³².

The return to fourth-century Athenian democracy thus explains why, for modern lottocracy, the use of a lexicon and categories regarded as precursors of modern liberal democracy is indispensable. This thesis is supported, moreover, by Mogens Hansen in the introduction to his monographic study *The Athenian Democracy* (1991)³³, and later taken

²⁸ A. Vergne, 2010.

²⁹ J. Fishkin, R.C. Luskin, J. Panaretos, A. Siu, E. Xekalaki, 2008.

³⁰ J.S. Fishkin, 2009, 32.

³¹ Y. Sintomer, 2007.

³² M. Caserta, C. Garofalo, A. Pluchino, A. Rapisarda, S. Spagnano, 2012.

³³ M.H. Hansen, 1991.

up by Nadia Urbinati in *L'Ethos della democrazia* (2006)³⁴, and together with Cristina Lafont in *The Lottocratic Mentality* (2024)³⁵. Consequently, revisiting the key texts of Aristotle's political philosophy – particularly *Politics* and *The Constitution of the Athenians* – constitutes a necessary step for theorists of democracy by sortition.

Evidence of this lies in the fact that James Wycliffe Headlam's monographic study on the political function of sortition in ancient Athenian democracy, *Election by Lot at Athens* (1891), is a privileged source for lottocrats for two reasons: (1) its identification and characterization of the legal-philosophical lexicon present in Aristotelian texts; and (2) its detailed description of the practices of sortition for the allocation of public offices in fifth-century Athens as described by Aristotle³⁶. As is well known, in Books IV and V of the *Politics*, Aristotle reconstructs the constitutional history of Athens from both a diachronic and synchronic perspective. In the *Athenaion Politeia* (*Constitution of the Athenians*), he presents eleven *metabolai* (transformations), summarized in chapter 41, before the constitution reaches its definitive form. The final *metabole* sanctions the transition to a democratic regime in which «the people themselves have made themselves masters of everything and administer all things through decrees and courts, in which they are sovereign».

In this way, Aristotle establishes direct participation for all those who enjoy the status of citizen in the sessions of the assembly and, in rotation, in the exercise of preparatory and executive functions, as well as in the popular juries to which political and supervisory functions were entrusted. In the analysis of forms of government presented in Book V of the *Politics*, he explains the rotation of offices: the expression «in turn» (*katà méros, ou en mérei, ou anà méros*) recurs twenty-two times. Since, from the fourth century onward, sortition was considered an instrument of democracy, «chance» effectively constitutes one of the methods of selection for the rotation of offices. Headlam notes that in Book VII Aristotle emphasizes that the rotation of offices can be combined with virtue, and that offices may be assigned in turn while taking age into account: magistracies related to military command require the vigor of youth, whereas offices responsible for deliberative and judicial functions require experience and wisdom. In a democracy, access to offices is permitted, but «each activity has its appropriate time in the ideal life», Aristotle warns in Book VII.

The various implications of the principle of rotation of offices, combined with sortition, find expression in the assembly (*ekklesia*), which met forty times a year and was open to those who enjoyed citizen status, and was based on the principle of equal right to speak (*isegoria*). In essence, the sortition of public offices in the fourth and fifth centuries fits within the framework of Cleisthenes' reforms aimed at «constituting stable groupings of citizens whose office consisted in the exercise of state activity independently of the

³⁴ N. Urbinati, 2006.

³⁵ C. Lafont, N. Urbinati, 2024.

³⁶ J.W. Headlam, 1891.

ancient ties that bound members of the genealogical tribes, and independently of local interests». From the tribes, members of the *boulē* were selected by lot; likewise, sortition was practiced for magistracies, except during the tyranny of Peisistratus and in the first twenty years after his death, when archons were not selected by lot. Aristotle reports that sortition was reintroduced in 487 BCE³⁷.

