



Center for Collaborative Democracy

A Strategy to Resolve Our Country's Existential Problems To the Long-Term Benefit of All

The Center for Collaborative Democracy grew out of the MIT-Harvard Public Disputes Program. We integrate insights from game theory, behavioral economics and conflict resolution in an effort to resolve societal ills that established institutions are failing to remedy.

Our Board of Advisors includes:

Lawrence Susskind, vice chair and co-founder of the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School

John Marks, founder of Search for Common Ground

Adi Ignatius, editor of the Harvard Business Review

Jerome Climer, founder of the Congressional Institute

Brandon Arnold, Executive Vice President of the National Taxpayers Union

Marie Margenau-Spatz, founder of Change Works

Rob Richie, founder and president of FairVote

Elisabetta di Cagno, former editor-in-chief of Columbia Business School publications

Larry Spears, co-founder of Policy Consensus Initiative

Overcoming Our Destructive Political System

Americans left and right, poor and well-off, young and old, coastal and heartland, have — for decades — increasingly diverged in their political beliefs, economic concerns and basic values.

This document will present evidence that our country has become so polarized that:

Whoever proposes a practical solution to any critical national problem inevitably draws far more opposition than support.

Yet several high-profile individuals outside government are equipped to work out a comprehensive agreement resolving our country's gravest troubles in ways that Americans across the spectrum would strongly endorse.

The evidence for these seemingly contradictory assertions consists of more than 200 political controversies that kept intensifying — until each interest group involved was asked to choose someone in their own ranks to represent them.

These representatives — for environmentalists, businesspeople, consumer advocates, labor unions, civil rights organizations, educators, professional associations, government agencies and so on — then worked out long-term remedies that all the groups supported.

When the authors of this document asked these representatives how they resolved their conflicts to the benefit of all sides, they answered, in essence:

Each of us knew in our bones that our own group trusted us to act in their best interests.

Each of us also knew what our own group most wanted to achieve — and what they could let go of.

So, the other representatives and I engaged in intense give-and-take over the various issues dividing us — seeking trades by which each side would advance a major goal in return for giving ground elsewhere. In time, we hashed out an agreement by which each group would attain more top objectives than seemed feasible any other way.

Each of us then persuaded our own group that this was far too much progress to pass up.

By analyzing these situations, this document will:

1) Build a case that whoever wins the upcoming presidential and congressional elections cannot possibly persuade most voters to agree on practical solutions for any of the problems jeopardizing our country's future, including:

- the economic havoc precipitated by the pandemic
- severe income inequality
- dangerously climbing temperature
- K-12 schools among the worst in the developed world
- the most cost-ineffective health care in the world
- unsustainably rising debt
- an economically destructive tax code

- 2) Show that our country can resolve these problems constructively and equitably, if — and only if — voters in each socio-economic-political category are given an opportunity to identify whom outside government they would most trust to represent them on these issues.
- 3) Present evidence that these representatives would be highly motivated and well equipped to work out a comprehensive agreement resolving the above issues in ways that would advance nearly every citizen's long-term interests.
- 4) Spell out how the representatives could persuade voters in each category to support that agreement vocally enough that politicians across the spectrum would endorse the pact to aid their careers
- 5) Answer each objection that we have heard to this endeavor
- 6) Show how citizens alarmed about our country's current trajectory can help launch this consensus-building process
- 7) Show that, without this enterprise, voters and whoever they elect will remain far too divided to agree on solutions for our existential problems, including: increasing class warfare, crushing debt and catastrophic climate change

What Does It Take to Resolve Intractable Conflicts?

When Congress was deadlocked over nearly every facet of environmental policy in the mid-1990s, 25 advocates for the various opposing sides agreed to meet face-to-face. They included top executives from Dow Chemical, General Motors, Chevron Oil and Pacific Gas & Electric; leaders of the Sierra Club, the World Resources Institute, Environmental Defense Fund and the National Wildlife Federation; the director of the EPA; the secretaries of commerce, interior, agriculture and energy; and the president of the AFL-CIO.

By evaluating a range of solutions for each issue that had long divided them, the 25 were able to piece together a plan to significantly advance each side's top priorities: increasing "jobs, productivity, wages, capital, savings, profits, knowledge and education" while reducing "pollution, waste and poverty."¹ All 25 signed the agreement.

