
Antonio Campati is Research Fellow at Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. He is a member of the Editorial Board of *Rivista italiana di filosofia politica* and *Power and Democracy*. His research interests mainly focus on the transformations of political representation, the role of elites and the theories of democracy. Author of the books: *La distanza democratica. Corpi intermedi e rappresentanza politica* (Vita e Pensiero, Milano, 2022) and *I migliori al potere. La qualità nella rappresentanza politica* (Rubbettino, Soveria Mannelli, 2016). He also edited: *Democrazia e liberalismo: un connubio da ripensare?* (Apes, Roma, 2022), *Cittadinanza e sogno europeo. Partecipazione e inclusione tra vincoli e opportunità* (Mimesis, Milano, 2019) and *Democracy and Disintermediation. A Dangerous Relationship* (with D. Palano, Educatt, Milano, 2022).

Contact: antonio.campati@unicatt.it

POLITICAL AND EPISTEMIC MEDIATION: “COMPLEX SOVEREIGNTY” AND REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY¹

Antonio Campati

Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Abstract

This article investigates the complex balance between political mediation and epistemic mediation within representative democracy. The proposed path develops starting from the concept of “complex sovereignty”, which has a long and articulated history behind it but is also used in the most recent analyses of political authority. The aim is to make this concept *more complex* by trying to include not only the dynamics of political mediation but also epistemic ones through the *pluralization* of the concept of people and time, as well as of the concept of competence. In the last part of the article, the arguments put forward will be discussed within a more general theoretical scheme that identifies complexity as the distinctive feature of democracy.

Keywords

Political Representation; Epistemic Mediation; Complex Sovereignty; Representative Democracy; Disintermediation.

1. Reception date: 21th March 2022; acceptance date: 24th April 2022. The essay is the issue of a research project carried out within the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Milano).

Resumen

Este artículo investiga el complejo equilibrio entre la mediación política y la mediación epistémica dentro de la democracia representativa. El camino propuesto se desarrolla a partir del concepto de “soberanía compleja”, que tiene una larga y articulada historia a sus espaldas pero que también se utiliza en los análisis más recientes de la autoridad política. Se trata de complejizar este concepto tratando de incluir no sólo las dinámicas de mediación política sino también las epistémicas a través de la pluralización del concepto de pueblo y tiempo, así como del concepto de competencia. En la última parte del artículo se discutirán los argumentos expuestos dentro de un esquema teórico más general que identifica la complejidad como rasgo distintivo de la democracia.

Palabras clave

Representación política; Mediación epistémica; Soberanía compleja; Democracia representativa; Desintermediación.

Introduction and aims

In contemporary political theory concerning the future of democracy, two themes are intertwined more than others: the development of technocratic powers and the theme relating to the transformation of political representation. This is inevitable because the accusation directed at technocratic power is that, on the one hand, of disfiguring representation, above all because it would orient the relationship between rulers and the governed in an antidemocratic direction, and on the other hand, of promoting and supporting those tendencies towards depoliticization taking place in Western democratic societies.

A possible key to deepen the link between these two themes at the centre of contemporary political theory is linked to a specific aspect of the broad and articulated crisis of democracy, namely the crisis of mediation². This includes the development of immediate modes of communication and interaction (typical above all of social logics), the structural crisis of the mediation of political parties (Mair, 2013), the change in the selection criteria of political classes (Best & Higley, 2018), and the crisis of the recognition of epistemic mediations (Pamuk, 2021): all they highlight how the concept of mediation is still central to understanding political dynamics. In the following pages, two of the main declinations by which mediation is expressed — *political* mediation and *epistemic* mediation — will be considered; these are threatened by a series of tendencies that aim to cancel them. This is worrying because the current era foresees an increasingly complex articulation of democratic decisions and, therefore, requires an increasingly incisive osmosis between these two types of mediation. In other words, to take up an important suggestion, although technocracy and democracy are antithetical — democracy is based on the assumption that everyone can decide everything, whereas technocracy claims that the few who possess the necessary knowledge decide — it is nevertheless significant to note that the problems to be solved in contemporary democracies are increasingly complex and require adequate preparation (Bobbio, 2010); therefore, it is important to be able to find a balance between political mediation and epistemic mediation.

