

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	1
1.1	On Interpretation . . . . .	1
1.2	A Philosopher Challenges a Mathematician: A Nineteenth-Century Dispute . . . . .	3
1.3	Democracy and Its Values . . . . .	8
1.4	The Contents of This Work . . . . .	10
	References . . . . .	15
<b>2</b>	<b>Majority Decision</b> . . . . .	17
2.1	A Short History of Social Choice Rules . . . . .	17
2.1.1	Decision-Making in the Church . . . . .	18
2.1.2	Majority Rule in Secular Decision-Making . . . . .	22
2.1.3	Political Theory and Majorities . . . . .	25
2.1.4	Majority Rule and the Rise of Modern Parliamentarism . . . . .	27
2.1.5	Conclusion: The Problem of Collective Reason . . . . .	32
2.2	Choices with Two Alternatives . . . . .	34
2.2.1	The Uniqueness of the Majority Principle: May's Theorem . . . . .	34
2.2.2	May's Theorem and Procedural Fairness . . . . .	38
2.2.3	Representation, Anonymity and Double-Counting: Mill's Problem . . . . .	42
2.2.4	Conclusion . . . . .	46
	References . . . . .	47
<b>3</b>	<b>On Voting</b> . . . . .	53
3.1	A General Taxonomy of Democratic Social Choice Rules . . . . .	53
3.1.1	Aristotle's Problem . . . . .	53
3.1.2	Parliamentary Voting Rules . . . . .	56
3.1.3	"Plurality-Like" Election Rules . . . . .	57
3.1.4	Preference Rules . . . . .	62
3.1.5	How Rules Disagree . . . . .	68

3.1.6	The Power of Choosing a Voting Rule: Locke's Problem . . . . .	70
3.1.7	Towards a Theory of Fair Voting Rules . . . . .	74
3.2	Criteria for Choice: Majority, Plurality, and Condorcet . . . . .	76
3.2.1	The Absolute Majority Criterion . . . . .	76
3.2.2	Condorcet, Plurality, and Borda . . . . .	77
3.2.3	Condorcet Against Plurality . . . . .	81
3.2.4	Applying the Social Choice Analysis: Plurality Rule and SV . . . . .	85
3.2.5	The Central Weakness: The Condorcet Paradox . . . . .	90
3.2.6	Condorcet Paradox and Parliamentary Rules . . . . .	92
3.3	Further Criteria for Choice: Borda and Beyond . . . . .	94
3.3.1	Beyond Ordinal Comparisons: Arguments for and Against . . . . .	95
3.3.2	The Borda Rule and the Structure of Preferences . . . . .	98
3.3.3	Saari's Argument for Borda (and Against Condorcet) . . . . .	102
3.3.4	Cardinal Voting-Rules . . . . .	107
3.3.5	For and by the People . . . . .	111
3.4	Applying Social Choice: Referendum-Rules . . . . .	113
3.4.1	Social Choice and Weber's Problem . . . . .	114
3.4.2	The Problems of Plurality, Again . . . . .	117
3.4.3	The Swiss Practices . . . . .	119
3.4.4	California . . . . .	121
3.4.5	Maine and Washington . . . . .	123
3.4.6	An Example of a More Complex Agenda: New Zealand . . . . .	124
3.4.7	Agenda Power in Direct and Representative Democracies . . . . .	126
3.5	Another Perspective to Social Choices: Proportionality . . . . .	129
3.5.1	Proportional Representation Systems . . . . .	129
3.5.2	Additional Complexities . . . . .	132
3.5.3	Proportionality and the Theories of Representation . . . . .	135
3.5.4	Some Formal Properties of Proportional Rules . . . . .	138
3.5.5	A Note STV and Monotonicity . . . . .	142
3.5.6	Condorcet, Borda, and Proportionality . . . . .	144
3.5.7	Proportionality, Power and the Formal Coherence Thesis: Does PR Empower Minorities? . . . . .	147
3.5.8	The Majority Criterion and the Choice of Government . . . . .	151
3.5.9	The Cordorcet Criterion and the Choice of Government . . . . .	153
3.5.10	Conclusion: Trade-Offs and the Meta-paradox . . . . .	157
	References . . . . .	160