Each CEO then persuaded other industry executives that this plan would meet their needs far better than any politically feasible alternative. Each environmentalist won over other environmental groups. The labor leader sold the plan to other unions. And each federal official enlisted colleagues in government.

"We succeeded," one advocate told us, "because we each understood our own community well enough to know what a deal had to include for them to consider it. We got the deal done because the alternative was a status quo we all hated. And we each had enough history with our own community for them to trust our case that this deal we had negotiated on their behalf would advance their interests much further than their other options."

Yet, congressional leaders rejected the plan, telling the advocates that most lawmakers would not give up the environment as a campaign issue in return for a solution too complex for them to sell to their diverse voters.

In hundreds of controversies, advocates for the various sides have agreed on solutions that all sides supported.² And yet elected officials have often ignored the result.

¹ See "A New Consensus for Prosperity, Opportunity and a Healthy Environment," U.S. Government Printing Office, 1996 (available online).

² Examples at www.GenuineRepresentation.org/consensus

Why Whoever Wins Elections Cannot Resolve the Critical Problems of This Era

In America's early days, nearly every family tilled crops suited to local conditions or provided goods and services to nearby families. Voters in each region thereby shared similar interests on the economic issues of that time. Each member of Congress could, in turn, show his voters how he was advancing their interests, if indeed he was.

Today, each lawmaker represents a much wider array of voters on a much wider range of issues. Former lawmakers have lamented to us that they could not bridge their constituents' differences on health care, income inequality, climate change, taxes or education.

A typical comment: "Whatever I proposed, various groups in my district complained that it didn't meet their needs, clashed with their beliefs or placed too heavy a burden on them. After all, my constituents included the young, the middle-aged and the elderly; high-school dropouts, college grads and PhDs; singles, couples, families and empty-nesters; the struggling, the up-and-coming and the thriving."³

Knowing they cannot satisfy voters ranging from 18 to 80+, from poor to well-off, most lawmakers have stayed in office year after year by offering emotionally charged slogans as remedies for America's long-term troubles; pushing legislation benefiting the interest groups that support them while imposing the costs on other groups; and stirring voters' hostility toward the other party.⁴

Incumbents can easily stoke this animus because, as recent election maps show, voters in urban areas are increasingly favoring Democrats, while most voters elsewhere have been leaning Republican.⁵

³ An often-cited example: members of Congress who tried to reform entitlements even-handedly have alienated enough voters — left, right, young and old — for two-thirds of those incumbents to be voted out.

⁴ See Roger H. Davidson et al., *Congress and Its Members* (CQ Press, 2019); and R. Douglas Arnold, *The Logic of Congressional Action* (Yale University Press, 1990)

⁵ <https://brilliantmaps.com/2016-county-election-map/>
<https://www.outsidethebeltway.com/2012-election-county-by-county/>

Voters' mutual hostility therefore keeps intensifying: from 15 percent of Republicans and Democrats holding "very unfavorable" views of the other in 1994 to 55 percent viewing the other with contempt by 2016.⁶ In the ensuing years, that polarization has continued to escalate.⁷

Who is Equipped to Resolve Our Gravest Problems?

In the controversies cited on the previous page, advocates for each side worked out wide-ranging agreements that advanced the top objectives of all sides. And each advocate had earned sufficient trust from his/her own group to win their vigorous support for that pact.

Who, then, would voters of each persuasion trust enough to heed their recommendations on the divisive issues of these times? We see just one way to find out: Ask them.

We therefore propose to give every registered voter an opportunity to identify whom outside government they most want to be their advocate on the issues that will shape their future.

We would convene the advocates who drew support from 1 or more percent of the public.

At their first meeting (electronic, if necessary), we would prove to the advocates that, by working together, each one will advance his/her agenda much further than he/she possibly can on his own. To that end:

1) We would point out that large blocs of voters have rejected every practical solution to each major problem of recent decades, refusing to bear the burdens that realistic remedies would entail, such as: curbs on entitlements, raising the cost of energy, loss of tax preferences, a larger federal role in education and/or increased government spending.

