THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION
FALK AUDITORIUM

THE DISSATISFIED PUBLIC: WHAT CAN CONGRESS DO?

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, January 30, 2019

PARTICIPANTS:

Welcome and Moderator:

WILLIAM A. GALSTON
Ezra K. Zilkha Chair and Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

Remarks:

HOWARD KONAR
Founder and President, Common Ground Solutions

Presentation:

STEVEN KULL
Senior Research Scholar and Director, Program
for Public Consultation, School of Public Policy
University of Maryland

Panelists:

GEORGE ALLEN
Former Governor and Senator
Commonwealth of Virginia

SARAH A. BINDER
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

HOWARD KONAR
Founder and President
Common Ground Solutions

REPRESENTATIVE JAMIE RASKIN (D-MD)
U.S. House of Representatives

MOLLY E. REYNOLDS
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. GALSTON: Well, ladies and gentlemen, let me kick this event off. I am Bill Galston, a senior fellow in Governance Studies here at the Brookings Institution. I'd like to welcome all of you to this event and to congratulate you all on braving what in some parts of the country is record cold and pretty cold here in Washington, D.C.

This event will be on the topic "The Dissatisfied Public: What Can Congress Do?" And that title contains a truism and a surprise. The truism is that the American people are dissatisfied. The surprise is even the possibility that Congress could do anything about it. But we'll find out what that might be.

I'm also pleased to tell the audience that we are joined by C-SPAN. So for those of you who care about such things, this would be a great time to tighten your ties, adjust your hair, or do whatever else you want to do to be appealing on national television. But let me proceed to the substance.

The public is dissatisfied and mistrustful. We know that and we'll hear more about that in just a few minutes. Congress is stalemated and dysfunctional. We know that, too, and we don't need a report to tell us that.

If the government as a whole is dysfunctional, I think by general agreement Congress today is the epicenter of that dysfunction. Brookings' own Tom Mann was one of a team that memorably labeled Congress "The Broken Branch." That was years ago. I think it is fair to say that it has not repaired itself in the years since.

So what's the problem? If Congress is broken, why? What broke it?

One answer is that rules and procedures and arrangements inside the Congress and outside discourage compromise. And a lot of people busy working on rules changes in the Congress and in the country as a whole that might address that issues.

Another answer with some significant scholarly backing is that today with an evenly divided country there is competition for control of Congress. That was not so much the case in the years from the mid-1950s to the mid-1990s, and competition is the source of

the problem.

The most typical problem -- answer to the question I would say is partisan polarization. It is the clash of two parties representing radically different visions and policy preferences. That raises a question: Where is the partisan polarization located? Is it possible that elected officials representing their respective parties are more polarized than the people as a whole? Is that possible?

And that question that I just posed is part of a larger question: Could the problem be that members of Congress are not accurately and faithfully representing the people who send them to Washington? This is the hypothesis explored by the report being released today from the Program for Public Consultation at the University of Maryland.

In brief, and I don't think I'm letting too many cats out of the bag, the report concludes that the social contract between the people and their representatives has broken down; that the people see their representatives as beholding to special interests rather than the common good and as insufficiently responsive to the views of their constituents. That is the argument that we've put on the table and you'll see evidence in favor of that proposition in just a few minutes.

So what's going to happen over the new two hours to explore these issues? First, you will hear a summary of the report from the report's principal investigator. Then you'll hear reactions and analysis from noted congressional scholars and distinguished elected officials, current and former. And finally, in the last half-hour or so you'll have a chance to put your own questions to the authors of the report and to the panelists.

But first, to continue the introduction and to provide a frame, let me welcome to the podium Howard Konar, a man that I've known for a while, someone who is genuinely dedicated to bringing the country back together. The president of an organization called Common Ground Solutions, founded I believe in 2017, and a man whose vision and support have helped make this report possible.

Howard, thank you very much for being here and welcome. (Applause)

MR. KONAR: Thank you, Bill, for that introduction. I'm honored to be here today at the Brookings Institution on the same stage with scholars and elected officials who've devoted their lives to making our democracy better. I'm here to offer a perspective from outside the Beltway.

I own a real estate development company in Rochester, New York, my hometown. I also manage a family foundation trying to address some of the major challenges that we face in Rochester, including high rates of child poverty and a badly failing public school system.

In many ways, Rochester is still recovering from the sharp decline of employers like Kodak, Xerox, and Bausch & Lomb. When I moved back in 1983, those three companies together employed over 80,000 people. Today they employ less than 10,000. And it's true some of their wounds were self-inflicted, but they also face challenges from changing technology and tougher global competition, and those same challenges confront our employers today. So people in Rochester, like other cities in our region and around the country, count on government not to create jobs or solve our problems for us, but to make good and lasting policy decisions that help us build better lives for our families and our communities.

And that is why it is so agonizing when elected leaders stop working together to solve problems. When they over and past each other without listening or when they stop talking entirely and Tweet instead, we stop making progress as a nation. We're left with the politics of anger, division, and blame.

Six years ago, my daughter, my youngest, left for college and I looked around and took stock. I believe that my children's success depends on the success and prosperity of everyone around them. As I looked out into their world, I was alarmed at the level of partisanship and hostility that was taking hold and that was starting to hold our nation back. I began spending nights and weekends studying the issues that were dividing us and I was surprised at what I found. I read study after study with thoughtful proposals

addressing the problems that we face as a nation: healthcare, poverty, immigration, deficits, electoral reform -- none of them being implemented, none of them being seriously discussed.

In the end, I put my findings and thoughts into an essay called, “Common Ground: An Alternative to Partisan Politics.” I later founded Common Ground Solutions with two goals: helping people find accurate and useful information and helping them engage constructively and civilly in our political system.

Common Ground Solutions began holding informal focus groups to learn more about what it would take to reach these goals. Again, what we found surprised us. We did talk to some people who expressed partisan anger and frustration, but far more often the people we talked to said that they felt frustrated, confused, and disconnected. They get most of their news from social media, but don’t trust it. They try talking to their elected representatives, but they’re not sure they’re listening. They badly want things to change but feel no sense of agency. Too often they don’t understand how political decisions are made and where they can begin to become active in the process.

Along the way we learned about the work of Steve Kull and the Voice of the People. We learned about their unique approach to presenting voters with policy choices and about their findings: that on topic after topic voters are often far less polarized than their representatives.

Before the midterm elections last year we hosted two policy simulations with Voice of the People in two congressional districts, Cleveland and Rochester, both with open seats. We believe that Steve has developed real tools that can make a real difference in connecting citizens with their representatives.

I look forward to hearing Steve speak about his research and to the discussion that follows. For me the ultimate takeaway is a simple test. Will voters believe they have a voice and will they believe their representatives are listening? (Applause)

MR. GALSTON: Well, thank you very much, Howard. You’re an example of

how concerned citizens who have the ability to focus on the real challenges before us can make a difference. Thank you.

You've done half of my job of introducing Steve Kull for me, and thank you very much. You have Steve's full bio in your information packets. I'm not going to run through it. Suffice it to say that both in this country and abroad Steve is widely recognized as one of the most adept practitioners not just of survey research, but of in-depth examination of how people actually react to information and argument, form judgments both as individuals and in groups.

Ordinary surveys are like snapshots, they capture a moment in time. But Steve has pioneered techniques to see public opinion more dynamically as a continuing response to evidence, to argument, and to working with fellow citizens. And his latest work product, which he will present today, is one more example of what this kind of survey research technique can produce.