This article aims to deepen this balance, which of course is not easy to achieve or to maintain within the broad and articulated crisis of democracy (Bazzicalupo, 2014). The path that will be proposed will develop starting from the concept of *complex sovereignty*,

2. An ancient theme and widely analyzed in political philosophy (Galli, 2010).

which has a long and articulated history — present in the reflections of Condorcet and developed by Fichte (Rosanvallon, 2017, pp. 108-122) — and also used in the most recent analyses on political authority (Grande & Pauly, 2005). The aim is to rediscover some original aspects of this concept to grasp the problematic nodes that lie behind the relationship between technocracy and democracy. Above all, we will try to consider the concept of complex sovereignty not only in relation to political mediation but also including epistemic mediation to propose an articulated theory of democracy that tries to place the opposition between democratic legitimacy and epistemic legitimacy in a more realistic and complex framework.

The apparent contradiction to be resolved revolves around the fact that the attempt to deconstruct political sovereignty by technocratic power accentuates the crisis of political representation and therefore should be weakened. However, at the same time, technocratic powers, through forms of epistemic mediation, are nevertheless indispensable for democracy, despite their problematic action. The balance between political mediation and epistemic mediation will be discussed, in conclusion, within a more general theoretical scheme that identifies “complexity” as the distinctive feature of the theory of democracy (Innerarity, 2022) and where *complex sovereignty* occupies a relevant and by no means negligible position.

Political mediation and epistemic mediation: the principle of delegation

Since the second half of the twentieth century, Western democracies have witnessed a development of the horizontal dimension of politics so impetuous as to overshadow its vertical dimension (Sartori, 2011). In other words, the development of forms of unconventional participation, the emergence of non-institutionalized movements, and the increasingly felt need to promote ways of direct participation in political life have led to a development of the horizontal dimensions of power, which have certainly had the merit of revitalizing some important practices of democracy, but, at the same time, they have obscured a fundamental idea, namely that according to which “the democracy of the moderns is representative and develops vertically, from the citizen upwards (up to the government that governs it)” (Sartori, 2011, p. 114). This is one of the main causes of what we now call the crisis of political representation because, with the erosion of the balance between the vertical and horizontal

dimensions of power, even the logics that determine the relationship between rulers and governed have undergone alterations³.

The tendency to neglect the vertical dimension of democracy has led to a relative decrease in attention on that intermediate area that defines the distance between those who govern and those who are governed, which is instead central to the dynamics of political representation (Campati, 2022a; Müller, 2021). In this sense, as is well known, the rhetoric of disintermediation has widened forcefully, fuelling a real revolt against intermediate bodies (Urbinati, 2015), which, however, are still at the base of some proposals for the revitalization of democratic systems, especially within a framework of democratic corporatism (Pabst, 2021, pp. 91-106, 134-143). In fact, in the history of modern democracy, intermediate bodies have always been at the centre of cultural and political controversies between those who want to cancel them and those who want to promote them. There is no doubt, however, that today, the relationship between democracy and disintermediation is characterized by some rather ambiguous trends that need to be monitored (Campati & Palano, 2022). Many of these ambiguities can be traced back precisely to the tension between epistemic mediation and political mediation.

Epistemic mediation is understood as a dynamic that develops within the more general reflection on *technocracy* and is based on a basic observation according to which the unequal distribution of knowledge — the *division of cognitive labour* (Dorato, 2019, p. 14) — makes it inevitable that many individual or collective decisions are based on some kind of mediation or consultation with experts more competent than the individual citizen. In the actions we perform in daily life, consciously or unconsciously, we rely on someone's expertise to make those particular actions possible (for example, when traveling by aeroplane, we rely on the competence of the pilot and trust the skills of those who designed and built the aircraft). In dramatic ways, we realized the indispensability of the competence of some professional figures (doctors) during the Covid-19 pandemic, when it became clear that the rhetoric that propagates the idea of epistemic undifferentiation is misleading: A new chapter has been added to the complex relationship between politics and competence, which must be constantly monitored and rethought (Pamuk, 2021). This complexity has been fuelled over the years also by those hypotheses that provide for a twist of representative democracy to meritocratic faith,

3. On horizontal and vertical conceptions of politics, see Bartolini (2022, pp. 35-43) and Boni (2021). On the extensive literature on the transformations of political representation, see Castiglione and Pollak (2019) and Albertone and Castiglione (2018); Di Sciullo (2022).

inspired by the efficiency guaranteed by some political regimes, such as the Chinese one (Bell, 2015).