Nobel-Prize-winning economists have in fact proven that most people will reject any significant change unless they perceive the benefits to themselves as far exceeding the costs.⁶

And for decades, no one has been able to change the public's perceptions sufficiently for a clear majority to agree on a practical solution for any critical national issue.

2) How, then, can any advocate hope to win enough voters' support for his/her agenda to become law within the next decade?

3) Yet, we will show the advocates that they can reach a comprehensive agreement addressing America's major challenges in ways that they and the vast majority of voters will see as enhancing their lives and future prospects far more than it will burden them.

4) To prepare for that demonstration, we will have asked the top think tanks on each part of the spectrum to summarize their optimal solution for each major economic, environmental, health, educational and fiscal problem.

5) We will distribute these summaries and ask each advocate to weigh the pros and cons of each solution from his/her constituents' perspective and then assign each solution a numerical rating.

6) We will identify and distribute the highest rated solutions, asking each advocate, "Which do you prefer: the total package or the existing national policies that have let your constituents' troubles persist?"

7) If a few advocates reject the overall result, we will ask them which elements they most oppose. We will then facilitate negotiations between them and the rest, modifying those elements until finding the outcome that satisfies the largest number of advocates.

8) To those who remain dissatisfied, we would explain that, in future meetings, they will evaluate many other solutions until finding a combination that every constituency will perceive as far better than the chaotic future that now awaits them and far better than any legislation a dysfunctional Congress could produce.

The advocates will develop that optimal combination by a series of steps spelled out later in this document.

⁶ Kahneman, David, and Tversky, Amos, "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk," *Econometrica*, (March 1979), pp. 263-292.

Once they agree on a mix of reforms, each advocate will be provided with expert help in communicating to his/her constituents exactly how the overall plan will significantly improve the quality of their lives.

Voters who want the reforms enacted into law could sign pledges to vote in congressional primaries exclusively for candidates who support the advocates' plan. With primaries typically drawing just 20 percent of registered voters, if 15 percent signed such pledges, lawmakers intent on reelection would have overwhelming incentives to change their priorities accordingly.⁷

Ambitious steps. But, for three decades, simpler efforts to resolve our critical problems have all failed.⁸

Who Will Launch This Effort?

This endeavor will require “orchestrators” — people with such high public standing that they can mobilize nationwide support for a project on this scale.

To fill that role, we intend to enlist visionary leaders in business, public policy and the media who have frequently exhorted elected officials to address income inequality, climate change, the national debt and/or the current economic crisis.

We will make a case to these leaders that the strategy spelled out above is necessary to reverse our country's extreme polarization, overcome decades of political dysfunction and resolve *any* of our country's major ills.

We thereby intend to enlist these leaders in a coalition that will refine this strategy until they are confident it will be far more effective than anything else they can do.

The coalition will then need to assemble the staff and resources necessary to launch this endeavor.

⁷ CCD is a 501(c) 3 organization, so advocates we convene could urge followers to vote but not who to vote for or against.

⁸ The best-known failure, the Bowles-Simpson commission, we attribute to: 1) voters knew too little about its members to trust they were acting in voters' interests; 2) the commission's top goal to curb federal debt ensured a plan that most voters would find painful and were thus sure to oppose. By contrast, we intend to work out a mix of reforms that each constituency sees as benefiting them far more than it will cost them.

The next step would be to conduct nationwide polls to identify the 50 or so individuals whom voters would be most likely to choose as their advocates.

The coalition will then need to engage the entire public in selecting among the 50.

Going Public with the Project and Giving It a Name

We propose to do this in early 2021, when voters for the losing presidential candidate will likely be intensely angry or anxious, and voters will see once again that the members of Congress cannot agree on fair, sensible, affordable solutions for our country's growing troubles.

To draw tens of millions of voters, the coalition could enlist iconic figures in the arts, business and media to do TV spots and Internet videos with a message such as:

- Lawmakers from both parties have, for decades, fixated on winning the next election rather than on solving our country's long-term problems.
- And now, when we face the greatest crisis of our lifetimes, each party is still offering solutions that half the country rejects.
- So we, the American people, need to seek out men and women we know we can trust to act in our best interests, and ask them to work out a realistic plan for us all to thrive in the years ahead.
- If enough of us support their recommendations, politicians who want to keep their jobs will listen.
- I believe in this idea so much that I have joined a group that is going to make it happen. We call it the Forum for Nationwide Prosperity.
- And we are organizing it so that one or more Forum members will speak for your concerns — we guarantee it — *if* you visit the Forum website and follow the steps it lays out.