He is a senior research associate and director of the Program for Public Consultation at the School of Public Policy, where I myself used to teach. Among his many other products he co-authored with I.M. Destler, who is also in the audience today, a study entitled, "Misreading the Public: The Myth of a New Isolationism." I will hazard an educated guess that the President of the United States has not yet read that study. (Laughter) But I'm sure he would be deeply impressed and perhaps moved if he did.

Okay, Steve, you know, enough horsing around. Please come to the podium and share with us the results of your latest research. (Applause)

MR. KULL: Thank you all for coming. And I'm going to try to keep myself under control here because I have so much I want to say and liked to say on this very important topic.

The Program for Public Consultation, formerly known as the Program on International Policy Attitudes, we've been studying public attitudes about democracy and governance it's really coming up on two decades now. And the fact that the American public

is dissatisfied with American government is well known, but it's a problem in other countries, as well. There's really no democracy where the public is really satisfied. And, in fact, trust in government is negatively correlated with Freedom House ratings in terms of the development of democracies.

And throughout the world outside candidates are being elected, playing on this dissatisfaction. And, of course, what is of particular concern is that some of them are beginning to take authoritarian positions, illiberal positions. And there is evidence that there is some support for these kinds of authoritarian positions, these are at least rising.

So I think it's not an overstatement to say that we really do have a crisis of democracy. And we need, of course, to start by looking at our own situation and to understand what can be done to restore the public's confidence in the democratic processes that we have.

You know, you kind of have this tendency to think, oh, yeah, people are always cranky. The people don't like government. Sure, that's natural. Well, it's not always been the case. Back in 1964, asked how much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right, 76 percent said just about always or most of the time. That's down now to 16 percent. That's been on a downward slide for some time.

Asked how do you feel about the way the federal government works, a large majority say that they're either angry or dissatisfied. You can see 2016, 2018. You can see it gets a little better when your party's in the White House. Right? But it's still a pretty -- even then it's a pretty large majority expressing some anger and dissatisfaction.

Now, I'm sure this is something very familiar to you, but I was literally walking to the office this morning when I (Laughter) -- down N Street and there it was just hanging out there above the Tabard Inn just a block from here. So, you know, my research continues.

So just to give you a quick touch, we've been studying this for many years. We've done lots of focus groups as well as surveys. In mid-2016, we did a survey where we

asked people with an open-ended question, you know, how do you feel about government? And okay, if you're unhappy, what are you unhappy about? And we took lots of answers and distilled them down to 49 key critiques. And with a separate sample, but then and more recently asked, how much they agreed with each one. So as we go along you'll see these critiques that, again, have sort of popped out spontaneously from people.

We've done a lot of surveys in the last two years working on this question, a total of over 16,000 registered voters with -- you can see all the various margins of error there. And they were all conducted online with a sample provided by Nielsen Scarborough, a representative of whom is here today. Thanks for coming, Neal. And they're drawn from their larger probability-based panel recruited by telephone and mail.

So what's my kind of key conclusion? As Bill already indicated a bit, my fundamental conclusion is that people feel that there has been a violation of a social contract that goes back to the Founders. And this contract goes something like this. In exchange for the people giving elected officials the reins of power, submitting to that power, and paying taxes, elected officials should serve the common good of the people rather than their own interests or any type of special interests or partisan interests. And they should consult and be influenced by the views of the people they represent. Let me give you a few quick examples.

From John Adams, "Government is the institute for the common good, for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people and not for the profit, honor, or private interests of any one man, family." And we have a little problem here, it's falling off the screen.

Alexander Hamilton said, "A government ought to be free from every other control but a regard to the public good and to the sense of the people." There they both are: regard to the public good and the sense of the people.

And we asked people in the survey, we mentioned if the Founders of the American Republic were somehow able to observe how the U.S. Government is operating

today, in your opinion would the Founders think that the U.S. Government is fulfilling the vision they had very well, somewhat well, not that well, not well at all; and so on? And 85 percent said not that well or not well at all. Democrats were more negative than the Republicans, but it's all pretty there. So core principle.

Failing to serve the common good over special interests? Well, there's this question that has been asked now for quite a few years: Would you say the government is pretty much run by a few big interests looking out for themselves or that it is run for the benefit of all the people? Well, you can see that climbing line there are those who say that it's run for a few big interests looking for themselves and the sliding downward line is for the benefit of all the people. Spontaneously people say things like Congress does not serve the good of the people, and overwhelming majorities of all parties agree with that argument.

Organized interests and their lobbyists have too much influence? Overwhelming agreement. Corporations and their lobbyists have too much influence? Overwhelming agreement. Think Republicans and Democrats don't agree on anything these days, there is a lot they agree on.

Rich people have too much influence? Well, the Republicans go down on that a little bit, but it's still three-quarters, an overall very large majority.

Now, the primary mechanism of influence is seen as campaign donations. We asked how often do you think members of Congress put a higher priority on serving the interests of organizations and individuals who have donated money to their election rather than serving the good of the country? And 84 percent say often or almost always; 50 percent almost always. Again, very bipartisan.

Elected officials are seen as overly responsive to partisan interests. Members of Congress think mostly about their party, not what is good for the country. Again, that's the core of the violation. It's not that it's bad to do something good for your party, but they're not thinking about what's good for the country and that is violation of that social contract.

Political parties are too beholding to special interests? These two things are actually very connected because competing special interests influence different parties and so the parties fight. But behind it are these special interests that are extracting commitments from elected officials. And that's how it's perceived, that basically people -- that special interests buy the influence over elected officials. And because they're polarized, those interests then intrinsically, the elected officials and parties are polarized.

There's too much partisanship in government? Well, we tried a different approach. We said, well, when different political parties compete for influence in a democracy, which do you think most often happens: the competition of ideas creates a vibrant system where many voices are heard, leading to decisions that best reflect the will of the people, right? You could pick that. Or the parties fight for their narrow interests, the will of the people is ignored, and the results do not serve the people? And, well, it came out pretty clearly on one side.

So the next component of this violated contract is that elected officials failed to consult and the influence by the people. Some assume incorrectly that the Founders had this idea that you shouldn't -- people almost think they're Burkeans or something, that they shouldn't pay attention to the public. That really doesn't hold up.

Alexander Hamilton, who was one of the people who's often attributed to this view, wrote, "Is it not natural that a man who is candidate for the favor of the people should take care to inform himself of their dispositions and inclinations and should be willing to allow them their proper degree of influence over their conduct?"

And James Madison said, "It is the reason alone of the public that ought to control and regulate government," a very strong statement, "and that Congress should have an intimate sympathy with the," and we lost where they're "with the people." Formatting issues when we crossed the two systems issues.

And Thomas Jefferson said, "Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe

depository. If once they become inattentive to the public affairs, you and I," and I'll have to tell you the rest of it, "will all become wolves."

So in the spontaneous critiques, an overwhelming majority say members of Congress do not listen to the people they represent. An overwhelming majority say Congress does not do what the majority of the people would do. And when asked how often do elected officials make the same decisions that the majority of Americans would make, the mean estimate was a third of the time. Less than chance. Republicans, they're 9 percent; Democrats, 30 percent; very common theme.

We could have a whole discussion, too, about how much there is a consonance between what government does, but there's a lot of data out there to support the notion that there are serious discrepancies between public opinion and what Congress and the federal government in general does.

