Analytic Table of Contents

List of Figures xix
List of Tables xxiii

1. Introduction 1
   1.1 Epistemic Competence: A Minimal Requirement of Good Government 1
   1.2 Ask Around 3
   1.3 Pooling Information and Judgements Based on It 4
   1.4 The Condorcet Jury Theorem, in Brief 5
   1.5 Extending the Condorcet Jury Theorem 7
   1.6 Forestalling Familiar Objections 8
      1.6.1 Competence 9
      1.6.2 Independence 10
      1.6.3 The Truth Value of Values 11
   1.7 The Structure of the Book 12

PART I. THE CONDORCET JURY THEOREM

2. The Classic Framework 17
   2.1 The Setup 17
   2.2 The Assumptions 17
      2.2.1 The Competence Assumption 17
      2.2.2 The Independence Assumption 18
      2.2.3 The Sincerity Assumption 19
   2.3 The Theorem 19
   2.4 The Calculation 20
   2.5 How Quickly Group Competence Converges to Perfection 21

3. Extensions 23
   3.1 Weakening the Competence Assumption 23
      3.1.1 Mean Competence among Heterogeneous Voters 23
      3.1.2 Topic-specific Competence 25
   3.2 Extending the CJT to More than Two Alternatives 26
   3.3 Using Different Decision Rules 31
      3.3.1 A Bayesian Parallel 32
      3.3.2 Other Decision Rules 33

4. Limitations 37
   4.1 Facts and Values 38
      4.1.1 Moral Realism 38
      4.1.2 Moral Conventionalism 40

4.1.3 Moral Separability 40
4.1.4 Moral Majoritarianism 41
4.2 There Might Be No (Single) Truth among the Alternatives 42
4.2.1 The Question Is Not Truth Apt 43
4.2.2 The Right Answer Is Not on the Agenda 43
4.2.3 There Are Multiple Truths 44
4.3 Failures of Sincerity: Strategic Voting 45
4.3.1 Beliefs versus Preferences 46
4.3.2 Game Theoretic Complexities 47
4.3.3 Sincerity as a Default 49
4.3.4 Deliberation Induces Sincerity 50
4.4 Failures of Competence 50
4.5 Failures of Independence 54
4.5.1 Worries over Independence 54
4.5.2 The Relation between Competence and Independence 55
4.5.3 Living with Dependence 60
4.6 Limitations Arising from the Choice Situation 62
4.6.1 The Choice Situation Is Systematically Misleading 62
4.6.2 The Options Are Ill Formulated 63

5. Independence Revisited 67
5.1 Understanding the Independence Assumption 67
5.1.1 Independence Is Not Absence of Interaction 68
5.1.2 Independence Is Not Unconditional 69
5.1.3 Independence Conditional on the State of the World 69
5.2 Dealing with Dependence by Further Conditionalizing 70
5.2.1 Independence Conditional on the Available Evidence 71
5.2.2 Independence Conditional on an Opinion Leader's Interpretation of the Evidence 73
5.2.3 Independence Conditional on All Common Causes 74
5.3 The Best Responder Corollary 76
5.4 Epistemic Implications of the Best Responder Corollary 79
5.4.1 A Single Common Cause 79
5.4.2 The Evidence-Limited Case 80
5.4.3 Multiple Common Causes Cases 80
5.5 Some People Are in Better Decision Situations than Others 81

PART II. EPISTEMIC ENHANCEMENT

6. Improve Individual Competence 85
6.1 Don't Worry 86
6.1.1 Voter Ignorance 86
6.1.2 Knowledge ≠ Competence 91
6.2 Priorities in Improving Voter Competence 92
6.3 What More Can Be Done to Improve Individual Competence? 94

7. Diversity 96
7.1 Clones and Common Causes 98
7.2 Negatively Correlated Votes 100
7.2.1 Epistemic Benefits of Negatively Correlated Votes 100
7.2.2 Are Negatively Correlated Votes Plausible? 103
7.2.3 Epistemic Benefits of Diverse Cognitive Models of the World 104
7.3 Engineering Diversity 107

8. Division of Epistemic Labour 110
8.1 Localized Search 111
8.1.1 Incomplete Agendas 112
8.1.2 Diversified (or Many Random) Search Parties as a Solution 114
8.1.3 Transition Costs 116
8.1.4 Recognizing the Best When We See It 119
8.2 Narrowing the Focus 120
8.2.1 Letting Individual Competence Vary with the Number of Options 121
8.2.2 Considering Options a Few at a Time 123
8.2.3 Subgroups Propose, Whole Groups Dispose 124
8.2.4 Experts Propose, Whole Groups Dispose 126
8.3 Devolving Control over Some Dimensions 128