This media campaign would include mailing each registered voter a unique code providing access to a website where the voter would be asked to:

- a) fill out a brief checklist of his/her values, concerns and aspirations
- b) watch brief videos of advocates whose priorities match his/her own;
- c) identify the advocates he/she would most trust: a first choice, second choice, third and so on.

Advocates will be selected with an algorithm by which each voter who follows the website's instructions will get one of their choices, while each category of voters will get representation in proportion to their numbers. The algorithm is available on request.

Obstacles the Prosperity Forum Will Face at Each Stage and How They Can be Overcome

Many voters know too little about the major issues to pick Forum representatives by objective criteria.

No selection process can force voters to be objective. But trust will determine whether each Forum member can win his/her voters' support for the final agreement. So, most of all the selection process needs to engender trust.

Some voters will prefer spokespeople who refuse to negotiate with ideological adversaries.

Granted, but most Americans deplore Washington's paralysis, which they feel powerless to change. After all, each citizen's one vote rarely affects election outcomes. As a result, few voters take the time to show up for congressional primaries, letting partisan zealots choose the candidates.

Voters who visit the Forum website will, by contrast, have dozens of spokespeople across the spectrum to choose from and be assured that one of their choices will become a member. Candidates who explain how they will deliver the results that voters want are likely to draw more voters than candidates who cannot.

Some voters will still choose spokespeople who prefer divisive slogans and grandstanding.

For that reason, Forum meetings will be held in private — with no media or audience to grandstand to.

Many voters will object to private meetings.

The Forum's sponsors could explain the need for privacy this way: "Congress and its committees meet in public, ensuring that lawmakers intent on reelection will posture for the cameras instead of trying to bridge their differences.

"By contrast, the U. S. Constitution — and the other constructive agreements we know of — were hashed out in total privacy. So, the negotiators could talk candidly with one another. At the end, each one showed his/her constituents how the result would advance their interests.

"Your Forum member will do the same — if we give them enough privacy to work out the kind of deal that Congress never does."

Some Forum members will still grandstand.

So, before the Forum first meets, we will advise each member:

"We intend to reach an outcome that your followers will see as advancing their interests and values much further than any other actions could. And if you stick to our guidelines, we guarantee you will get there.

"If, instead, you keep insisting to other members that your approach is right and theirs is wrong, they will likely ignore you for the duration.

"If the vast majority of them then negotiate an agreement that would benefit virtually everyone and that enough voters support, even lawmakers loyal to you until now are likely to favor the result.

"So, if you want to advance your agenda and hold onto your constituents, work with us and the other Forum members."

Some members will lack negotiation skills.

Forum meetings will be led by facilitators experienced in helping representatives with diverse skills to negotiate agreements they can all support.

Forum members may lack the expertise to reform energy policy, health care, education, entitlements and/or taxes.

The members will therefore divide into task forces that tackle each subject by meeting with top experts, evaluating a wide range of reforms and assessing the benefits, costs and risks of each one.

Each task force will have a staff that summarizes how each reform would advance or hinder each Forum member's priorities. Each member will have an opportunity to question the staff about their conclusions.

Following that process, each member will be asked to rate each reform. We thereby intend to identify the mix of reforms that would yield the most overall benefits.

If some members are dissatisfied with the result, the facilitators will ask them to identify the clauses they most oppose and then suggest modifications — until finding an overall result that the advocates all prefer over leaving their constituents ill-prepared for what lies ahead.

Some advocates may hold out for terms the others cannot abide.

If so, we will remind them that if the rest agree on a plan far better for the public than the status quo — and enough voters support it — most lawmakers intent on reelection will likely favor it as well. The holdouts would thereby be left pushing a narrow agenda with little chance it will be enacted into law, in effect, gaining nothing for their constituents.

We expect the vast majority of Forum members will find that outcome unacceptable and therefore agree on a plan far better for all than Congress can possibly devise.