Asked how responsive do you think members of Congress should be to the views of the majority of their constituents on a 0 to 10 scale, the mean response is 8.4, not 10. We're not talking about direct democracy here, but pretty high, 8.4. And how responsive are they? On average 3.7; 4 among Republicans, 3-1/2 Dems. And the numbers who said that the influence should be greater than it is, is 88 to 90 percent.

There's a substantial optimism that with greater responsiveness there will be positive effects. It asked if the views of the public were to have more influence do you think the nation would be better off or worse off than it is today? Overwhelmingly they say better off.

And here again we tried inserting an argument, saying, "When Congress gets stuck in gridlock, do you think if Congress would listen to the views of the people this would help break the logjam because the people are less polarized than Congress, or turning to the views of the people would not help because the gridlock in Congress is just a reflection of the polarization among the people? And clearly they go for the first formulation that if Congress would listen to the people more, this would help break the logjam.

Now, there's a very strong relationship between perceptions of responsiveness and voting. We asked people to rate their incumbent senator in terms of responsiveness on a 0 to 10 scale, and then we asked whether they voted for that incumbent senator. And there was a very high correlation. For social scientists, we go wow, this is nice stuff. Well not nice, but.

So as you can see, the higher the perception of responsiveness, over there on the left you have a very low perception of responsiveness, rising more as it goes to the right here. So by the time you're above 6, they're voting for them most of the time. But even at 5, it's doubtful.

We also asked people to say -- this was just after the election in 2016. We said, "How responsive do you think Donald Trump will be or Hillary Clinton would have been," and then we looked at their voting. And again, very high correlation between those two factors.

Now, this narrative of violating the social contract comes a lot from outsider candidates and it played a significant role in the 2016 and 2018 elections. Donald Trump, "We are fighting for every American who believes government should serve the people, not the donors and not the special interests. The government will work for the people," and what's underneath there is, "the people will be in charge." Not just an influence, they will be in charge.

Bernie Sanders, another outsider candidate, "The struggle of the people to create a government which represents all of us and not just the 1 percent, I look forward to being part of that struggle." And AOC, "I'm fine being called a bull in a china shop because politics that answers to special interests more than the American people should be disrupted." So this is clearly a narrative that people respond to on the left and the right, particularly when you're talking about candidates that are outsider candidates and they succeed in pushing aside more establishment candidates.

All right. What can be done? Well, one of the most common proposals is to

have structural reforms to counter the power of special interest campaign donors and incumbent political parties. And we have done some in-depth surveys on these proposals and most of them get rather robust support. Ones that limit the influence of campaign donors through campaign finance reforms, very large support for a constitutional amendment enabling governments to put limits on campaign spending, bipartisan. A large majority supports various efforts to offset the influence of big campaign donors by promoting more donations by small donors and increasing requirements for public disclosure of campaign contributions. This is all available online.

Very strong bipartisan support for limiting lobbying by extending the period former elected officials or staffers must wait before becoming a lobbyist. And to counter the power of the incumbent party they favor having citizen commissions design congressional districts to counter gerrymandering. Term limits for members of Congress, again that's a bipartisan one. And making it more possible for independent candidates to succeed in a whole variety of ways.

Now, on consulting the people, well, we've been developing -- there are a lot of different methods for consulting the people. There's a lot of experimentation that's going on out there and all of it is very useful and we're all learning a lot from each other. We have been focusing particularly on a method called the "Citizen Cabinet." And a Citizen Cabinet is a large representative sample of a district, state, or a nation that's been pulled together to be consulted on issues before government. And they go through an online process called a "policymaking simulation," and this includes a briefing on an issue and the policy options that are in play. They evaluate very strongly stated pro and con arguments, the ones that are being made in the current discourse, and then finally, they make recommendations. Sometimes they're required to deal with tradeoffs, like when they're making up a budget they see the effect of their choices on a deficit and so on.

All of the content is reviewed by experts across the spectrum of use, most often congressional staffers, sometimes more advocacy groups, or both. And ultimately, the

results are aggregated, weighted, and so on, and delivered to congressional representatives and to the media. It's all publicly disclosed. And we put the policymaking simulation online. You can do it yourself and, in the end, send your recommendations to your members, as well.

Well, so we describe how would you feel about a member who would say, okay, I want to invite you constituents to be part of a Citizen Cabinet to give me this kind of input. I'm going to take it into account. I want to hear from you and how do people feel about that? Well, oh, 90 percent say they approve. Okay. You know, right out of the park.

And how likely do you think it would be if a member had such a Citizen Cabinet they would be more responsive? Well, not quite as high, but about two-thirds say, yeah, very or somewhat likely.

But is it politically viable for members or candidates to promote having a Citizen Cabinet? So find out how a political consultant would react we talked to some, one in particular, and said, you know, what would make you think it would be a good idea for a candidate to actually propose something like this? And we got a few challenges and one of them was the question, well, will partisanship override the positive response to having a Citizen Cabinet, and you just said, okay, here's this nice person who says they want to do this? But what if you put a partisan label on them, right? So it's really -- you know, this is a Republican doing it or this is a Democrat doing it.

So we had a very elaborate survey. We had a candidate who was presented who makes a pledge to consult constituents, support having a Citizen Cabinet, and pledges to take into account -- not do, but take into account -- its recommendations when deciding how to vote. And the candidate was given the partisan label and presented to different subsamples.

Well, what's particularly interesting to me is what -- the effect of the partisan label opposed to the party of the respondent. So here we have the Republican view of a Democratic candidate who would do this. Well, 79 percent say that they would have a

positive view of that and 64 percent said that it would make them more likely to vote for them and about 20 percent of them said much more likely to vote for them. So that even with that partisanship, the desire for this responsiveness was strong enough to really have this positive response. On the Democratic view of the Republican candidate, 92 percent were positive or even higher and 80 percent said that they would be more likely to vote for this Republican candidate who made this pledge.

Well, okay, but in the rough and tumble of a campaign will a candidate who supports having a Citizen Cabinet be vulnerable to attacks? One person said this is a very target-rich idea and rolled out a bunch of possible attacks. And I won't be able to show them all to you, but they're in the report.

Here's an example. Members of Congress shouldn't govern by putting their finger to the wind. Oh, I'm sorry, so we had another sample and we said, okay, there is a debate and there's one person who's saying they're for a Citizen Cabinet and we've given, you know, a partisan label, that's made this commitment and so on, and there's a challenger.

Okay, here's what the challenger says against this candidate: "Members of Congress shouldn't govern by putting their finger to the wind, reacting to every shift in public opinion. The American people elect members of Congress to show leadership and make decisions. Having a Citizen Cabinet would make it harder for members of Congress to exercise their independent judgment, make the hard decisions, and do what is best for the country rather than what they think is popular."

So there was a strong assumption among these consultants that this would really draw blood. But it really did not do well, only 35 percent found it somewhat or very convincing.

Then there was the rebuttal: "The problem with Congress is not that they're too reactive to public opinion. It's that they're too reactive to special interests. The Citizen Cabinet will give me advice from people who have heard all sides of an issue and come to

well-considered conclusions that accurately reflect the will of the people. This way we can all be sure that the special interests are not in charge. I think that when the people have accurate and balanced information, they can give valuable advice about what is best for the country."

Well, this one knocks it out of the park, 84 percent finding it convincing.