9. Discussion and Deliberation 132
9.1 The Ideal and Practice of Deliberation 133
9.2 The Many Benefits of Deliberation 134
9.2.1 Deliberation to Increase Individual Competence 135
9.2.2 Deliberation to Reduce Dependence 138
9.2.3 Deliberation Induces Sincerity 140
9.2.4 Deliberation to Improve Best Responder Performance 141
9.2.5 Deliberation Can Change the Decision Problem 142
9.3 The Deliberation Effect 144

PART III. POLITICAL PRACTICES

10. Respecting Tradition 149
10.1 Traditionalism in Practice: Precedent in the Courts 150
10.2 The Epistemic Costs of Complete Deference to Previous Decisions 151
10.3 Modelling Partial Deference 153
10.4 Solutions 156
10.4.1 Hiding Precedents 156
10.4.2 Resisting Precedent: Stubborn Judges 157
10.4.3 Discerning Traditionalists: Picking Informative Precedents 159
10.4.4 Lots of Precedents to Choose Among 161
10.5 Beyond Traditionalism in the Courts 162

11. Following Leaders 164
11.1 A Single Opinion Leader 165
11.2 Multiple Correlated Opinion Leaders, but Some Independent Voters 168
11.2.1 Positively Correlated Opinion Leaders 169
11.2.2 Polarization: Negatively Correlated Opinion Leaders 170
11.3 Everyone Partially Follows Uncorrelated Opinion Leaders 172
11.3.1 Opinion Leaders of Purely Random Competence 173
11.3.2 Competent Opinion Leaders 174
11.4 Many Multiply Mediated Opinion Leaders 175

12. Taking Cues 178
12.1 Cue-taking and Low-information Rationality 178
12.2 How Effective is Cue-taking? 180
12.2.1 Experimental Evidence 180
12.2.2 Evidence from Large-Scale Surveys 181
12.3 Cautionary Tales 183
12.3.1 Some Cues Might Be Unreliable 183
12.3.2 Some Cues Might Not Be Chosen for Their Reliability 184
12.4 The Epistemic Effects of Cue-Taking: Two Models 185
12.5 Calculating the Potential Epistemic Effects of Cue-taking 188
12.5.1 Baseline Calculation 189
12.5.2 Sensitivity to the Number and Reliability of Independent Cues 190
12.5.3 Relative Insensitivity to the Rate of Cue Use 191
12.5.4 Cue-taking with Varying Individual Voter Competence 191
12.5.5 Cueing Incompetents Only 193

13. Pluralism: Differing Values and Priorities 195
13.1 Differing Values 197
13.1.1 Baseline Scenario 197
13.1.2 Six Variations 198
13.1.3 The Democratic Upshot 205
13.2 Differing Priorities 205
13.3 Democratic Competition over Values and Priorities 206

14. Factionalism: Differing Interests 208
14.1 A Factional Interpretation of the CJT 209
14.1.1 Uniform Voter Competence 209
14.1.2 Unequal Factional Competence 211
14.2 Epistemic Solidarity and Block Voting 213
14.3 Who's with Us? 216
14.3.1 Differential Abstention from Epistemic Solidarity 217
14.3.2 Differential Group Selection Competence 217
14.3.3 Strategic Leadership and Coordination 220

PART IV. STRUCTURES OF GOVERNMENT

15. Epistocracy or Democracy 225
15.1 Beating the Smartest Guy in Town 227
15.1.1 Beating the Smartest Single Guy 227
15.1.2 Beating the Smartest Clique of Guys 228
15.2 Modelling the Epistemic Effects of Expanding the Electorate 229
15.2.1 Each Individual's Competence Level Is Known 229
15.2.2 Only Average Individual Competence Is Known 230
15.2.3 Enfranchising Batches of Voters with Heterogeneous Individual Competence 230
15.2.4 Enfranchising Voters with Heterogeneous Knowledge Bases 231
15.3 The Epistemic Logic of Enfranchising the Less Competent 231
15.4 Competence-Weighted Voting Rules 233
15.5 Epistemic Considerations beyond Competence 235
15.5.1 Other Ways Smaller Groups Might Outperform Larger Ones 235
15.5.2 Other Ways Larger Groups Might Outperform Smaller Ones 237
15.5.3 The Political Upshot 238
15.6 The Differential Benefits of Learning from Experience 239
15.6.1 The Classical Argument of Participatory Democrats 239
15.6.2 Improving Already Competent Voters 240
15.6.3 Rendering Initially Incompetent Voters Competent 242
15.6.4 The Political Upshot of Learning from Experience 242