In the purely political sphere, all the suggestive hypotheses proposed in recent years concerning the possibility of guaranteeing *permanent* and *direct* contacts, therefore without mediation, between citizens and political decision-makers have failed to improve the functioning of representative democracy. In fact, as has been observed, our societies are too complex, articulated, and difficult to manage to be governed, for example, by drawing lots for public office or through a continuous flow of electronic voting. The hypothesis of politics without mediation does not make power “more democratic” but distances it even more from citizens: Therefore, a network of mediations is still indispensable, because one does not govern without skills and knowledge and, at the same time, without orienting the large bureaucratic apparatuses (Schia-vone, 2013, p. 96)⁴.

All these findings on epistemic and political mediations demonstrate that the *principle of delegation* is indispensable in both the cognitive and political fields (Dorato, 2019, p. 14). Therefore, the growing attitude of suspicion towards *knowledge mediators* (experts) and *political mediators* (the political class and political parties) undermines the entire architecture of representative democracy because it cannot do without such mediations. The causes of the wide diffusion of this attitude are numerous and now cemented in a large part of the population, thanks to the use of information and communication technology (ICT), and it can be summarized in the widespread trend that we indicate with the term *disintermediation* (Gellman, 1996). In fact, the multiplication of sources of information and the reduction of the costs of producing and distributing opinions make it possible to erase the gap between “high” and “low”, but, at the same time, they also allow the opinions of experts and amateurs to be placed on the same level, enabling each individual to aspire to present himself or herself as an “agent of truth” (Palano, 2020, p. 162). In short, in the words of Dorato (2019, p. 67):

“the solution to the fundamental conflict between the principle of delegation made necessary by the division of knowledge and the principle of the decision-making autonomy of the citizen, however, cannot consist in making everyone express

4. A specific study should be made on the mediation function of political parties (cf. Mair, 2013; Mancini, 2015; and, more generally, Katz & Crotty, 2006).

themselves on everything. Rather, it must consist in organizing a representative democracy in such a way that the rationality of a decision based on the principle of competence and representation can coexist with our autonomy"⁵.

Noting that the principle of political and epistemic delegation is a crucial element for the functioning of the democratic system, it is now necessary to direct attention to a conceptual formula that explains how this assumption is valid, that of "complex sovereignty", elaborated by Pierre Rosanvallon (2000) in his work on the genesis of representative government. In fact, to grasp the complexity of the link between political mediation and epistemic mediation, it is necessary to dwell, at first, on some elements of the theory of representation.

Complex sovereignty: pluralization of the people, the time of politics (and competences)

According to Rosanvallon's (2000) reconstruction, one of the central figures to understanding the genesis of representative democracy is surely Nicolas de Condorcet because he "reproblematizes" an issue that led to an *impasse* in political debate during the French Revolution⁶. In fact, whereas many of his contemporaries saw representative government as an *alternative* to the impossibility of direct and immediate democracy, he managed to identify an autonomous and well-defined model that is the basis of modern democratic constitutionalism (Urbinati, 2020, p. 175). In other words, according to Rosanvallon (2011), Condorcet's "main idea" is to "allow for different forms of popular sovereignty" (p. 108) to define an *indirect* democracy and not simply a model of democracy that must take note of the impossibility of direct contact between those who have power and those who do not.

The pluralization that Condorcet describes investigates the *modalities* and *temporalities* of expression of political life. Therefore, it allows us to overcome the opposition between Sieyès' conception, according to which the collective will can exist only through

5. The translation from Italian into English is by the author. On the implications of the "symbolic mediation" of the intellectual technocrat, also in relation to the function of political mediation, see Antonelli (2019, pp. 89-91).