Now, after they went through four of these, then we said, okay, based on what you have heard in this debate who would you be more inclined to vote for? Not just do you like them, who would you be more inclined to vote for? And the question we wanted to know is would people cross party lines and say that they would -- you know, a Republican would vote for a Democrat and a Democrat would vote for a Republican based on what they heard here? Now, obviously, in a real election there would be more factors, but just based on this could they actually say that, that they would cross party lines?

And 78 percent of Republicans said that they would cross party lines and vote for a Democratic candidate who commits to consult the Citizen Cabinet and 90 percent of Democrats said that they would cross party lines and vote for a Republican. What that says to me is that concern about responsiveness is a stronger force, a bigger factor than partisanship.

Well, will the Citizen Cabinet really find common ground? I mean, it sounds nice. They seem like nice people, but really in the end will they? Will they do any better at solving the problems that have stymied Congress?

Well, we've done a big pilot study. You can get more summaries in the report; I'm just going to touch on a few quick ones before I close. And with a large national Citizen Cabinet and with Nielsen Scarborough, and we did it in eight states and two districts. And I'm just going to give you a quick taste of some of the things that we found.

On Social Security, we had them explain the Social Security shortfall problem and we said, okay, here are these different options. And they're each one scored in terms of what impact they had on the shortfall and they could make their own

recommendations. And as they went along a little bubble told them how they were doing relative to the shortfall.

What happened in the end was basically a very large majority of Republicans and Democrats agreed on steps that eliminated two-thirds of the shortfall. Remember this is the third rail, nobody can get near this, nobody wants to deal with reality. But by reducing benefits for the upper 25 percent, raising the retirement age to 68, raising the cap on taxable earnings to 215,000 or more, or raising the payroll tax from 6.2 to 6.6 percent. So you can see more than 70 percent of both Republicans and Democrats agreed on that and that covered 66 percent.

Furthermore, another 59 percent went further and eliminated the cap and also 58 percent raised minimum monthly benefits, which actually worsened the shortfall. But altogether with all those proposals you cover 98 percent of the shortfall. Again, this is the problem that is seen as impossible to solve because it's the third rail and because people don't understand, you know, they're just babies, they want their benefits, they don't want to pay for it. You've heard all that.

Federal budget, this is another one where you -- there are polls that show a majority say, yes, we should cut the deficit. A majority say -- but then you ask them do you want to raise your taxes? No, rather not. Do you want to cut education? Do you want to cut transportation? Do you want to cut this or this? No, really rather not. You see, the public is just a big baby. They just don't understand money in, money out.

Well, what we have done is we give them the federal budget, discretionary budget, broken into 31 line items. Here's how much goes to each. Here are the sources of revenue. Here are the tax rates. Here are new options, all of them scored. And you now can make up your own budget however you like. And as you go along there's this little bubble that tells you how you're doing relative to the deficit.

You give people that situation, they actually do reduce the deficit. The overall majority reduced it by $348 billion the last time we did it. And now there were

differences between Republicans and Democrats, but they did converge on $128 billion in deficit reductions and everybody acted out of character. The Republicans raised taxes and the Democrats cut spending.

Now, immigration, and you think, oh, my god, there's nothing we can do about that. I mean, it's hopeless. And it's true that this issue of the wall on the southern border is very polarizing. The majority oppose it, but a majority of Republicans favor it and an overwhelming majority of Democrats oppose it. So, yeah, okay, this is a tough one. Does that mean there's -- is there no low-hanging fruit? Is there nothing they can agree on?

Well, it turns out that there were a few things that they agreed on. One was a Republican proposal to require employers to use the E-Verify system. It's modeled after a Republican bill. And here you have a very large majority -- 72 percent overall, 83 percent of Republicans, 60 percent of Democrats -- agreeing, yeah, that sounds like a good idea.

Here's another one: expand the program for guest workers. Once again, large majorities agreeing, yeah, that's a good plan. On DACA, provide legal status and make them eligible for citizenship in 10 to 12 years? Large bipartisan majorities.

So there is low-hanging fruit. But I think basically the political system doesn't reinforce people going for the low-hanging fruit. It reinforces going after things that are polarizing because that makes you more distinctive. But, in fact, if you give the public voice and the means, they will point the way.

And I'm going to just end with a quote from Thomas Jefferson, "The ultimate arbiter is the people."

Thank you. (Applause)

MR. GALSTON: Well, I'd now -- perfect timing -- I'd now ask the panelists to come forward and to take your seat at the seat with your name on it. This is a test.

While the panelists are getting mic'd up let me do some very quick introductions. Again, you have pretty full bios in your information packet. I'm not going to waste anybody's time going through that, but let me just introduce our panelists in the order

in which they'll be speaking in the first round.

First is George Allen, who was, among many other accomplishments, governor of the State of Virginia from January of 1994 to January of 1998, and then Senator from the State of Virginia from January of 2001 to January of 2007.

Next, Sarah Binder, who is one of my colleagues in Governance Studies, a Senior Fellow, as a matter of fact, in Governance Studies at Brookings, as well as a professor of political science at George Washington University. She specializes in congress and legislative politics. Her many accomplishments and awards are listed. Most recently she co-authored a book entitled "The Myth of Independence: How Congress Governs the Federal Reserve", published in 2017, and in 2018 won the Gladys Kammerer from the American Political Science Association as the best book on U.S. national policy published during that year, a signal honor indeed.

Third is Jamie Raskin, who is a second term member of congress from Maryland's eight congressional district. He is, among his many other offices and attainment, he is my congressman, which means I'll be listening with particular attention to his views on the need to be responsive to the views of his constituents. (Laughter) And if he wants a bellwether voter, just talk to me.

And, finally, Molly Reynolds, also one of my colleagues in Governance Studies at Brookings, also a Senior Fellow. She has become very rapidly a recognized expert on congress. I believe she did the play-by-play for C-SPAN -- is that correct? -- during the opening of the 116th Congress. Almost as exciting as a football game. (Laughter) And she is also living testimony to Brookings as a force for upward mobility, because she began her professional career as a senior research assistant and then an associate here at Brookings working for Tom Mann and eventually becoming Tom Mann's welcomed replacement.

And, finally, Howard Konar. And I would introduce him, except he's already been introduced and I will not do it twice. But he has I think introduced himself much more

fully than I could with his very poignant opening remarks at today's session.

So round one is going to be really simple, namely, three minutes each -- and our timekeeper is seated in the front row with those hard to miss neon signs -- three minutes each to respond as you choose to the evidence and arguments and significance of the report that Steve Kull has just summarized for you.

Governor Allen?

MR. ALLEN: All right. Well, thank you, Bill, and thank you, Howard, for your leadership and to Steven Kull as well. There are so many people who talk about what's wrong and negativity. It's really heartening to see somebody come up with positive constructive solutions. And I think your citizen cabinet idea is a good one. I was a member up here who actually had a real cabinet when I was governor, and the men and women where in my cabinet were all smarter than I was on every one of their particular issues of jurisdiction and transportation or commerce and trade, and various other areas. And so I think a cabinet is a great idea in many respects. And the other thing is, consistent with your polls, when I was governor we had a democratic controlled legislature but we worked together. We ran on a positive constructive audacious agenda and worked with a democratically controlled legislature. And so these bipartisan solutions that we crafted in education, welfare reform, public safety, economic development, and so forth, endured through subsequent administrations, republican or democratic, because they were fashioned in a bipartisan consensus common ground way.