16. Direct versus Representative Democracy 244
16.1 How Can a Smaller Group of Representatives Be Better than a Larger Group of Voters? 245
16.1.1 Incompetent Masses Choosing Competent Representatives 246
16.1.2 Competent Voters Choosing Even-More-Competent Representatives: The Selection Effect 248
16.1.3 Epistemic Benefits of Smaller Groups: The Deliberation Effect 251
16.2 Delegate versus Trustee Representatives 254
16.2.1 Delegate-style Representation: The Epistemic Costs of Bunching Voters into Constituencies 255
16.2.2 Trustee-style Representation: The Deliberation Effect Again 256
16.2.3 Mixed Assemblies with Both Delegates and Trustees 257

17. Institutional Hindrances to Epistemic Success 260
17.1 Strong Leaders 261
17.1.1 Party Leaders Dictating Party Policy 262
17.1.2 Mitigating Factors: Many Independent Leaders 263
17.2 Small Upper Chambers or Committees 264
17.2.1 Legislative Committees as Epistemic Bottlenecks 265
17.2.2 Smaller Upper Houses as Epistemic Bottlenecks 266
17.2.3 Mitigating Factors: The Selection and Deliberation Effects 269
17.3 Party Whips and Small, Pivotal Parties in Coalitions 272
17.3.1 Party Whips in the Legislature 272

17.3.2 Coalition Government with Small, Pivotal Parties 275
17.4 Presidential Vetoes and Supermajority Rules 276
17.4.1 Supermajority Rules 277
17.4.2 Presidential Vetoes 281
17.4.3 Political Cooling-off Periods 283

18. Institutional Aids to Epistemic Success 288
18.1 Mechanisms to Make Decision Situations More Truth Conducive 288
18.1.1 Finding New, Better Alternatives 288
18.1.2 Weeding Out Bad, Confusing Alternatives 290
18.1.3 Improve the Evidence Base 293
18.2 Mechanisms to Increase Independence 294
18.2.1 Restricted Franchise, Secret Ballot 295
18.2.2 Public Funding of Elections and Public Broadcasting 296
18.2.3 Proliferate Independent Opinion Leaders 297
18.3 Mechanisms to Increase Competence 298
18.3.1 Increasing Individual Competence 298
18.3.2 Increasing Collective Competence 298
18.4 Mechanisms to Increase Sincerity 299

PART V. CONCLUSIONS

19. The Relation between Truth and Politics, Once Again 303
19.1 The Limitations of Truth-seeking in Politics 303
19.2 Is Pursuit of the Truth Dangerous in Politics? 305
19.3 Are There Matters That Should Not Be Put to a Vote? 307
19.4 Who Should Decide What Is True? 308

20. Headline Findings, Central Implications 312
20.1 Headline Findings 314
20.1.1 As Good As It Gets, As Bad As It (Probably) Gets 314
20.1.2 All's Well So Long As There Are Sufficient, Numerous, Competent, Independent Influences at Work Somewhere 315
20.1.3 There Are Ways of Coping with Incompetent Voters 316
20.1.4 The Case for Large Groups 316
20.1.5 Smaller Groups to Deliberate and Winnow the Options 317
20.1.6 The Decision Situation Is Crucial 318
20.2 Central Implications for Political Practice 319
20.2.1 Avoid Epistemic Deference 319
20.2.2 Pluralism Is Good 319
20.2.3 More High-Quality Evidence Is Good 320
20.2.4 Small-Scale Deliberative Conclaves to Advise the Electorate Are Good 320
20.3 Getting It Right Matters 321

21. Epilogue: What about Trump and Brexit? 322
21.1 The Political Lies of 2016 325
21.1.1 Brexit Lies 325
21.1.2 Trump Lies 327
21.1.3 How Lies Undercut the CJT 330
21.2 In the US Anyway, the Big Liar Actually Lost 331
21.3 Sending a Strategic Signal 332
21.4 Differing Priorities 335
21.5 Opinion Leaders Lied, and Voters Believed Them 339
21.6 Affective Explanations 341
21.6.1 Expressing Emotions 342
21.6.2 Expressing Identity 343
21.6.3 Having Fun 345
21.7 Epistemic Insouciance 347
21.7.1 Voters Were Indifferent on the Topics of the Lies 349
21.7.2 True Fictions 350
21.7.3 Actions, Not Words, Are What Matter 351
21.8 Everyone on Facebook Agrees with Me 354
21.9 Epistemic Malevolence 358
21.10 Epistemic Agnosticism 365
21.11 Conclusion: Epistemic Democracy under Threat 367

APPENDICES

A1 Key to Notations 369
A2 Estimating Group Competence by Monte Carlo Simulation 371

References 373
Index 425