



GREEN HOUSE
THINK TANK

Written Evidence for the Modernising Elections Inquiry

**A response from Green House Think Tank to the Housing,
Communities and Local Government Committee's call for evidence**

Written on behalf of Green House by Oliver Millington and Peter Sims

May 2026

Response Structure

Background	1
Inquiry Terms of Reference	2
Green House Think Tank's Response	3
Who We Are	3
Summary of Our Inquiry Response	3
Summary of our recommendations:	4
Foreign Political Donations and Money in Politics	5
Democratic Engagement	9
Modernisation of Elections	13

Background

The [Modernising Elections Inquiry](#) aims to examine the state of electoral democracy in the UK and inform the select committee's scrutiny of the Government's [Representation of the People Bill](#). The inquiry directed written evidence submissions to relate to some or all of the questions outlined in the inquiry's terms of reference.

Inquiry Terms of Reference

Foreign political donations

- What is the current scope of and level of concern about foreign influence on UK elections?
 - Are the Government's proposed reforms likely to close existing loopholes in the rules governing foreign political donations?
- Are there any additional reforms to the rules around political donations that could further strengthen democracy?

Democratic engagement

- What is the current state of electoral democracy in the UK today?
 - What are the key challenges facing the administration of the electoral system and what should be done to address these?
- How effective is the Government's proposal to lower the voting age likely to be at increasing electoral engagement?
 - How well placed are young people to participate in UK elections and what could the Government do to improve this?
 - What else should be done to increase electoral engagement?
- What impact has delays to planned local elections had on public trust in and attitudes towards democracy?

Modernisation of elections

- What role has online mis- and disinformation played in recent elections in the UK? How can we effectively monitor its impact?
 - To what extent have social media algorithms amplified and promoted misleading content about UK elections?
 - How effective is the existing regulatory framework at tackling this and how could it be improved?
- Is the current system of electoral registration fit for purpose in the modern era?
 - Is the Government's proposal to run pilots of AVR for the next general election the most effective way of moving toward an automated system of voter registration?
 - What are the potential democratic risks associated with rolling it out in this way?
- Which international comparators have high levels of electoral registration, engagement and security? Which countries have taken effective steps to ban foreign donations?
- What other changes to the UK's body of electoral law would you like to see?

Green House Think Tank's Response

Who We Are

1. [Green House Think Tank](#) is an independent think tank that aims to lead the development of green thinking in the UK. It is a not-for profit organisation, limited by guarantee, with a core group and advisory group. We publish [reports](#), [briefing papers](#), [book reviews](#) as well as opinion pieces, commissioned work and organising events. Our funding breakdown is [available here](#) and our website includes an [overview of our project work](#).
2. We are submitting this written evidence to the Modernising Elections Inquiry, because we believe that the [Representation of the People Bill](#) has the potential to significantly strengthen British democracy. However, the bill requires vital amendments to achieve its full potential.

Summary of Our Inquiry Response

3. The UK's systems of governance are of critical importance. Without effective democratic governance, the UK's capacity to mitigate the impacts of climate change and build a more resilient, stable, and sustainable society is neutered. This risks the UK state becoming increasingly vulnerable to global shocks and crises. The world is changing rapidly, in part because human societies have collectively taken Earth beyond safe limits with respect to several planetary boundaries.¹
4. Our society must adapt quickly to a changing world. This requires governance systems that are far more dynamic and genuinely democratically accountable than those that the UK has today.²

Scope of Our Response

5. Our response to the inquiry focuses upon the following questions from the Terms of Reference:

Foreign Political Donations and Money in Politics

- What is the current scope of and level of concern about foreign influence on UK elections?
- Are there any additional reforms to the rules around political donations that could further strengthen democracy?

¹ <https://www.stockholmresilience.org/research/planetary-boundaries.html>
(accessed 20 April 2026)

² <https://www.greenhousethinktank.org/rethinking-energy-demand-framing-report/>
(accessed 20 April 2026)

Democratic Engagement

- What is the current state of electoral democracy in the UK?
- How effective is the Government's proposal to lower the voting age likely to be at increasing electoral engagement?
- What else should be done to increase electoral engagement?