The final agreement could be filled with compromises that address issues far more timidly than these times require.

With this concern in mind, we put together a "grand bargain" addressing America's major challenges in ways that we thought political activists across the spectrum would see as advancing their top priorities sufficiently for nearly all to endorse it.

We then spoke with ideologues at five think tanks whose agendas ranged from far left to far right. To each one, we said, in effect, "The policies that you have been championing for the past decade have not gained traction with most of the public. Given how polarized the country is, by what means do you think that those measures could realistically become law?" The typical answer was a dispirited shrug.

We then read the grand bargain — starting with items that we knew he/she strongly supported — and asked if he would prefer the overall result to the status quo. After some discussion, each said yes, but many doubted that counterparts opposite them on the spectrum would. "But they are in the same position you are," we responded, "and those we've spoken to have said yes."

From these interactions, we expect that nearly every Forum member will eventually realize that, to significantly advance his/her top priorities, he will have to help the other advocates advance theirs just as far. Each advocate will then need to make that same case to his/her voters.

Regardless of how much the final agreement would benefit the public, many voters hold such unrealistic views that they will resist any practical plan.

The Forum's sponsors will therefore need to hire experts in communication to help each member show his/her constituents how the Forum plan is their best option. The gist could be:

"This deal gives us the policies we have most wanted but that politicians never delivered. They promise the moon and blame failures to keep promises on scapegoats. So, we either support this deal in its entirety, or we are signing up for endless political double-talk and no progress on the issues we care about."

The public strongly supports many initiatives that have never become law.

That is because members of Congress lack incentives to care what the overall public wants. What each lawmaker does care about is what most voters in his/her state or district want. And while those voters may agree on slogans, any attempt to turn a slogan about a divisive issue into legislation inevitably draws fierce opposition. By contrast, the Forum is designed to produce a detailed, comprehensive plan that will draw strong support from each sector and region of our country.

The Forum's plan will still face fierce opposition from groups and voters that strongly object to specific provisions.

Granted, but if voters who see the Forum's plan as advancing their long-term interests far outnumber the voters who reject it, politicians seeking reelection would have overwhelming incentives to favor the plan as well.

Various media will likely spread conspiracy theories about the Forum and distort its recommendations.

Media that intentionally distort reality are indeed becoming more prevalent. That is precisely why America's ills will grow far worse *until* we convene individuals that each segment of the public trusts. They, better than anyone, could persuade each segment to ignore the lies and distortions.

In Summation: This document has presented evidence that our country of 330 million people divided along ideological, economic and social lines cannot possibly bridge its differences on contentious issues without:

- 1) representatives that each segment of our society trusts to speak for them;
- 2) a process by which these representatives can resolve conflicts that no one has yet been able to untangle; and
- 3) an effective means for those representatives to win support for their solutions from millions of voters whose interests, beliefs and values sharply diverge.

Skeptics typically assert that the strategy outlined here is too ambitious. To which, we ask: Which of the above elements can our country dispense with and still solve any of its critical problems? And if we cannot solve our problems, won't Americans grow increasingly hostile to those opposite them on the spectrum? And how can that end well?

Ambitious as the above strategy may be, it is based on hundreds of divisive issues that have been resolved to the long-term benefit and satisfaction of all the groups involved. In every case:

Each group was represented by an advocate whom they trusted to act in their best interests.

The advocates tackled various issues simultaneously — enabling them to work out a combination of solutions that advanced each group's top priorities.

Each advocate was then able to persuade his/her own group that the overall agreement would benefit them far more than any feasible alternative.

By contrast, members of Congress who have tried to resolve our country's long-term ills pragmatically have nearly all lost their seats to candidates making fanciful or divisive promises.

America's troubles and voters' anger will therefore increase — until leaders in business, public policy and the media use their high visibility to mobilize public support for the one method that evidence shows can resolve the kinds of conflicts afflicting our country.

Until then, our democracy, political stability, economy, fiscal health and, ultimately, our planet's capacity to sustain life will be in peril.

To citizens and organizations alarmed about these perils, we invite you to discuss these ideas with us by contacting Sol Erdman at the Center for Collaborative Democracy:

solderdman@igc.org

212-860-0969