6. It is no coincidence that Dorato (2019, pp. 105-123) also uses Condorcet's theorem to demonstrate that an increase in scientific literacy is a necessary condition for citizens and the public to be able to decide in the most autonomous, reactional, and free way possible. Urbinati (2014, p. 115) recalls that supporters of epistemic democracy consider Condorcet a mentor of theirs.

an organ that gives it shape, and that of the Parisian “sectionaries”, who, instead, imagine the people as subjects that are immediately encountered on the street (Rosanvallon, 2011, p. 109). In short, Condorcet’s intent is to present representative democracy not as the synthesis of contradictory principles but as a specific model that is opposed to an immediate democracy, which cancels mediations and makes the relationship between representatives and those they represent rather confused. In these terms, complex sovereignty “can be defined as the political form adequate to a more faithful expression of the people, inasmuch as functionally *and* materially multiplied” (Rosanvallon, 2011, pp. 108-109).

The pluralization of sovereignty concerns the modalities and temporalities of politics (Cuhna & Cassimiro, 2022). As for the former, Rosanvallon (2011) recalls that the people are not a monolith but present themselves in at least three forms: electoral people, social people, and the people as principle (pp. 109-110). The first is easily identifiable because it assumes numerical consistency in the ballot boxes and manifests itself in the division between a majority and a minority, even if for this reason it is evanescent and presents itself in a discontinuous form. Social people, on the other hand, are the set of an uninterrupted series of minorities, active or passive, so they are the sum of all the protests and initiatives of all kinds present in society. Finally, principled people give consistency to the electoral people in the form of inclusive equality, based on the possibility for everyone to be fully considered in their existence and dignity. These are the results of the pluralization of ways of doing politics.

However, as anticipated, Rosanvallon (2000) recalls that even the temporalities of the political must be pluralized. A central point in the theory of political representation is defined here: In fact, he maintains “that is why the constituent power understood as *direct existence* of popular sovereignty cannot be taken as a rule of democratic life” (Rosanvallon, 2011, p. 111) because it is impossible that it can be expressed in immediate form, as democracy takes on meaning and form only as a construction in history. In this sense, democracy is a function of time, and the people, as a collective political subject, are also a figure of time (Rosanvallon, 2011, p. 179). In essence, it is necessary to hold together a series of temporal dimensions that pluralize the temporalities of democracy: vigilant time of memory, long time of constitution, limited time of a parliamentary mandate, short time of opinion, and so on must confront and adapt continuously in order to give consistency to the democratic ideal. As is evident, according to this scheme, democracy is the set of a series of tensions that are never definitively resolved but that are continually stimulated by internal and external transformations.

Therefore, if political mediation (in a representative democratic regime) is based on the pluralization of the people and the time of politics, as far as epistemic mediation is concerned, of course, a specific discourse must be made. However, it is not entirely accidental that the two elements at the base of the pluralization proposed by Rosanvallon (2011) (*people* and *time*) can be taken as coordinates to analyse the epistemic dimension of democracy. In fact, the accusation that is addressed to the holders of epistemic mediation (individual personalities and institutions) is that of not being democratically legitimized through an electoral mechanism of *input legitimacy* (Scharpf, 1998), and therefore, their actions would be in clear contradiction to popular sovereignty. Starting from this observation, as is known, a heated and varied debate has opened around the *epistocracy*, which also includes radical proposals on the role of the competent individuals within democracy (Brennan, 2016; Estlund, 2008; Nichols, 2017) and that variously recall the well-known concept of "epistemic democracy" (Cohen, 1986). The most important fact to highlight is that surely the various attempts to assert technocratic powers as more relevant than democratically elected institutions represents an attempt at depoliticization, which is rightly worrying because it weakens the indispensable procedures of participation and popular legitimation⁷: In short, the risk is that epistemic doctrine reduces democracy to a chapter in the search for truth (Urbinati, 2014, p. 127). At the same time, as already mentioned, the figures of epistemic mediation are indispensable for the functioning of democratic institutional procedures and for the formulation of public policies, regulated by authorities operating in very different areas from each other. It is therefore appropriate to try to overcome the polarization that sees the *democratic legitimacy* that requires that everyone's speech be received with respect and tolerance and the *democratic competence* that requires that the discourse be subject to a disciplinary authority that distinguishes good ideas from bad ones (Post, 2012, p. 34). One way to achieve this goal is precisely to insert this dichotomy within the concept of "complex sovereignty" to certify the indispensability of a pluralization of mediations: political mediation linked to democratic legitimacy and epistemic mediation linked to competence.