The same applied to the selection of popular jurors. Aristotle notes that with the introduction of Solonian reforms, the jurisdiction of the courts was expanded in parallel with the limitation of the powers of the Areopagus. While validating the theory of sortition, Aristotle, both in the *Politics* and in the *Constitution of the Athenians*, argues in favor of the principle of collegiality: «the size of the body is inversely proportional to the risk that deliberations may be influenced by promises of money, favors, or emotional impulses»³⁸. These elements, together with the practice of sortition in the Renaissance republics of Florence and Venice, constitute the arguments that underpin the theory of democracy by sortition.

3. In Search of Lost Democracy

At the core of the diagnosis offered by theories of democracy by sortition lie two fundamental documents published between 2020 and 2021, which analyze new forms of deliberation and democratic participation and the need to reinvigorate global public opinion in an era of democratic anxiety. The 2020 OECD report *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions*, in its introductory sections – *Deliberative Democracy*, characterized by extensive references to Habermas, and *Participatory Reform*, which draws on Carole Pateman's *Participation and Democratic Theory* – and in the first chapter, *Deliberation and New Forms of Governance*, paragraph 3, *On Innovative Methods of Citizen Participation*, summarizes different forms of participation within a model that combines deliberation, representativeness, and decisional impact. This model integrates the elective practices of ancient Athens, based on sortition, with the methods of modern statistics. Such an innovation would make it possible to understand complementary mechanisms for representative democratic institutions, becoming a useful tool for identifying: (1) different models of representative deliberative processes; (2) levels of governance; (3) the quality of deliberations; and (4) public decision-making processes³⁹.

³⁷ P. Demont, 2000, 69-70. Cf. Aristotle, 1935, 69, c. 22.5: «But directly afterwards, in the next year, in the archonship of Telesinus (487 B.C.), they elected the Nine Archons by lot, tribe by tribe, from a preliminary list of five hundred chosen by the demesmen. This was the date of the first election on these lines after the tyranny, the previous Archons having all been elected by vote».

³⁸ A. Zei, 2023, 213.

³⁹ https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/06/innovative-citizen-participation-and-new-democratic-institutions_11aa2baf/339306da-en.pdf.

It is clear that this innovation stands halfway between public deliberation and criteria for allocating seats in parliamentary assemblies. As public-law scholarship has observed, as early as the eighteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, proposals and models already existed: from Jean-Charles de Borda (the Borda method, 1770, based on a weighted voting system, used by the Roman Senate until 105 BCE) to Condorcet (Condorcet's lot), to D'Hondt (devised by Thomas Jefferson and reformulated by D'Hondt). Numerous precedents can be identified, not to mention the aforementioned collective volume by the Catania group, *Democrazia a sorte* (2012), which proposes the use of sortition in parliamentary assemblies⁴⁰.

The second document, *Global Public Opinion in an Era of Democratic Anxiety* by the Pew Research Center, reports that «the institutions of representative democracy are under siege» and that the problems afflicting them fuel the impression that democracy is failing to deliver on its promises⁴¹. Specifically, these two documents have become objects of study both for scholars engaged in public-law analysis – such as Astrid Zei's *Il diritto e il caso* (2023) – and for those working within political theory, as in Lafont and Urbinati's *The Lottocratic Mentality*. From both perspectives, the «sortition-based» solution, although considered a possible «supplementary instrument» – as experimented, for example, in the Icelandic constitutional forum of 2010, which proposed constitutional revision through the creation of a National Gathering composed of 950 randomly selected citizens, and in Ireland, with the establishment of Citizens' Assemblies in 2016 on the constitutional regulation of abortion⁴², as well as in the Consensus Conferences whose first experiments date back to the mid-1980s under the Danish Board of Technology regarding the use of genetic technologies in Denmark – reveals significant limits. These emerge both when sortition may conflict with the principles of the existing constitutional order⁴³, and on the historical and normative level, insofar as, as Urbinati and Lafont argue, it rests on a simplistic identification between democracy and sortition, and between oligarchy or aristocracy and elections. Normatively, its principal flaw lies in the reinterpretation of the principles of equality and accountability of those who are selected.