Now, polls are always really interesting. And you want to have them confirmed. And you can look at a poll from John McLaughlin or the Tarrence Group or Emerson and Quinnepiac and so forth. The National Association of Manufacturers don't have time to go through their entire polls, but they did a poll of thousands of voters in 206 pivot counties in the United States -- and this is a recent poll. Pivot counties are those counties in 2016 that voted for President Trump but in the previous two elections voted for Barack Obama as President. And it's very interesting, and it validates your poll, Steve, but

not exactly the same questions. But one key point was that in those pivot counties these voters -- there was a strong preference for members of congress to work collaboratively with members of other parties to achieve solutions and pass resolutions. Eight percent of the voters in those pivot counties. Only twelve percent said that they would like them to stick to their principles even if it doesn't get anything done. So this is a validation of your approach. It's one solution. There are other solutions that I think are really important.

I think there should be a balanced budget requirement in the federal constitution. That's the way the states operate and you have to set priorities. I think members of congress, if they don't get appropriations bills done on time they ought to withhold their pay. That's the way it is in the real world. And this is the disconnection that you see with people in congress.

And, finally, I think the states are going to have to take the lead in this, but districts ought to be compact and contiguous, which is the way it is in most states. And I think redistricting reform would get more competitive districts where people would be worrying about what's good for all the people to get reelected rather than worrying about my base and will I lose the nomination in a primary of I stray from the partisan approach.

Time's up.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you, Governor.

MR. ALLEN: Thank you.

MR. GALSTON: Sarah Binder.

MS. BINDER: Great. Well, thanks very much for including me. This is a very impressive report. It raises a whole host of questions about the state of congress, about public perceptions of the institution, and about lawmakers' responsiveness to the broader public.

If I had to distill I think one overarching lesson from the report it would be this, that the report sees public dissatisfaction with congress as primarily a problem of representation, that the public feels their views aren't well represented or addressed by

lawmakers and that lawmakers may be more influenced by "special interests" or their own particular interests than the public good. Lots of measures, lots of surveys. The authors of the report suggest these perceptions are pretty widespread, that they've grown over time, and that they are held by an overwhelming majority of both parties.

I won't quibble the results. I want to offer two small caveats about them and then suggest there may be a different way to think about the problem of public dissatisfaction with congress in Washington, all in a mere less than three minutes.

So first, quickly, two caveats on the evidence. First, these are very impressive results. The authors really detect overwhelming bipartisan support for many of the ideas that they're testing. I would just caution that just because large bipartisan majorities think something to be true doesn't always mean that it will be true. For example, there's a really interesting question in the report that goes like this, "If the members of congress were more influenced by the people than they are now do you think they would be more or less likely to find common ground?" An overwhelming bipartisan support for yes, they would be more likely to find common ground. But that might not actually be true, right. Expanding the range of constituencies might be extremely important, but it won't necessarily make gridlock any less likely, for reasons that we can come back to.

So the first caveat is just to keep in mind that the public doesn't always have a very fine tuned grasp on what is possible and the difficulties and the tradeoffs involved in legislating.

The second caveat -- and I'm a public opinion consumer not a producer. I'm not an expert on survey research in any way. I would just point out, there is a decent level of experimental results in political science that point to partisans approving of the party's performance when they perceive they're winning, while support for bipartisanship tends to emerge when people see themselves on the losing side. That's just a caveat that we should think about both experimental and observational results and neither are correct on their own, but they don't necessarily tell us the same thing about the public's views of congress.

But to my bigger point, rather than -- or maybe think of it this way, in addition to seeing public dissatisfaction with congress as a problem of representation, I might encourage us to think about public dissatisfaction with congress as a problem of governance instead of or in addition to representation. Quite simply, to state the obvious, congress struggles to legislate. Congress isn't always prone to gridlock, but by my favorite metrics, congress stalemates on maybe three-quarters of the big-ticket items on the broader public agenda. But we know that when congress does act these laws do sometimes get high marks, and certainly the Affordable Care Act over time comes to mind -- perhaps the recent round of tax cuts less so.

Why does this matter, whether we call it a problem of representation or governance? I think the issue is how do we address it, right, where should our focus be. There are no easy answers if the question becomes how can we create conditions that make it more likely for congress and the parties to reach consensus. But the extent I think that we can find ways to improve congress' legislative and problem-solving capacity, I'd wager that we might begin to see improvement in public perceptions of how our lawmakers and the institution respond to constituency interests. In other words, thinking of the problem as one of representation begs I think that we address the underlying problem of congress' governing capacity.

Stop. (Laughter)

MR. GALSTON: Thank you. Now, Congressman Raskin.

MR. RASKIN: Well, forgive me, because I missed your presentation, Bill, but I'm here for the rest of two hours, so that's not bad for constituent service. (Laughter) I'm delighted to be with everybody. And I don't know where Steve is -- there's Steve. I salute you on this project and on the accomplishment of the report. I've been a big fan of this idea since I first heard about it. And I'll tell you what I like about it, one suggestion, for a change, and then how I think we might be able to move some things forward on it.

I mean in a certain sense the House of Representatives and the Senate are

supposed to be in a sense the citizen cabinets, that is the representative microcosm of the American people which get together to meditate and deliberate on these issues. So at first, you might well this is just duplicative, why did you need to create these auxiliary citizen cabinets to what the cross section of citizens are already doing, as contemplated by the founders. But there is one critical difference between the citizens who are drawn together as the citizen cabinet from those who are drawn together in the House or the Senate, which is these people are not running for office, they do not identify at least primarily with a political party, and so they're not locked into the political and electoral system the way those of who are in politics are.

And so I would think that they would have a distinctive advantage in terms of addressing questions, especially going to the character of the political process. So take, for example, congressional redistricting, which we dipped our toes in the water on yesterday in the House Judiciary Committee as part of the H.R.1 hearing. And I was absolutely amazed that some of my colleagues were openly defending gerrymandering. I mean I knew that some would be defending it behind the scenes, but many were saying this is just great, we need elected officials to be the ones to draw the districts. And, you know, of course, from my perspective that's allowing politicians to draw the districts that they run in. And I can imagine that if you had a real cross sample of Americans drawn from almost any other walk of life, they would not be vehemently defending gerrymandering and partisan redistricting as an example of democratic participation. But that was precisely what we were hearing yesterday. I think it's probably the same thing with the Citizens United decision and opening the floodgates on corporate treasury money entering into the political process. So I think a lot of those issues, especially that are built into the H.R. 1 legislation, which is in the 116th Congress, the attempted and omnibus bill on democracy reform, I think that this would call precisely for the skills of a citizen jury.

That's just my other point, which is I don't quite know why it's being called a citizen cabinet since a cabinet is appointed by a president or a governor in some case and

this is much more like a jury, it's drawn from the people to serve a vital social function and not to act on behalf of an executive branch official. So I would prefer to think of it as a citizen jury drawn at random in order to advise the legislative branch.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you. Molly Reynolds.

MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Bill. Thank you all for including me on this panel.