<b>4</b>	<b>Arrow's Theorem</b> . . . . .	171
4.1	The Impossibility Theorems . . . . .	171
4.1.1	Arrow's Theorem . . . . .	171
4.1.2	On Judgment Aggregation Paradoxes . . . . .	174
4.1.3	The Judgment Aggregation Impossibility Theorems . . . . .	177
4.1.4	On Interpretation . . . . .	179
4.2	The Conditions for Making Rational Collective Choices . . . . .	180
4.2.1	Non-dictatorship and Anonymity . . . . .	181
4.2.2	The Pareto Condition . . . . .	183
4.2.3	The Universal Domain and Restricted Domains . . . . .	189
4.2.4	Restricting the Domain: Institutional Restrictions . . . . .	193
4.2.5	Restricting the Domain: Deliberation and Agreement . . . . .	197
4.2.6	The Rationality Conditions: Transitivity and Its Conceptual Relatives . . . . .	201
4.2.7	Path-Independence . . . . .	205
4.2.8	Justifying Path-Dependence in Judgment Aggregation Contexts? . . . . .	208
4.3	The Struggle Over Independence . . . . .	211
4.3.1	How to Interpret the Independence Condition: Some Mistakes . . . . .	212
4.3.2	Manipulability . . . . .	217
4.3.3	Other Forms of Strategic Voting (or Non-voting) . . . . .	221
4.3.4	The Normative Significance of Manipulability . . . . .	226
4.3.5	In Praise of Manipulation? . . . . .	229
4.3.6	Proportionality and Arrow's Conditions . . . . .	235
4.3.7	Conclusion . . . . .	238
	References . . . . .	239
<b>5</b>	<b>Interpretations</b> . . . . .	247
5.1	Reading Arrow . . . . .	247
5.1.1	A Mathematical Curiosity? . . . . .	247
5.1.2	Unanimity as a Solution? . . . . .	248
5.1.3	Arrow's Theorem and the Radical Critique of Liberal Democracy . . . . .	252
5.1.4	An Interim Summary: For and Against "Individualism" . . . . .	255
5.2	Riker's Challenge . . . . .	257
5.2.1	Introduction to Riker . . . . .	257
5.2.2	Riker's Challenge: Non-uniqueness . . . . .	259
5.2.3	Riker's Challenge: Lack of Fairness . . . . .	261
5.2.4	Riker's Challenge: Manipulation and Instability . . . . .	262
5.3	Some Responses to the Rikerian Thesis . . . . .	264
5.3.1	Is the Meaninglessness-Thesis Compatible with Liberalism? . . . . .	264
5.3.2	Procedural Fairness and Social Choice . . . . .	268
5.3.3	Fairness and Uniqueness: Some Populist Responses . . . . .	272

5.4	Riker's Thesis: Some Institutional Implications . . . . .	277
5.4.1	Riker on Liberal Institutions . . . . .	277
5.4.2	The Meaninglessness-Thesis and the Role of Courts . . . .	283
5.4.3	Stability and the "Liberal" Bias for Status Quo . . . . .	286
5.4.4	The Meaning of Meaninglessness . . . . .	290
5.5	Epistemic Theories . . . . .	295
5.5.1	Introduction: The Epistemic View of Decision-Making . . .	295
5.5.2	Reading Rousseau . . . . .	297
5.5.3	The Jury Theorem . . . . .	301
5.5.4	The Jury Theorem, Binary Choices, and Riker's Problems . . . . .	304
5.5.5	The Problems of Democratic Authority in Epistemic Populism . . . . .	306
5.5.6	Deliberation vs. Aggregation . . . . .	310
5.5.7	Rational Consensus as an Ideal . . . . .	312
5.5.8	Deliberative Theories and the Majority Principle . . . . .	317
5.6	Pettit's Challenge . . . . .	323
5.6.1	Pettit on Deliberation and Judgment Aggregation . . . . .	323
5.6.2	Pettit on Representative Institutions . . . . .	327
5.6.3	Critical Comments to Pettit . . . . .	330
	References . . . . .	334
<b>6</b>	<b>Pluralism and Majority Decision . . . . .</b>	<b>341</b>
6.1	On the Political Theory of Democratic Pluralism . . . . .	341
6.1.1	The Forerunners of Pluralism: Constant and Kelsen . . . . .	341
6.1.2	Maximizing Self-Government . . . . .	345
6.1.3	The Problems of Kelsenian Pluralism . . . . .	348
6.1.4	Modern Pluralists and Social Choice . . . . .	352
6.2	Pluralism and Compound Majorities . . . . .	355
6.2.1	Ostrogorski and Anscombe . . . . .	355
6.2.2	Compromises and the Paradox . . . . .	360
6.2.3	Complex Majoritarianism . . . . .	364
6.2.4	The Multiple Elections Paradox . . . . .	367
6.2.5	Majorities Rule and the Anscombian Majority Frustration . . . . .	369
6.2.6	Non-separability . . . . .	371
6.2.7	Issue-by-Issue Decision-Making in Real Life: Single- Subject Rules . . . . .	374
6.2.8	Conclusion . . . . .	377
	References . . . . .	379
<b>7</b>	<b>Social Choice in the Real World . . . . .</b>	<b>383</b>
7.1	The Missing Evidence? . . . . .	383
7.1.1	Spotting the Monster . . . . .	383
7.1.2	Strategic Voting in Assemblies: Does It Ever Occur? . . .	388

7.2	The Tale of Two Colleges . . . . .	390
7.2.1	The Finnish Case: The Institutional Background . . . . .	391
7.2.2	The Preferences of the Actors in the Pre-war Finnish Politics . . . . .	393
7.2.3	The Elections in 1925 . . . . .	394
7.2.4	The Elections in 1931 . . . . .	396
7.2.5	The Elections in 1937 . . . . .	398
7.2.6	Dramatis Personae in 1956 . . . . .	400
7.2.7	The Preferences of the Actors . . . . .	401
7.2.8	The Game Inside the Bourgeois Bloc . . . . .	404
7.2.9	The Game Between the Bourgeois Bloc and the Social Democrats . . . . .	405
7.2.10	The Communists' Dilemma . . . . .	408
7.2.11	The Elections in 1982 and 1988: The Limits of Manipulation . . . . .	414
7.2.12	Social Choice Implications . . . . .	417
7.2.13	Comparing Two Electoral Colleges . . . . .	419
7.2.14	Conclusion: The Trade-Off Again . . . . .	424
	References . . . . .	426
<b>8</b>	<b>Some Conclusions . . . . .</b>	<b>431</b>
8.1	Problems and Paradoxes . . . . .	431
8.2	Finale . . . . .	436
	Reference . . . . .	437