Conclusion

The debate on the random selection of public offices today encompasses a vast body of literature. Theorists such as Robert Dahl and John Elster, already in the early 1970s, argued that sortition differs from elections, combats corruption, and promotes

⁴⁰ F. Lanchester, 2016.

⁴¹ R. Wike, J. Fetterolf, 2021. Available at <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2021/12/07/global-public-opinion-in-an-era-of-democratic-anxiety/>.

⁴² A. Zei, 2023, 213–217.

⁴³ F. Lanchester, 2016.

participation and representation; yet neither identifies as a lottocrat⁴⁴. Dahl's intuition, for example, highlights an initial problem that conflicts with some contemporary lottocrats who question the democratic legitimacy inherent in the principle of *one person, one vote*⁴⁵. Elster, by contrast, maintains that a strongly lottocratic revision of democracy would not only lack accountability but would generate a double paradox: that of an expanding bureaucracy (*the paradox of a ballooning bureaucracy*), ironically created in the name of democratic participation (*citizens' participatory*), and that of a reduction in voting (*lottery voting*). This dynamic particularly affects elections in single-member plurality systems (*first-past-the-post systems*), or, as Elster calls them, *deterministic voting systems*⁴⁶.

Nonetheless, lottocrats and their models are today at the forefront of debate. The model devised by James Fishkin – the *Deliberative Poll* (1988), protected by copyright – is among the most well known. Beginning with the publication of *Democracy and Deliberation* (1991), Fishkin has employed minipublics in his polling experiments. He has sought to reconcile the democratic principle of political equality with the role played by deliberation in the formation of collective choices, advocating minipublics as an alternative to previous metrics that purportedly measure (but in fact distort) public opinion. He has articulated a forceful critique of the technology of persuasion, which «has made it possible for elites to shape opinions and then invoke those very opinions in the name of democracy»⁴⁷.

While the lottery method has enabled a segment of the population to gather in spaces where the quality of deliberation could be improved – albeit for a limited number of citizens and for consultative purposes only – it nonetheless presents several contradictions, as also highlighted by Lafont and Urbinati: (1) although it possesses the features of a democratic method of selection, it fails in terms of accountability, as it does not allow for the formation of a political class capable of governing; (2) in democracy, sortition plays an auxiliary role with respect to electoral outcomes rather than substituting for or completing elections; (3) even if it is considered one of the possible instruments for public decision-making (as in the Icelandic, Irish, and Canadian cases)⁴⁸, it has limited practical applicability when it comes to integrating randomly selected citizens; (4) in the Italian proposal advanced by the aforementioned Catania group, while it underscores social advantages, it also presents constitutional limits, both with reference to Article 3 of the Constitution and in relation to other constitutional provisions; (5) it risks reinterpreting representation in populist terms; (6) it generates the possibility of sliding toward a technocratic conception of politics, a concern also highlighted by Anne

⁴⁴ C. Lafont, N. Urbinati, 2024.

⁴⁵ R.A. Dahl, 1987.

⁴⁶ J. Elster, 1989.

⁴⁷ J.S. Fishkin, 2009, 17.

⁴⁸ F. Lanchester, 2016.

Applebaum in her 2024 book *Autocracy, Inc.*⁴⁹; (7) on the historical level, the argument in favor of sortition relies on a simplistic identification between democracy and sortition, and between oligarchy and elections, as Lafont and Urbinati note; (8) on the normative level, again with reference to the principle of equality, it entails a «deprivation of power» for a portion of the citizenry.