I want to talk about two things in particular that came to mind as I was reading the report and watching Steve's presentation of it today. One of them involves that time series that Steve showed towards the beginning with the line of people saying that the government is run for the benefit of all the people going down and the benefit of a select few going up. And I found myself reflecting a lot on what's changed in American politics over that time series that might help us understand some of what we see in these results. And so of the things, one is that I think we've had a real -- so that data goes back to the early '60s -- I think we have had a real change in our understanding of who all the people are in the political arena over that timeframe. We've seen increasing power of women and non-white people in the political process, and I think that has had implications for how we think about trust in government. We also, as Bill said in his opening remarks, have increasing macro level political level competition in the United States, which can reduce the incentives for members of the two parties to cooperate with one another. So even when large numbers of voters say that the government is too gridlocked and that politicians have forgotten how to compromise, it's not clear to me that individual members of congress we see incentives that point them toward compromise on a given issue. It's also true that political polarization has increased. There are fewer members of congress who are cross pressured on a given issue, for whom what they perceive their constituents want, if they are listening to them, is different from what their party in congress is telling them to do on a particular issue. And so I think those kind of broader kind of contextual factors really help us understand some of the over-time change that we've seen.

And then the second thing that I've found myself thinking about in terms, particularly in the context of the idea of a citizen cabinet or other ways for voters to get their opinions in front of their elected officials is some research that's out there in political science on the degree to which elected officials, members of their staff, aren't actually great -- don't have great hugely accurate perceptions of the opinions of their constituents. So there's some research that suggests that this is true for state legislature. There's also some new research that suggests it can be true for congressional staff as well.

So as we think about the sort of a two-sided problem. There's both the idea that voters don't feel like they're opinions are getting in front of their elected officials, and then there's also a question about whether elected officials are accurately perceiving the information that is coming to them, in part because of differences between the kinds of people who take the time to contact their elected officials.

So I will stop there.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you, Molly. Howard Konar.

MR. KONAR: Thanks. I have a couple of responses. The first is a practical one. There's a lot of data that Steve presented, but one of the most striking figures to me was the number of people who would actually cross-party lines to vote for somebody who endorsed the citizen cabinet idea. I thought that was a powerful result.

On a little bit bigger picture, I really like the idea of the social contract. I like the idea that you put in about some sort of a violation of a social contract. In the analysis that I read, and a lot of us read today, people are kind of slicing and dicing the electorate into different pieces, trying to put them all together into some sort of a whole that will constitute a majority. And I think this kind of analysis, talking about a basic social contract in terms of listening to constituents, cuts to the heart of something different. And I think that's a truth, at least for me. You know, when I think of what I want out of an elected representative, I would think it's a person who votes according to their experience, their conscious, and the will of their constituents. And that is something that, you know, sadly we

don't see today because when people are in office they usually vote the party line, sometimes in almost shockingly high correlation.

And then I think that gets to another kind of larger point, which is that if you really took this to its logical conclusion, if you thought well, you know, I'm electing somebody to office and that person would vote along the lines of constituency, conscience, and experience, then what does that mean for parties? If people are really voting along those lines all the time it would shift a little bit how we feel about parties and I think it would, taken to an extreme, reduce the control that parties have. I don't see that as a bad thing. In fact, I think parties, although they're not evil in and of themselves, have just gathered way too much power to themselves. And I think that's an issue in elections, I think it's an issue in governance, I think we see it in congress as well. So I would see that as a favorable result.

And it also makes me think of special interests in a different way. We usually think about parties as being beholden to special interests, but sometimes I look at parties as special interests. I mean what does a democrat do and what does a republican do? Too often their focus is electing more democrats and more republicans. So at that point, who is really influencing whom? I would like to see us come to the point where we're electing people based on their ability to fix problems rather than vote the party line. So I think this is a great first step.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you very much, Howard. We now are going to drill down on some of the aspects of this report rather than reacting to it in general. I have a lot of practical questions, but I'd like to start with a more conceptual question having to do with this resonant phrase, social contract, that Howard referred to in his remarks.

Now, as the report presents it, the social contract has two elements. First of all that elected officials should serve the common good of the people and, second, that elected officials should consult and be influenced by the view of the people they represent. Now, the question I want to pose is whether those two elements of the social contract are completely compatible.

And let me tell you why I'm posing this question. We have a system -- everybody knows this -- of geographical representation in this country for the congress of the United States. You know, as George Allen knows, because he's been in both of these institutions, the House of Representatives represents particular districts, the Senate represents particular states, there's no guarantee that when you represent the people of your own district or state -- faithfully represent it -- that the views you represent will be the same as the views that people equally faithfully representing their states or districts will have. And so the more ardently you defend your own geographical district, the more you may pull away from the common good of the American people as a whole.

Or let me turn the question around, how do you take out of the geographical representation of the 50 states in the Senate and the 435 congressional districts -- how do you move from those particular representations to the common good, which is the first principle that this report stands for? What's the relationship between the two of them?

And there's no particular order. People can jump in. Not everybody has to respond to every question, but feel free.

MR. ALLEN: I'll start unless somebody wants to. We're a representative democracy. I actually had Thomas Jefferson's seat in the House of Delegates, and he said the just powers of the government are derived from the people. And I've been in these situations where, all right, you've got to represent the people of your district and the people in Alaska or the people in Louisiana or Texas -- say energy producing states, which are so important for their economies -- are going to have a different view than people from Maine or Connecticut or northeastern states generally, other than New Hampshire, where they live free or die, which is almost an island (laughter) or oasis, depending how you want to look at it philosophically.

The other disconnect that is missed here is that too many people running for office will say one thing to get elected and then people are frustrated that they’re not showing the integrity to keep their word. So the social contract -- and that's why there's

elections and the representatives elections, as you know, are every two years. And senators are supposed to be longer, four years for governors and six years for senators. So the point is that people ought to keep their promises, but recognize you just can't promise everything to everyone. And that's the problem. Every group they go -- not everyone, and I'm sure you don't do this, Jamie, but you've seen others who will go to one group and say yeah, I'm all with you on that, and then they go to another group and say, I'm all with you on that, but those two positions are completely different and you can't keep your promises to both sides. I think what you need to have are -- back to the redistricting, districts that are compact and contiguous and have the voters decide who their elected representatives are rather than the politicians deciding who their voters are. And you end up with these districts that look like spaghetti, winding around and are connected by a river or something like this. And it just makes it so polarized that it gets to what you're saying, is that they're worrying about the party.

When you had Eric Canter, republican leader gets knocked out in a primary and he was supposedly on the side of President Obama, I guarantee you President Obama considered him a burr under his saddle. Then you had Representative Ocasio-Cortez, who knocked off a high-ranking democrat up in the New York City area. And so I guarantee you these kind of shock waves goes across and I say, my goodness, I'm not worried about the general population, I'm worried about my own political hide in the next primary. So that's what I'd like to see, districts are more competitive, where you have communities of similar interests together. Then I think you'd get folks working together.

Jamie, the congressman, mentioned on redistricting. I'm one who thinks elected representatives ultimately approve that plan from a bipartisan citizen cabinet type thing, Steven, coming up with the plans. And there are ways to do that. Put a few legislators on that panel but have a much safer or more fair system. And that's the sort of thing -- all right, you take something from one side, take something from the best of the other, you get it together and listen to the other side just to get things done, because that's

what you're elected to do -- not play partisan politics, but actually improve opportunities for economic development and jobs and so forth. Say in the Rochester area we like Wegmans, by the way. My wife Susan is here. But you have to be willing to adapt, to innovate to listen, and to improve if you want to make your constituents, your state, your country more competitive and make sure that everyone has that equal opportunity to compete and succeed.

MR. RASKIN: Can I follow up on that?

MR. GALSTON: Absolutely.