Modernisation of Elections

- Which international comparators have high levels of electoral registration, engagement and security?
- What other changes to the UK's body of electoral law would you like to see?

Overview of Recommendations:

1. Introduce a universal annual cap on political donations that applies to all donors, not just those living overseas.
2. Set the cap on political donations to no more than one third of the median income.
3. Limit permissible political donors to exclude all non-natural persons, such that political donations may only be made by individuals who are registered on the UK electoral register.
4. Give a citizens' assembly a mandate to determine how future generations' interests should be accounted for in the UK's system of democracy and inform the preparation of relevant legislation by government.
5. Invest Public Money into Democracy:
 - a. Political Education
 - b. Institutional Funding for Political Foundations
 - c. Enhance Support for Public Interest Journalism
6. Empower sub-national authorities via greater devolution and reform of local government finance.
7. Trial participatory budgeting at all levels of government.
8. Mandate that a citizens' assembly is convened to examine the different options for proportional electoral systems and determine the most appropriate system for general elections in the United Kingdom.
9. Actively pursue democratic innovation including making more extensive use of sortition based representative bodies, such as citizens' assemblies.

Foreign Political Donations and Money in Politics

What is the current scope of and level of concern about foreign influence on UK elections?

6. The issue of foreign influence on UK politics, including but not limited to the outcomes of elections, is rightfully attracting significant attention. Safeguarding our democracy against malign influence is a matter of utmost importance that underpins both the National Security and the British people's right to genuine self-determination. Thus, we welcome the government's proposal to take some steps on addressing this matter in the *Representation of the People Bill* and the commissioning of [The Rycroft Review](#). We consider that The Rycroft Review effectively explores the particular question of the scope of and level of concern regarding foreign influence on UK politics.
7. However, the Government's proposed reforms, even if strengthened by Rycroft's recommendations, do not go far enough to adequately protect democracy from being systematically undermined. We outline how the *Representation of the People Bill* could be more comprehensively strengthened in our subsequent answers.

Are there any additional reforms to the rules around political donations that could further strengthen democracy?

8. When considering what reforms could further strengthen democracy, it is first useful to reflect on what democracy really means and to draw the distinction versus certain alternative forms of government. Deriving from the Ancient Greek words *dêmos* (ordinary citizens) and *krátos* (power), democracy means the rule of the ordinary people. A democratic system of government is one in which political power rests with the ordinary citizens of the state. It is essential that we contrast democracy with aristocracy (rule of the elite), oligarchy (rule of the few), and plutocracy (rule of the wealthy).
9. Some countries, notably Switzerland,³ make relatively extensive use of direct democracy via national referenda. In the UK, referenda have historically been used only sporadically on select major issues.
10. In the UK, like most modern democratic states, our democracy primarily takes the form of representative democracy: political power is exercised by the people via the election of representatives (MPs, MSPs, MSs, councillors, etc.). Formally, representative democracy could be described as an aristocracy in which the ruling elite are given democratic legitimacy by virtue of being chosen from amongst and by the ordinary citizenry.

³ <https://www.aboutswitzerland.eda.admin.ch/en/direct-democracy> (accessed 20 April 2026)