In light of these critical points, what role might sortition play in democracies? Lafont and Urbinati argue that sortition procedures can support representative democracy, provided that both technocratic and populist conceptions of representation are abandoned. The two scholars advocate the implementation of randomly selected assemblies with functions auxiliary to democratic institutions. Participatory minipublics, unable to «speak for us» because they have not been elected for that purpose, would instead have the function of «speaking to us», acting as interlocutors within the dialogue that involves citizens in the public sphere. Urbinati and Lafont maintain that, in this auxiliary role – which does not compete with representation established through electoral relations but rather complements it – randomly selected assemblies could become an important support for parliaments and political parties, provided they are equipped with tools that enable them to disseminate information to the public. Thus, while democracy by sortition is not a panacea for the democratic crisis, it does envisage a method that could restore the functionality and systemic efficiency necessary for the proper functioning of democratic institutions. Participatory minipublics, as privileged arenas for public debate, could reinvigorate the public sphere by giving greater prominence to the concerns and opinions of the citizens called upon to take part in them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPLEBAUM Anne, 2024, *Autocrazie*. Mondadori, Milano.

ARISTOTLE, 1935, *The Athenian Constitution, The Eudemian Ethics, On Virtues and Vices*. Trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library 285. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

BARNET Anthony, CARTY Patrick, 2008, *The Athenian Option*. Imprint Academic, Exeter.

BOVERO Michelangelo, 2002, «Sette globalizzazioni?». In *Teoria Politica*, 18(3).

BURNHEIM John, 1985, *Is Democracy Possible?* Polity Press, Cambridge.

⁴⁹ A. Applebaum, 2024.

CASERTA Marco, GAROFALO Calogero, PLUCHINO Alessandro, RAPISARDA Andrea, SPAGNANO Salvatore, 2012, *Democrazia a sorte. Ovvero la sorte della democrazia*. Malcor D'edizione, Catania.

COURANT Dimitri, 2019, «La légitimité des assemblées citoyennes tirées au sort: Quelle institutionnalisation pour la démocratie délibérative». In *Silomag*, 10.

DAHL Robert A., 1970, *After the Revolution? Authority in a Good Society*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

DALY Tom Gerald, 2019, «Democratic decay: Conceptualising an emerging research field». In *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 11(1).

DEMONT Paul, 2000, «Le tirage au sort des magistrats à Athènes: Un problème historique et historiographique». In *Sorteggio pubblico e cleromanzia dall'antichità all'età moderna*, edited by Federica Cordano and Cristiano Grottanelli. ET Edizioni, Milano.

DIAMANTI Ilvo, 2014, *Democrazia ibrida*. Laterza. Roma-Bari.

DOWLEN Oliver, 2009, *The Political Potential of Sortition of the Random Selection of Citizens Public Offices*. Imprint Academic, Exeter.

ELSTER Jon, 1989, *Solomonic Judgements: Studies in the Limitations of Rationality*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

FERRARA Alessandro, 2024, *Sovranità intergenerazionale: Potere costituente e liberalismo politico*. Edizioni Società Aperta, Milano.

FISHKIN James S., 2009, *When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

FISHKIN James, LUSKIN Robert C., PANARETOS John, SIU Alice, XEKALAKI Evdokia, 2008, «Returning deliberative democracy to Athens: Deliberative polling for candidate selection». Available at SSRN 1142842.

GALLI Carlo, 2023, *Democrazia ultimo atto?* Einaudi, Torino.

GINSBORG Paul, 2006, *La democrazia che non c'è*. Einaudi, Torino.

GUINIER Lani, 2008, «Beyond electocracy: Rethinking the political representative as powerful stranger». In *Modern Law Review*.

HAEDLAM James Wycliffe, 1891, *Election by Lot at Athens*. Macmillan, London.

HANSEN Mogens Herman, 1991, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford.

LAEBENS Melis G., LÜHRMANN Anna, 2023, «What halts democratic erosion? The changing role of accountability». In *Resilience of Democracy*. Routledge, London.