MR. RASKIN: And I thank George for those thoughtful comments. I think Steve is right to identify the social contract as the big question here. Of course, there are lots of different dimensions of the social contract, the contract between voters and elected officials in one part of it. You go, you get to represent us, you get the honors of office and so on. In return, we expect you to pursue the common good and not a strategy of private enrichment or foreign emoluments, or whatever else you might find to do with your time. And so that's part of it.

But there are other parts of the social contract too, such as in our commitment to the common good, that we all try to advance the norms of effective and fair procedural democracy. And I think that's where we've really broken down. You know, I believe that most of elected officials are spending a lot of time out with their constituents listening and so on. I don't think that's where the breakdown is. For me, when I look at the trajectory of constitutional development in our country, we have made the country progressively more democratic. And when we do we make the country a lot better because we make it more inclusive, we make it more participatory, and we make it more egalitarian, and more free. But it's broken down in a number of ways. One of the ways is the way that we've been talking about in terms of congressional redistricting. Like, George, I favor independent redistricting as a procedural reform. Substantively, I think the standard should be one of competitiveness, but also one of representativeness.

I mean we have states that are basically 50-50, like North Carolina or Ohio, where we have 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 imbalance in the congressional delegation. Generally republicans to democrats because the republicans control the majority in the vast majority of the state legislatures and they've used their power to gerrymander themselves into power and to draw lopsided congressional delegations. That's a serious problem.

The electoral college is a serious problem. It was put in consciously as an anti-democratic instrument at a time when the right to vote really didn't exist. It inscribes the slave power, it inscribes the disproportionate power of smaller states because of the two add on electors for senate and so on. There's a movement underway in the country, which I think appeals to a broad national sentiment that we need to replace the electoral college with the national popular vote. And I would love to have citizen juries or citizen cabinets composed to look at it. Most people think that we do elect the president by popular vote or if they understand how the system works they think it's ridiculous and we should have a direct election for president the way we elect governors and senators.

So I think there are a whole host of issues like that where we're stuck. And I think the impaneling popular discussion to overcome the idea that the country can never understand this. You know, people say oh, well, it would be great if the millions of people disenfranchised in Puerto Rico and the Territories and the District of Columbia could get the right to vote, but nobody can understand it, it's too complicate. I just don't think that's true. And so I think that the citizen cabinet methodology is an instrument for overcoming the mythology that people aren't smart enough to govern themselves.

MR. GALSTON: Howard, you wanted to get in here.

MR. KONAR: Well, first of all, I think you asked a hard question. And it's entirely possible that a citizens' cabinet composed of people from western New York, where I live, would come up with a very different guidance for their representative than a citizens' cabinet in Wyoming. And you can imagine a lot of different variations on that. I think the question, though, is would people see that outcome as more fair? In other words, we've got

all these representatives, they're taking the will of their constituents into their decision making process, would they see that as more or less fair than people perceive to be the situation today, and the way they perceive it today is that either people are voting along partisan lines or their voting because they're controlled by corporations or other special interests. And I would have to say, on a basic fairness test, if people accept majority rule and if they really think their representatives are listening to them as citizens and voters, hopefully that would be better.

MR. GALSTON: Any other reactions to my question?

MS. BINDER: I would just, I guess, put the political science hat on for a moment, and not to disagree with the comments that have been made about the benefits of redistricting, but just a slight reality check on two claims. And, first, the importance of contiguous and compact districts, the dilemma is that requirement or that desirability of those types of districts runs up against other requirements and the law, namely, in particular Voting Rights Act, which produces other types of constraints on the drawing of district lines. And how that gets worked out is very difficult, both for lawmakers as well as for the courts, as we've seen.

The second, on the desirability for competitive districts, that is very hard to disagree with. Just one caveat to keep in mind, that even from competitive districts, meaning that as we see them, districts that often send a democrat and then two years later might send a republican, and back and forth, those districts don't necessarily produce centrist lawmakers, right. If we look at their voting patterns, often the ones who come in as democrats from centrist districts tend to push for the liberal side and republicans look more like conservative lawmakers. There are some exceptions, but there's something else going on besides redistricting that's influencing how lawmakers cast those votes once they come to the congress.

MR. ALLEN: Although one example, though, for the Senate is whatever senators are from Maine -- because I remember hearing republicans saying -- or when

Lincoln Chafee was a senator from Rhode Island, and grousing, and I said look, Maine doesn't think the same way as they do in Mississippi, Rhode Island doesn't look at things the same as they look at things in Wyoming. And in those situations you can't redistrict the state, but you do see a moderation, generally from New Englanders, generally speaking, compared to say westerners.

MS. BINDER: For sure. And certainly in the senate where there's a broader heterogeneous mix for sure. Absolutely.

MR. GALSTON: Let me tell you all where we are in our program. I'm going to pose one more round of questions to the panelists, then it's going to be your turn. And as I go to the podium the author of the report, Steve Kull, will come up to join the panel because you probably have some questions for him about the report that you'd like to hear his answers to.

Here is my final round of questions. I have so many questions that I'd like to pose, but I have to pick and choose. This is sort of a reality test question; answer it any way you want. The hypothesis of the report, and some of the evidence adduced in the report, suggests that people feel poorly represented by their representatives and that they're right to feel that way, which leads to the following question: if elected officials are so out of touch with their constituents, why do they keep on getting reelected in such large numbers? And that is not a rhetorical question, it's an analytical question and I'd be interested in the views of the panelists on that issue. And please feel free to say that you disagree with the premise of the question, which is the premise of the report, that, in fact, elected officials are not as far as out of touch as the report suggests they are?

Any reactions?

MS. REYNOLDS: So I have two. One is I think on this question of why do people keep getting reelected. To some degree I think is a defensive parties, in response to something that was said earlier. I think part of it is because for the typical voter when they go to the polls, parties are a really useful shortcut and they have a sense of this one party

generally agrees -- I generally agree with them, I feel affinity to that party, and that's going to influence my voting decision in a world where the average American doesn't consume a huge amount of political news, unlike probably all of us sitting up here. So that's one thing that I would say.

And the other thing that I would say is that there are certainly times where we have seen elected officials when they are out of step with their constituents not get reelected. I think of the biggest stories of what happened in the 2018 midterms were republican members of the house losing their seats on the democrats way to picking up 40 seats in the house because of how far out of step with public opinion they were on repealing the Affordable Care Act and the idea that they were going to take away benefits from citizens that they had come to expect and come to like. So I think in some ways what we just watched happen is a counterpoint to what you're arguing.

MS. BINDER: I would just quote the political scientist Dick Fino from Rochester, New York, who said decades ago we love our member but we hate congress. And in part I think that speaks to Congressman Raskin's view that there is a lot of electoral responsiveness at the member's level, but the difficulty of making the tradeoff to legislate is ample. We see it everywhere and the public makes judgments about congress' dysfunction more broadly, even if they like their own member and are happy to reelect them.

MR. GALSTON: So why did the elected officials think that elected officials get reelected in such great numbers?

MR. ALLEN: Again, if you have a district that's strong democrat or strong republican, you're likely to get reelected. But then there's wave elections. You were talking about 2018, there was a wave election. We saw it in Virginia. Virginia's state elections are in odd numbered years, and the logic of that was they don't want Virginia being somehow influenced by what's going on with the federal government and national issues and they're more focused on local issues. Well, there was a wave election in the governor's race and it wiped out a lot of members of the state legislature, the House of Delegates, with it. And so

the sentiments that people have an uprising and there's a bigger turnout and you have those wave elections.