11. Consequently, strengthening our democracy must be about ensuring that the processes by which we elect representatives, our elections, are wholly and genuinely an expression of the political will of the people. Within an electoral system, it is necessary, but not sufficient, that fair elections are orchestrated that uphold the fundamental principle of 'one person, one vote'. It is additionally required that voters are able to make an informed decision on how to cast their vote based on true and accurate information. Otherwise, votes will fail to reflect the genuine outcome preferences of the voters (ordinary citizens).
12. Campaigning by political parties is one of the most significant systems via which information is provided to the voting public regarding their political options. The capacity of political parties to conduct their campaigns requires funding. A critical aspect of strengthening our democracy must therefore be ensuring that political parties are funded in a manner that is consistent with democratic principles, i.e. devolving power to ordinary citizens.
13. An issue which The Rycroft Review skirts around is that permitting any large political donations at all is inherently subversive of democratic principles. If political parties derive substantial part of their funding from a relatively small number of large donors, then these donors have a vastly disproportionate influence on the political landscape.
14. There are two distinct risks. Firstly, that political parties will adopt positions that are in the narrow interest of potential large donors rather than the wider public interest. Secondly, that even if donations do not actually influence the formation of policy by parties, those parties that do have policies that are in the interest of large donors will have a significant campaigning advantage over those that do not. The information that citizens receive is thus distorted by undemocratic party financing, which may influence the votes of a significant proportion of the electorate. In essence, permitting excessively large donations weakens our representative democracy by layering the vital provision of political information with an element of oligarchic plutocracy. It is fundamentally undemocratic for any one individual, regardless of domicile, to be able to make donations that have, as Rycroft puts it, a 'game-changing impact'.

Recommendation 1) The Rycroft Review recommends setting an annual cap on political donations from British voters living abroad. **We recommend extending this to a universal cap on all donors, not just those living overseas.**

15. The Rycroft Review suggests that the cap on donations is '*set initially at a reasonably high level, perhaps in a range from £100,000 – £300,000 per donor per year*' so that political parties have time to adjust their fundraising strategies to reflect the new reality. We disagree. No consideration should overshadow acknowledgement that the continuation of large donations is fundamentally anti-democratic. Alignment with democratic ideals necessitates that the donation cap is reduced to a level that is accessible to an ordinary citizen as soon as possible. Only by doing so can the plutocratic aspects of our electoral system be eliminated. If forced to, political parties have the capacity to adapt quickly.

16. So, what is a sensible donations cap? We suggest that the national median income is an appropriate benchmark that the donation cap should be indexed against. It is clearly not sensible to consider any amount more than the median income as accessible to the ordinary citizen. However, even the median income itself is too high, as the median citizen must subtract from this the cost of living to determine the income that they have freedom to spend as they wish, including on political donations.

Recommendation 2) Consequently, we recommend that the cap on political donations is no more than one third of the median income. We note that that with adjustment for inflation this is broadly comparable to the £10,000 cap proposed by the Committee on Standards in Public Life's inquiry in 2011.⁴

17. By definition, all foreign influence is anti-democratic because foreign actors, be they states or private individuals, are not the ordinary citizens of this country. This is recognized by the emphasis of The Rycroft Review. In the case of British companies with significant foreign ownership, even where no such persons have significant control, corporate donations in the political interest of these foreign shareholders are inappropriate.
18. Going further, the principle of 'one person, one vote' captures a critical aspect of a truly democratic electoral system. 'One person' explicitly means one *natural person*, i.e. one real flesh and blood human being who is a citizen of the relevant state. It is not inclusive of *juridical persons*, such as companies; juridical persons are not ordinary citizens of the state. Just as it is clearly recognized that it would be undemocratic to give votes to corporations, it must also be recognized that permitting juridical persons to make political donations is inconsistent with ensuring that parties are funded in accordance with democratic principles.
19. Where the executives or board members of a company believe that it is in the interest of their British employees or shareholders to support a particular political party, then it is appropriate not for the corporation to make a direct political donation from its profits but to advise its British employees and British shareholders of its opinion and distribute the relevant profits via wages and dividends. This allows the relevant natural persons to make their own decision regarding political donations, which may balance their interests as an employee or shareholder with the interests that arise from each of the many other roles that any real person has within society. An analogous argument applies to other types of organisations, such Trade Unions.
20. As drafted, *The Representation of the People Bill* proposes a number of tweaks around the edges regarding corporate donations. What is needed is a complete reappraisal of the compatibility of any such donations with the meaning of democracy.