The second element of the pluralization of popular sovereignty proposed by Rosanvallon (2011), after the people, is time. As we have anticipated, even with respect to this second element, we can find a link with epistemic mediation because sometimes time is

7. Innerarity (2022, p. 275) writes, "Direct democracy and plebiscite forms of decision are instruments of an apolitical character, and if they enjoy greater prestige today than they really deserve, it is essentially because they fall within that general tone of a democracy without politics that distinguishes our society". All quotes from Innerarity (2022) were translated from Italian into English by the author.

the dimension that is evoked when recourse to epistemic power is used. Of course, this is not always the case. Epistemic authorities are often permanent and governed by specific temporal logics, and there is no doubt that they too are influenced by the dynamics of acceleration (Rosa, 2010), especially in an era in which the “exceptional” moments to be governed seem to be increasingly numerous (the management of Covid-19 is perhaps the latest emblematic example in this sense). Therefore, just as “the notion of general will loses all consistency if it is considered only in the form of immediacy” (Rosanvallon, 2011, p. 178), in the same way, the notion of epistemic mediation cannot be exhausted immediately, in the resolution of a problem that imposes itself suddenly, but must be “pluralized”, that is, inserted within a dynamic that provides for the balance between temporal diversities: in the first place, the immediate time of the decision to be taken on the wave of urgency and the time of reflection that precedes the decision of the political authority.

To summarize, the pluralization of sovereignty proposed by Rosanvallon (2011), in the wake of Condorcet investigates the modes and temporalities of politics, thus determining the creation of a plural vision of the people and a plural vision of the times of politics, which are the basis for the creation of the concept of political mediation within a representative democracy. What has been proposed in the previous pages is to reflect on epistemic mediation starting again from the notions of people and time (both are decisive for understanding the complex relationship between democracy and the epistemic dimension) and thus try to enrich the concept of pluralization of sovereignty. In other words, the classic notion of “complex sovereignty” would thus include both types of mediation (political and epistemic), becoming a conceptual dimension capable of grasping some important dynamics of the transformation of democracy, starting from the fact that the latter is an articulated system, regulated by a series of balances, and often unstable. In fact, one of the shortcomings in the broad debate on democracy is an oversimplification, sometimes based on a conceptual and ideological confusion that needs to be overcome.

Complex democracy: expanded sovereignty

The myriad of publications dedicated to the health of the democratic system sometimes do not help to fully understand the transformations that affect it because conceptual categories, historical examples, and perspectives very different from each other are used, which risks confusing the levels of analysis. It is therefore inevitable that, despite

careful analyses on the genesis and development of democracy (Butti de Lima, 2019; Crick, 2002; Dunn, 2005; Petrucciani, 2014; Salvadori, 2016), some simplifications on the functioning of representative democracy are spreading, especially in public opinion. Two examples are represented by political and epistemic mediation, as we have mentioned: both accused by the *ideology of immediacy* (Innerarity, 2020, pp. 160–161) but both indispensable for the functioning of democracy.

To avoid simplifications, it is therefore important to study representative democracy with an approach that puts it “up to the complex ways of organizing and functioning of our societies” (Scuccimarra, 2017, p. 17). In fact, as Daniel Innerarity (2022, pp. 9–11) pointed out in his latest book, the main threat to democracy today is not violence or inefficiency but simplification, which is expressed with two faces: a conceptual inadequacy and an ideological tool. There is much concrete evidence of this, and some of the evidence that Innerarity (2022) indicates recalls the double question of political and epistemic mediation: for example, the simplifying opposition between elite and people, or the extension of the category of efficiency to the main element of the political system. After acknowledging the difficulties that an excess of simplification produces, Innerarity (2022) elaborates a *theory of complex democracy* to delimit a conceptual horizon suitable for the needs of contemporary democratic life, in the full conviction that “democracy is not incompatible with complexity, on the contrary: its internal dynamism and its capacity for self-transformation make it the system of government with the best structures to manage it” (p. 19). The challenge posed by this interpretation is difficult because it aims to integrate the conceptual equipment of a discipline (political philosophy) with that of the natural sciences, thus defining a *post-disciplinary* horizon (Innerarity, 2022, pp. 53–55)⁸. Leaving aside this suggestive interpretation, which cannot be studied in depth here, it is, however, important to underline how the theory of complex democracy offers a foundation on which to place the reflection on “complex sovereignty” in the terms with which it was presented in the previous pages.