LAFONT Cristina, URBINATI Nadia, 2024, *The Lottocratic Mentality: Defending Democracy against Lottocracy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

LANCHESTER Fulco, 1984, *Saggi in tema di votazioni e di riforme istituzionali nel diritto pubblico*. La Madonnina, Roma.

LANCHESTER Fulco, 1987, *Votazioni sistema politico e riforme istituzionali*. Bulzoni, Roma.

LANCHESTER Fulco, 2006, «Teoria e prassi della rappresentanza politica nel ventesimo secolo». In *Rappresentanza e governo alla svolta del nuovo secolo*, edited by Sandro Rogari, Firenze University Press, Firenze.

LANCHESTER Fulco, 2016, «Il sorteggio in campo politico come strumento integrativo dell'attività delle assemblee parlamentari». In *Nomos*, 2.

MANDATO Massimiliano, 2017, «Alla ricerca della democrazia perduta: A proposito di alcuni contributi sul sorteggio nelle assemblee rappresentative». In *Nomos*, 1.

MASTROPAOLO Alfio, 1996, «La crisi della democrazia tra interessi e pregiudizi». In *Associazione per gli Studi e le Ricerche Parlamentari*, Quaderno, 7.

MASTROPAOLO Alfio, 2015, «La crisi della trascendenza democratica». In *Storia del Pensiero Politico*, 2.

NARBONNE Jean-Marc, 2020, *Sagesse cumulative et idéal démocratique chez Aristote*. Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, Paris.

NASI Federica, 2025, «The crisis of the democratic imaginary: How anti-democratic imaginaries foster democratic malaise». In *Communication and Democracy*, 59(1).

OECD, 2020, *Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions: Catching the Deliberative Wave*. OECD Publishing.

PALANO Damiano, 2015a, *La democrazia senza partiti*. Vita e Pensiero, Milano.

PALANO Damiano, 2015b, «Il partito inutile». In *Filosofia Politica*, 1.

PAOLI Ugo Enrico, 1930, *Studi del diritto attico*. Università degli Studi di Firenze, Firenze.

PORTINARO Pier Paolo, 2021, *Breviario di politica*. Morcelliana, Brescia.

SALIH Mohamed Mahdi, 2023, «Discrepancy between theory and practice: Democratic recession or a crisis of state legitimacy?». In *South African Journal of International Affairs*, 30(3).

SCHMIDT Michael, 2001, «Institutionalizing fair democracy: The theory of the minipopulos». In *Futures*, 33(3-4), 361-370.

SINTOMER Yves, 2007, *Le pouvoir au peuple: Jurys citoyens, tirage au sort et démocratie participative*. La Découverte, Paris.

SINTOMER Yves, 2007, *Petite histoire de l'expérimentation démocratique: Tirage au sort et politique d'Athènes à nos jours*. La Découverte, Paris.

URBINATI Nadia, 2006, *L'ethos della democrazia: Mill e la libertà degli antichi e dei moderni*. Laterza, Roma-Bari.

URBINATI Nadia, 2014, *La democrazia sfigurata: Il popolo tra opinione e verità*. Egea, Milano.

URBINATI Nadia, VANDELLI Luciano, 2020, *La democrazia del sorteggio*. Einaudi, Torino.

VERGNE Antoine, 2010, «A brief survey of the literature of sortition: Is the age of sortition upon us?». In *Sortition: Theory and Practice*, edited by Gil Delannoi and Oliver Dowlen. Imprint Academic, Exeter.

WALDNER David, LUST Ellen, 2018, «Unwelcome change: Coming to terms with democratic backsliding». In *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1).

WIKE Richard, FETTEROLF Janell, 2021, «Global public opinion in an era of democratic anxiety». OECD Publishing. Available at:

https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2020/06/innovative-citizen-participation-and-new-democratic-institutions_11aa2baf/339306da-en.pdf.

ZEI Astrid, 2023, *Il diritto e il caso*. Jovene, Napoli.