⁴ [Political Party Finance: ending the big donor culture, The thirteenth report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life, published November 2011](#)

Recommendation 3) We recommend limiting the definition of permissible political donors to exclude all non-natural persons, such that **political donations may only be made by individuals who are registered on the UK electoral register.**

21. We acknowledge that these ambitious reforms would represent a step-change in the rules regarding political donations. Several of the UK's major political parties are presently highly financially dependent upon anti-democratic large donations by wealthy individuals and/or juridical persons. However, acknowledgment of this dire situation is no reason not to enact reform. It is the very signal that reform of political finance regulations is required with utmost urgency.
22. Some may suggest that limiting donations would leave political parties unable to fulfil their core democratic purpose, i.e. effectively campaign and develop policy. However, this argument ignores that being financed in an undemocratic manner also prevents a party from genuinely fulfilling this democratic purpose. Moreover, the dependency issue is not intractable. We contend that positing that parties are financially dependent on large and corporate donations is a circular argument. For as long as it is common public knowledge that political party funding is dominated by large donations, ordinary citizens will perceive that the small donations that are within their power to give are inconsequential. Thus, the very existence of large donations reduces the incentive for ordinary citizens to participate in political financing. Permitting large donations therefore hinders political parties from more effectively establishing wide funding bases that are more strongly aligned with democratic principles.
23. We note that typical party membership fees are in the range £1–£7 per month.⁵ It is perhaps insightful to contrast these with the cost of standard subscriptions to typical entertainment services such as Netflix (£12.99/month)⁶, Spotify (£12.99/month)⁷, and the TV Licence Fee (£15/month)⁸. It seems unlikely that citizens who are sufficiently politically engaged to be members of political parties genuinely value supporting their politics less highly than they value their access to television or music services. Clearly, there is scope for political parties to raise more from their membership bases by raising fees. Indeed, members of political parties can be anticipated to feel that there is substantially more value in paying higher fees if they are aware that membership fees, and not large donations, are the main source of party funding.

⁵ Based upon the membership fee information indicated on the 'join' pages of the websites of the following political parties (accessed 18 April 2026): [Conservative and Unionist Party](#), [Green party of England and Wales](#), [Labour Party](#), [Liberal Democrats](#), [Plaid Cymru](#), [Reform UK](#), and [Scottish National Party](#).

⁶ <https://www.netflix.com/signup> (accessed 18 April 2026)

⁷ <https://www.spotify.com/uk/premium/> (accessed 18 April 2026)

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/find-licences/tv-licence> (accessed 18 April 2026)

24. This call for evidence asks what can be done to increase electoral engagement, which we take to mean the number of people actively participating in democratic politics. Voting is but one form of engagement. Choosing to donate, or being a member of a political party, or volunteering for political party are further, more active, forms of engagement. Eliminating big donations from British politics will help engagement on multiple fronts by ensuring that people at all levels of engagement feel that their contribution matters.

Democratic Engagement

What is the current state of electoral democracy in the UK?

25. One critically important issue in the state of electoral democracy in the UK is that future generations are the most impacted and least represented. In Wales the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act⁹ has given some political representation, albeit not within the electoral system. In England and Scotland this void remains. In the past, the idea that living generations made decisions in their own interest was perhaps less problematic. However, intergenerational inequality has never been a more salient issue; our society's disregard for planetary boundaries is going to have very serious and wide-ranging implications for future generations. This democratic flaw is now critical to address.¹⁰

Recommendation 4) Give a citizens' assembly a mandate to determine how future generations' interests should be accounted for in the UK's system of democracy and inform the preparation of relevant legislation by government.

26. Reliance on First Past The Post (FPTP) as the electoral system in UK general elections and local elections (but not elections for the parliaments of the devolved nations) results in huge numbers of people being politically disenfranchised. As noted above, representative democracy is formally an aristocratic system of government in which the ruling elite (meaning a group of those considered best for the task) is held democratically accountable by the ordinary citizenry via an electoral system. An electoral system that returns a chamber of representatives that has a vastly different composition than the composition of votes cast may provide each citizen with a representative, but it cannot be considered genuinely democratic.
27. Under FPTP, electoral outcomes are oversensitive to small shifts in the geographical distribution of political support. Each party's electoral fortunes depend as much on the distribution of support as its overall level of political support. This undermines democratic oversight and encourages parties to prioritise the interests of small swing groups over the population at large. This can exacerbate political polarisation and disengagement from politics.

