

*French elections for the new President are coming on April 23th and May 7th. Some of the candidates propose to rethink the process of elections when they will be elected. As a French citizen, I ask myself about this new possibility. What if sortition rebecomes a method in our democracy, like it was in the Athenian democracy? Here is an excerpt from an article published by ABC News Australia dealing with this topic.*

The basic logic of voting is that it is the method by which we determine the will of the people. Free elections are therefore understood to be the cornerstone - the defining characteristic - of democratic governance.

No vote, no democracy is just about a truism.

But what if that's wrong? What if voting actually hampers democratic governance and is leading to outcomes? What if all the stuff we complain about in regard to our politicians - that they are unrepresentative, that they are out of touch, that they are in the pocket of various vested interests, that all they are really interested in is getting re-elected - what if all those problems are actually a by-product of voting itself?

Wouldn't it then make sense to get rid of voting? To choose our politicians by another method?

David Van Reybrouck is a Belgian historian and founder of the G1000 Citizens' Summit, and although he doesn't want to get rid of voting altogether, he does want us to think about other ways of deciding who governs us.

Reybrouck wants to replace traditional democratic voting with a combination of voting and sortition. That is, the drawing of lots.

[...]

Essentially sortition is a lottery, where political power is given to candidates on the basis of random sampling. It is not dissimilar to the system we use to select juries, and it is often used in other informal and semi-formal situations. But why go down this path?

Reybrouck [...] writes: « Democracy is like clay: it moulds itself to the times. The concrete forms it assumes are always shaped by historical circumstance. As a governmental model centering around consultation, it is extremely sensitive to the available means of communication.

That is why the democracy of ancient Athens was formed in part by the culture of the spoken word. That is why the electoral-representative democracy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries flourished in the age of the printed word (the newspaper and other one-way media such as radio, television and the Internet 1.0). Today, however, we find ourselves in the age of permanent interactivity. Hyper-fast, decentralized communication leads to more and more critical voices being heard. But which form of democracy fits these circumstances? »