There are several reasons that justify this, starting from the sharing of the three basic assumptions that Innerarity (2022) places at the base of his theory (pp. 92–93) and which are also congruent for the perspective adopted in this article: First, complexity is a factor of greater democracy, especially because the latter is bound to the ability to

8. Innerarity's (2022) proposal is to attempt a dialogue between political theory and the natural sciences and their concepts to bridge the rift between the natural sciences and the human sciences, in the wake of what the ideologues of modern democracy did (p. 53). In fact, the use of natural sciences to understand political phenomena is a perspective adopted by several scholars, such as Walter Bagehot, a well-known intellectual during the Victorian Age, especially for some of his interventions on the relationship between “science” and “politics” (Campati, 2022b).

introduce all ideas into the processes of formation of political will, the experiences and perspectives of a society that no longer tolerates the logic of hierarchical deliberative procedures. Second, democracy is the regime of complexity because it articulates social pluralism better than other regimes and makes it possible to learn about society. From this perspective, democracy is therefore also the fertile ground for the creation and development of intermediate bodies. Finally, the third element Innerarity (2022) indicated recalls that democracy and complexity are united by the difficulty of governing considering the variety of requirements of a plural system. This point refers more directly to the question of representative government and therefore to the intrinsic contradiction that is inherent in it, namely the need to allow the participation of all but within a logic that provides intermediaries to express the popular will.

On the basis of these premises, Innerarity (2022, p. 287) sets some objectives, including overcoming the antagonism between populism and democracy, which is presented as a negative consequence of the polarization between competence and participation. In fact, he explains that the impetus with which the opposition of technocracy and populism has burst into the current ideological landscape is proof of how the terms of the issue are not well centred. The connection between this contrast and the dual declination of mediation analysed above is quite evident. In fact, it is known that the impulse to immediacy, and therefore to the annulment of mediation, is one of the main characteristics of populism (Rosanvallon, 2020), which criticizes the action of intermediate institutions in favour of forms of political immediacy. In the same way, one of the declinations of the technocratic problem — as pointed out in the first paragraph — is the problematic acceptance, in a democracy, of epistemic mediation.

Therefore, there is a point of contact between the desire to overcome the antagonism between populism and democracy and the intent to include in the concept of “complex sovereignty” political mediation and epistemic mediation with their respective pluralizations. In this way, it is possible to add an element to the theory of complex democracy and, in particular, to the reflection on political representation. In short, to overcome the antagonism between populism and democracy, it is necessary to “complicate” sovereignty, that is, consider it in its totality (Galli, 2019), without adopting simplifying shortcuts. In this way, the polarization between democratic legitimacy and epistemic legitimacy is attenuated, and the reflection on the transformations of democracy is brought back into a problematizing logic, which is perhaps the only one capable of grasping the most radical transformations.

References

- Albertone, M. & Castiglione, D. (eds.) (2018). *Les Défis de la représentation. Langages, pratiques et figuration du gouvernement*. Paris: Classiques Garnier.
- Antonelli, F. (2019). *Tecnocrazia e democrazia. L'egemonia al tempo della società digitale*. Roma: L'asino d'oro.
- Bartolini, S. (2022). *Il Politico. Teoria dell'azione politica nucleare*. Brescia: Scholé.
- Bazzicalupo, L. (ed.) (2014). *Crisi della democrazia*. Milano: Mimesis.
- Bell, D.A. (2015). *The China Model: Political Meritocracy and the Limits of Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Best, H. & Higley, J. (eds.) (2018), *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bobbio, N. (2010). *Il futuro della democrazia*. Milano: Rcs [1984].
- Boni, S. (2021). *Orizzontale e verticale. Le figure del potere*. Milano: Elèuthera.
- Brennan, J. (2016), *Against Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Butti de Lima, P. (2019). *Democrazia. L'invenzione degli antichi e gli usi dei moderni*. Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Campati, A. (2022a). *La distanza democratica. Corpi intermedi e rappresentanza politica*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Campati, A. (2022b). Scienza e politica? Élite e «gruppi cooperativi» nella riflessione di Walter Bagehot. *Rivista di politica*, 2, 131-141.
- Campati, A. & Palano, D. (eds.) (2022). *Democracy and Disintermediation. A Dangerous Relationship*. Milano: Educatt.
- Castiglione, D. & Pollak, J. (eds.) (2019). *Creating Political Presence. The New Politics of Democratic Representation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen, J. (1986). An Epistemic Conception of Democracy. *Ethics*, 1, 26-38.
- Crick, B. (2002). *Democracy: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cunha, D. & Cassimiro, P.H.P. (2022). Populism as a Model of 'Polarized Democracy': Pierre Rosanvallon's Theory of populism in contemporary debate. *Sociologias*, n. 59, 200-234.
- Di Sciullo, F.M. (2022). *La democrazia della sfiducia. La rappresentanza nell'età del paradosso*, Napoli: Editoriale Scientifica.
- Dorato, M. (2019). *Disinformazione scientifica e democrazia. Le competenze dell'esperto e l'autonomia del cittadino*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina.