⁹ [Well-being of Future Generations \(Wales\) Act 2015](#) (accessed 20 April 2026)

¹⁰ <https://www.greenhousethinktank.org/rethinking-energy-demand-framing-report/> (accessed 20 April 2026)

28. In times and geographic locations of relative political stability, FPTP results in vast numbers of people having votes that they know to be meaningless. In any 'safe seat', each citizen is painfully aware that their individual vote will not make one iota of difference to the result; this is true regardless of whether the individual supports the status quo or would like to see change.
29. FPTP is even more subversive of democratic oversight in times of political upheaval, as is the case in 2026 and likely into the future. It is impossible not to acknowledge that a new multi-party politics has emerged in Great Britain. There are now five major political parties in England with a sixth major party in each of Scotland and Wales. Recent opinion polling consistently indicates that in Great Britain as a whole, the five major parties all consistently have between 10% and 30% support.¹¹ Under a FPTP system for general elections, this has major consequences.
30. In a fragmented multi-party-political environment, if each voter were to vote according to their first preference, the overwhelming majority of the population will gain representatives that they did not vote for. This creates pressure on voters to vote 'tactically' to avoid the outcome (elected representative) that they perceive to be worst, rather than being genuinely able to use their vote to support the party that they feel best represents their political views.
31. It should be unsurprising that citizens are left cynical with politics; political campaigns frequently place more emphasis on each party's relative capacity to be the 'only party to be able to beat [insert other party]' rather than each party focussing on offering a genuine policy platform to win voters over on its own merits. The necessity for tactical voting that is driven by FPTP exacerbates political division and is corrosive to society whilst being fundamentally anti-democratic in disempowering citizens to vote according to their genuine first preferences.
32. Our response to the final questions gives a recommend to how this should be addressed.

How effective is the Government's proposal to lower the voting age likely to be at increasing electoral engagement?

33. The government's proposal to lower the voting age is a token gesture. Without wider electoral reform, expanding the electorate only serves to expand the number of people who are left politically disenfranchised by a dysfunctional electoral system.
34. If the government is serious about increasing electoral engagement, then it must prioritise reforming the electoral system and wider democratic processes so that every citizen feels both that their vote matters and that they are able to indicate their genuine first political preference with said vote.

¹¹ Relevant polling has been conducted by several organisation including but not limited to the following (sites accessed 18 April 2026): [More in Common's April MRP](#), [Find Out Now](#), [Electoral Calculus](#), and [YouGov](#).

What else should be done to increase electoral engagement?

35. The reasons people engage or not in the UK's democratic processes are varied and diverse. Some of these wider factors may impact engagement in multiple ways. For instance, the level of political education might not only influence whether people feel empowered to vote in elections (e.g. confidence comparing party literature), but also whether they understand the importance of participation in elections as part of the wider system of governance in the UK.
36. With regard to local elections, citizens might not vote because they do not understand the role of local councillors, or because they feel it does not matter whether they vote in those elections. In the latter case, this could be because they feel they live in a 'safe seat' and it will not change result. Or, it could be because all the candidates appear to be offering much the same from the voters' perspectives. Or, because they are disillusioned with politics more generally. Citizens might feel it is important to vote for MPs, but believe that local councils have little power and that corresponding elections are pointless as a result. This range of reasons for low engagement means that there are multiple avenues that could be pursued to increase electoral engagement.
37. If we want a thriving democracy where people feel empowered to engage in electoral politics, we need all citizens to feel empowered and informed to express their views. UK education outcomes in general are currently very unequal. Unequal political education outcomes mean that some people do not get the opportunities that others do to build understanding and confidence to participate electorally. The interventions needed to address this are varied. An effective response must be partly about formal education, partly about providing resources to political movements to conduct their own political education, and partly about resourcing the civil society space to fill in gaps and scrutinise/collate/contrast/translate the output of political parties to diverse set of audiences.

