

## Democracy's Operating System: On Efficiency, Resilience, and the Quiet Power of Procedure

<https://doi.org/10.22151/politikon.61.CON6>

**Kevin W. SETTLES**

Institute for Parliamentary Research (Berlin)

[settles@iparl.de](mailto:settles@iparl.de)

### Abstract

*This essay argues that democracy's resilience lies less in grand reforms than in the quiet, continuous maintenance of its procedures. Tracing a lineage from early parliamentary record-keeping to contemporary AI tools, it shows how digital infrastructures mostly reinforce—rather than reinvent—existing legislative practices. These systems enhance institutional capacity by managing complexity, enabling parliaments to function under growing informational strain. Efficiency is thus reframed as throughput legitimacy: the ability to transform collective intent into coherent decisions without sacrificing representation. Yet this procedural competence must remain democratically guided. When aligned with deliberative purpose, technological innovation strengthens democratic stability rather than hollowing it out.*

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence and Democracy; Democratic Resilience; Parliamentary Procedure; Throughput Legitimacy; Artificial Intelligence in Legislatures; Institutional Capacity

In 1265, royal clerks in England began recording the names of those summoned to what would become the first representative Parliament (The National Archives 2024). It was not a democratic act but an administrative one: an attempt to turn speech into record and governance into permanence. Upon this act grew a tradition of rendering politics legible; from handwritten journals to printed acts and, centuries later, digital portals. Each era devised its own medium for institutionalizing authority through method.

Centuries later, that logic persists in digital infrastructures. Reviewing more than seventy uses of artificial intelligence (AI) in parliaments worldwide reveals a similar pattern: most applications do not reimagine parliamentary processes but sustain them: systems for transcribing debates, classifying amendments, retrieving records. They make legislatures smoother, not necessarily smarter. Only a few reach further, experimenting with participation or prediction (Settles, 2025). A current example is the UK Parliament's Parlex AI system, which automatically classifies, compares, and prepares draft bills for parliamentary debate. This relieves parliamentary staff, making it easier to handle massive volumes of text—yet it does not shift decision-making powers away from elected representatives. What initially appears as a procedural routine reveals itself as institutional maintenance: the often-invisible work that keeps representative systems coherent under rising informational strain. Parliamentary digital infrastructures thus extend a long tradition of emphasizing procedural transparency and legislative output over interaction, reflecting what Cristina Leston-Bandeira (2009) observed in her study of parliamentary websites.

This maintenance, often mistaken for technical optimization, in fact constitutes democracy's procedural core. Efficiency, in this sense, means not acceleration but capacity, the ability of institutions to process complexity without collapse, to maintain the preconditions of deliberation when demands become time-sensitive, multiply and attention shortens. A parliament unable to organize information cannot sustain its core functions, such as legislation and representation. The current state of democracy has been described as an exhaustion of democratic theory, a fatigue born of expanding complexity and shrinking institutional imagination (Selk 2025). This exhaustion is not ideological but procedural, as democracies struggle to convert legitimacy into competence. Their weakness, however, is also their resilience. The very slowness that frustrates their critics—the deliberation, coordination and procedural constraint—protects democracies against collapse by forcing adaptation through method rather than rupture.

In that sense, efficiency underpins democracy's *throughput legitimacy* (Scharpf 1999; Schmidt 2013), the connective tissue between legitimacy and capacity. It is the institutional skill of translating collective intent into workable form, of transforming complexity into collectively binding decisions. This competence has a dual nature: it sustains capacity but risks hollowing purpose when detached from deliberation. Properly understood, it is not the opposite of democracy but its infrastructure, allowing flexibility within rules and change within continuity. Technological transformation, if it is to preserve democratic self-governance, must therefore itself be democratized (Zipperstein 2023). Properly guided, procedural competence strengthens democratic resilience; left to automation, it risks producing institutions that work efficiently but cease to represent meaningfully.

It is often said that one should never change a running system. Yet, an operating system requires continual maintenance: repairs, updates, and adjustments that preserve its code as requirements and environments change. Democracy has always evolved by integrating new instruments without surrendering core functionality. Its endurance lies in balancing innovation with judgment, in maintaining what might be called its *institutional code*: the quiet logic of deliberation, caution, and the urge to repair what keeps representative systems running, update after update.

## References

- IPU, Inter-Parliamentary Union. 2025. *Use cases for AI in parliaments*. Centre for Innovation in Parliament, Parliamentary Data Science Hub. <https://www.ipu.org/AI>
- Leston-Bandeira, Cristina. 2009. "Parliamentary functions portrayed on European parliaments' websites." *European Journal of Communication* 24(1): 89–109. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0104-44782009000300003>

- Scharpf, F. W. 1999. *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, V. A. 2013. "Democracy and legitimacy in the European Union revisited: Input, output, and throughput." *Political Studies* 61(1), 2–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2012.00962.x>
- Selk, V. 2025. *Erschöpfte Demokratie*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Settles, K. W. 2025. "From pixels to parliament: How AI is reshaping Legislative Governance." Paper presented at the 4th Global Conference on Parliamentary Studies, Athens, Greece. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29264873>
- The National Archives 2024. "List of people summoned to the 1265 Parliament." <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/explore-the-collection/stories/list-of-people-summoned-to-the-1265-parliament/>
- UK Government. 2025. "Parlex." AI Knowledge Hub. <https://ai.gov.uk/knowledge-hub/use-cases/parlex/>.
- Zipperstein, S. 2023. "The Democratization of Technology." Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.