- Dunn, J. (2005). *Democracy: A History*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Estlund, D.M. (2008). *Democratic Authority: A Philosophical Framework*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Galli, C. (2010). *Genealogia della politica. Carl Schmitt e la crisi del pensiero politico moderno*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Galli, C. (2019). *Sovranità*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Gellman, R. (1996). Disintermediation and the Internet. *Government Information Quarterly*, 1, 1-8.
- Grande, E. & Pauly, L. W. (eds.) (2005). *Complex Sovereignty: Reconstituting Political Authority in the Twenty-First Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Innerarity, D. (2020). *Politics in the Times of Indignation. The Crisis of Representative Democracy*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Innerarity, D. (2022). *Una teoria della democrazia complessa. Governare nel XXI secolo*. Roma: Castelvecchi.
- Katz, R.S. & Crotty, W (2006). *Handbook of Party Politics*. London: Sage.
- Mair, P. (2013). *Ruling the Void. The Hollowing of Western Democracy*. Brooklyn-London: Verso.
- Mancini, P. (2015). *Il post partito. La fine delle grandi narrazioni*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- Müller, J.-W. (2021). *Democracy Rules*. London: Allen Lane.
- Nichols, T. (2017). *The Death of Expertise: The Campaign against Established Knowledge and Why It Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Palano, D. (2020). *Bubble Democracy. La fine del pubblico e la nuova polarizzazione*. Brescia: Scholé.
- Pamuk, Z. (2021). *Politics and Expertise. How to Use Science in a Democratic Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pabst, A. (2021). *Postliberal Politics. The Coming Era of Renewal*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Petruciani, S. (2014). *Democrazia*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Post, R.C. (2012). *Democracy, Expertise, Academic Freedom: A First Amendment Jurisprudence for the Modern State*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rosa, H (2010). *Towards a Critical Theory of Late-Modern Temporality*, Natchitoches: Nsu Press.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2000). *La démocratie inachevée. Histoire de la souveraineté du peuple en France*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Rosanvallon, P. (2011). *Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

- Rosanvallón, P. (2017). *Controdemocrazia. La politica nell'era della sfiducia*. Roma: Castelvecchi.
- Rosanvallón, P. (2020). *Le siècle du populisme. Histoire, théorie, critique*. Paris: Seuil.
- Salvadori, M.L. (2016). *Democrazia. Storia di un'idea tra mito e realtà*. Roma: Donzelli.
- Sartori, G. (2011). *Democrazia. Cosa è*. Milano: Rizzoli.
- Scharpf, F.W. (1998). *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schiavone, A. (2013). *Non ti delego. Perché abbiamo smesso di credere nella loro politica*. Milano: Rizzoli.
- Scuccimarra L. (2017). Ripoliticizzare la società, complicare la democrazia. Pierre Rosanvallón e le sfide della politica democratica. En P. Rosanvallón, *Controdemocrazia. La politica nell'era della sfiducia* (pp. 5-23). Roma: Castelvecchi.
- Urbinati, N. (2010), *Democrazia rappresentativa. Sovranità e controllo dei poteri*. Roma: Donzelli.
- Urbinati, N. (2014). *Democrazia sfigurata. Il popolo fra opinione e verità*. Milano: Egea.
- Urbinati, N. (2015). A Revolt against Intermediary Bodies. *Constellations*, 4, 477-486.