Recommendation 5) Invest Public Money into Democracy.

a) Political Education: Extra funding for schools, youth clubs, universities, colleges to arrange talks, host hustings and deliver citizenship education. This should cover not just how the current democratic governance system works, but review and debate philosophical and practical questions regarding what works well, what does not, and how the system could be improved.

b) Institutional Funding for Political Foundations: Introduce a distinct legal structure for party aligned political foundations. Administer public grants directly to these organisations for political education, policy development and consensus building. The size of grants could be determined by the vote share that the nominating party receives in general elections.

c) Enhance Support for Public Interest Journalism: BBC public interest broadcasting, notably BBC News and the World Service, should be funded via direct taxation rather than a license fee model. To ensure that the BBC remains independent of government and impartial, this revenue stream must be ring-fenced. To support local democracy, the Local Democracy Reporter Scheme should be expanded.

38. The UK is one of the most centralised countries in Europe. Local authorities need to be empowered to provide local services if there is a local mandate to do so. If the fund-raising powers of local authorities are so restricted that they cannot do this, then it is no wonder that people feel disillusioned and don't turn out for local elections. Even just updating council tax bands to reflect current property prices and giving councils more powers to vary tax per band could give Local Authorities the possibility to do more and consequently engage many presently disillusioned voters.¹²

Recommendation 6) Empower sub-national authorities via greater devolution and reform of local government finance. For people to feel that their local authority or town council matters, and that it is worth turning up to vote in relevant local elections, these bodies need to be empowered to deliver their own initiatives and not just administer centrally structured services (e.g. social care).¹³ This means reducing the extent that legislation reserves power for Westminster, stifling local innovation and initiative.

39. Involving people in budgeting processes (e.g. via sortition) would bring two advantages. It would directly strengthen democracy through the direct participation of ordinary citizens but it would also increase citizens' engagement and understanding which is likely to increase participation in electoral politics. Finally, it contributes to political education as discussed above.

¹² <https://www.greenhousethinktank.org/evidence-to-the-parliamentary-committee-on-political-and-constitutional-reform/>

(accessed 20 April 2026)

¹³ <https://www.greenhousethinktank.org/a-green-vision-for-english-devolution/>

(accessed 20 April 2026)

Recommendation 7) Trial participatory budgeting at all levels of government. Make grants available for sub-national tiers to run their own long running trials. Utilise sortition (citizens' assemblies) to engage citizens in both national and local budgeting processes.

Modernisation of Elections

Which international comparators have high levels of electoral registration, engagement and security?

40. Australia is a democratic OECD country that is a fair international comparator to the UK. Australia has consistently maintained extremely high levels of electoral engagement, with electoral turnouts rarely falling below 90% for over a century.¹⁴ Australia enforces Compulsory Voting. Eligible voters are required by law to vote, such that those who do not vote without a valid and sufficient reason face an administrative penalty of AU\$20 (~£10).¹⁵
41. The premise of compulsory voting is straightforward. It is not only a citizen's civic right to vote, but their civic duty. As discussed above, a representative democracy is arguably an aristocracy that derives democratic legitimacy from a democratic electoral system for the selection of representatives. However, if only a fraction of eligible ordinary citizens participate in the electoral process, then the degree of democratic oversight is diminished and non-comprehensive. Low voter turnout undermines the legitimacy of representative democracy.
42. Compulsory voting is akin to treating participation in elections the same as participating in a jury when a citizen is called to do so.
43. However, some perceive the right not to engage in the democratic process as an important civil liberty. Whatever the merits of compulsory voting, its adoption represents an explicit prioritisation of the ideal of comprehensive democracy over that of personal liberty.

What other changes to the UK's body of electoral law would you like to see?

44. The first step in modernising the UK's democracy is to replace the UK's dysfunctional first past the post system with a system of proportional representation for general elections.
45. There are different variations of proportional representation in operation in democracies around the globe, including for the elections to the parliaments of the devolved nations of the United Kingdom.

¹⁴ [Voter turnout – previous events, Australian Electoral Commission](#) (accessed 18 April 2026)

¹⁵ [Non-voters, Australian Electoral Commission](#) (accessed 18 April 2026)

Recommendation 8) We recommend that the *Representation of The People Bill* is amended to mandate that a citizens' assembly is convened to examine the different options for proportional electoral systems and determine the most appropriate system for general elections in the United Kingdom. This process will ensure that electoral reform is based upon a deliberative, evidence-based process, whilst avoiding the conflict-of-interest that would be inevitable if the issue of electoral reform was delegated to parliament.

46. However, even when combined with the other recommendations above, changing the voting system can only strengthen our democracy to the extent that this is possible within the confines of a framework of electoral representative democracy.
47. Many of the most significant challenges that our society faces this century are intergenerational and global. There is significant evidence that the nature of electoral politics biases electoral systems to prioritise the short-term and the local, and so are systematically maladapted to address such major challenges.^{16,17} A worst case scenario is that the UK fails to respond sufficiently to serious risks and is left overexposed to a rapidly changing world.^{18,19,20,21}
48. To mitigate this risk, the UK should proactively pursue democratic innovation. This means trialling and evaluating alternative democratic participation and decision-making structures, to complement electoral representation. Citizens' assemblies, where democratic governance is based upon sortition rather than election, are one extensively trialled innovation. In Recommendations 4 and 8, we have indicated two exemplary issues that would be most effectively resolved using specially convened citizens' assemblies.
49. We recognise that it could be problematic to give citizens' assemblies the power to decide on policy issues that have complex interrelations with other areas of public policy. However, the efficacy of citizens' assemblies to avoid electoral short-termism would also be undermined if they are only ever advisory. Where utilised, critical consideration should be given to what mandate they are given, what accountability there is over the implementation of their recommendations, and how to avoid mandate overlap with elected politicians. Some degree of experimentation with such innovative systems of democracy will develop political and institutional experience and best practice over time.

¹⁶[Zero Carbon Sooner, Centre for Understanding Sustainable Prosperity](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

¹⁷[An Intergenerational audit for the UK, Resolution Foundation](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

¹⁸[Nature security assessment on global biodiversity loss, ecosystem collapse and national security, DEFRA](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

¹⁹[Merz et al., World scientists' warning: The behavioural crisis driving ecological overshoot, Science Progress, 106\(3\), 2023](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

²⁰[A Growing Divide: Two decades of intergenerational unfairness, Intergenerational Foundation](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

²¹[Intergenerational inequality and the future of the social contract, International Longevity Centre UK](#) (last accessed 21 April 2026)

Recommendation 9) Actively pursue democratic innovation including making more extensive use of sortition based representative bodies, such as citizens' assemblies. This includes giving them direct power to determine policy in stand-alone areas where key considerations are ethical, moral or about changing democratic systems (see Recommendation 4 & 8).

50. Although such innovations are primarily about democratic structures beyond electoral law, they may lead to improvements in public trust, understanding and motivation to participation in all forms of democracy, including elections.

Green House is a think tank founded in 2011. It aims to lead the development of green thinking in the UK. Green House produces reports and briefings on different subjects. We do not have a party line, but rather aim to stimulate debate and discussion. Politics, they say, is the art of the possible. But the possible is not fixed. What we believe is possible depends on our knowledge and beliefs about the world. Ideas can change the world, and Green House is about challenging the ideas that have created the world we live in now, and offering positive alternatives.

Green House Think Tank is a company limited by guarantee, company number 9657878.

Email: info@greenhousethinktank.org

Download this publication from: greenhousethinktank.org/modernising_elections_response_2026

Copyright Green House 2026. Some rights reserved.

34 Queensway, Didcot, Oxfordshire, England, OX11 8LZ

Open Access. Some rights reserved.

Anyone can download, save, perform or distribute this work in any format, including translation, without written permission. This is subject to the conditions:

- The work is not resold
- The text is not altered and is used in full
- Green House, our web address (greenhousethinktank.org) and the authors are credited
- A copy of the work or link to its use online is sent to Green House.

Green House acknowledges the work of Creative Commons in **our approach to copyright** – see creativecommons.org