Steven mentioned it in the presidential race. And the two of you were quoting and there were Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump. I was for Marco Rubio in the nomination. I thought he had good experience to expand the party, liked his ideas and principles. Regardless, looking at what people were -- republicans, they were just so sick of what was going on in Washington. If someone had experience, that was a negative. And they wanted someone who wasn't beholden to any special interests, who was supposedly self-funding his own campaign and so forth. And so it was just a very unique unprecedented election in many respects.

And then you saw when President Obama was in passing the so-called Affordable Care Act in 2010. It just wiped out tons of democrats with it. So, you know, that's the sentiments of the voter, that's what representative democracy is. And it swings one way or the other.

And I still think, though, as an institution, the reason people don't like congress -- and the people say, oh, President Trump, his approval rating is 42, or whatever number it is, and look how awful that is. Well, congress is at 11 as a body. And they think that -- people look at them and the fact that they have this government shutdown, this is an example of dysfunction. I guarantee you -- I don't know if this room is 90 percent democrat and 10 percent republican or 50-50, I don't know what it is -- I guarantee you all of us, we say, all right, we're going to have to solve these differences. We could get it done this afternoon, and people know that, that they could do that with folks in their communities. You sit around a table and say, all right, you need this, you need that, all right, how about this. And you'd work it out. You'd work it out.

And then when you see people who are working for the government -- people can criticize government workers, but they have a job and they're not getting paid. And you get comments that seem really out of touch. And you just think and the reason for

this is that congress did not pass appropriations bills on time, which is their single thing to do. And then it's not as if it's a part-time legislature, it's a full-time legislature. And I think that in the real word, if you're a contractor and you don't get the job done on time, you don't get paid. And people would then say, why -- and I guarantee you, they'd get it resolved -- you go through one month without a paycheck, I guarantee you they'd figure out a way to get common ground and a consensus. And then the people will say, darn right, regardless of party. Regardless. If that's the way it is in the real world -- you all in Washington don't get it. And those are the kind of constraints or disciplines that I think are absolutely necessary, which are normal in the real world but abnormal inside Washington.

MR. RASKIN: So to follow up on that -- and I've got to say, I certainly wish George Allen were back in congress because we could only get a dozen republicans to vote with us to reopen the government when we were going through this, and it would have been great to hear you make that speech on the floor. (Laughter)

MR. ALLEN: I generally got criticized for making such speeches. (Laughter)

MR. RASKIN: Yeah. But I don't think it's an issue of personalities. And obviously like that's the easy story, just to seize on particular members and say if we could replace that person everything would be fine. If we could just get rid of -- what was your colleague who got beat by David Brat -- Eric Canter -- then it would be fine. If we can get rid of him, then that would be fine, and so on and so forth. That's the American game because we do believe in individuals and people's individual political careers and it's exciting and it's like a sports event.

But there are important structural issues here. The reason that I like the idea of the citizen cabinet is because they could take those and apply some real intelligence and deliberation to them. I mean I think what we're facing is a collapse of critical thinking skills in the public and in congress itself. And so I think it would assist congress to have some people who say we're not coming in with a partisan agenda, we're not running for

anything, but here's how we would look at this question.

I mean another one we would look at is the whole question of how we elect people to the presidency. And, you know, Donald Trump won the republican nomination never having won the majority of republican votes in one state. I think he went for 40 states without winning a majority, but the anti-Trump vote was split up among three or four different candidates. The democrats, we're about to have 30 or 40 people run for president, somebody is going to win with like 3 percent of the vote (laughter), and that doesn't make sense. But we actually have a mechanism, if we used our brains, that we've developed -- that just worked in Maine, which is the ranked-choice voting mechanism, which builds and instant runoff into the election. And if you sat some people down and you could get them to focus with no cell phones and not TV for a total of even 10 minutes, they would all understand it and they would say this would make perfect sense as a way for us to have the primaries produce majority vote winners as opposed to the person who can get on top of 30 percent of the vote and just stay there.

So I just think there's a whole host of those kinds of issues that deal with procedural democracy where our partisan commitments don't necessarily predetermine where we're going to come out. You know, I've a little less confidence that we'll be able to deal with other questions, like the debt or the military industrial complex or what have you this way, but maybe, maybe we could. But let's start with those questions of procedural democracy where we really could get past the ideological blinders that have been put on people in the kind of debased political system we've got.

MR. GALSTON: Howard, you get the last word in this part of our event before we move onto audience questions.

MR. KONAR: Well, I'm going to heartily endorse everything that Representative Raskin just said and also say that, yes, I do believe that people get elected because voting along political party lines is a shortcut, which was Molly's point. So I don't have much to add.

MR. GALSTON: Very good. Steve, please join us.

MR. ALLEN: As he's coming up, one thing that the Congressman said, on the idea of voting in primaries, this is the beauty of our country and the states. The states are laboratories of democracy. The fact that Maine does that and the City of Alexandria is looking to do that, that's the beauty. Sometimes states come up with bad ideas and you wouldn't want that across the whole country, but to me each party and each state ought to determine how they want to allocate it so you don't get those kinds of sort of results that say, my goodness, you need to get more than that to have a winner take all. And some states do want to do winner take all.

The other thing, the other solution is in the Constitution if you want to have an election for president more on a district or split it -- Maine and Nebraska split their votes by congressional district, which is more representative, let's say, of a split vote where you may not get all electoral votes on a winner take all.

So there are those solutions.

MR. RASKIN: As long as you don't have a badly gerrymandered state, that could work all right.

MR. ALLEN: Well, Maine does it. And --

MR. RASKIN: They're not so badly gerrymandered.

MR. GALSTON: Okay. Your turn. Here's my request, when you're recognized, please state your name, if you think it's relevant, institutional affiliation, and then pose a question. Long statements will not be in order.

So there's a gentleman right here. Please wait until a microphone reaches you.

QUESTIONER: Only appropriate that Douglas Carr, formerly from Maine, asks this first question. (Laughter) Representative Jared Golden is in your House of Representatives by ranked-choice voting elected him and defeated the incumbent. But my question to the panel is do you think ranked-choice voting is part of the solution, or is it just

another interesting gimmick?

MR. RASKIN: If I could kick it off, of course it wasn't ranked-choice voting who elected Jared Golden, it was the people who elected him. And what ranked-choice voting allows you to do is to make certain that the winner has a majority support. So what happened in Maine was there were I think one or two third-party candidates whose votes -- the bottom candidates get dropped off and their votes get redistributed to their second choice, and he had a majority of the second choice, so that deals with the Ralph Nader problem, that, you know, Ralph Nader got -- god, I can't remember what percentage of the vote -- something like 5 percent of the vote. Say 4 of the 5 percent would have chosen Gore as their second choice, that vote would have been redistributed. And, of course, it works in the other direction. It doesn't have any kind of particular partisan valence to it, but it's a way to build a runoff into the election itself.

QUESTIONER: I would add that you do get majority support among the public. When you explain it to them, like in a policy making simulation, you do get I think 55 percent support and it is bipartisan.

This kind of thing, these kinds of structural reforms, people support them. They like the idea of independent candidates being more capable of winning to weaken the power of the incumbent party, just to break it up. They don't necessarily thing that structural reforms are the total solution, though. They do think that members have to actively want to consult and get input from their constituents, that just restructuring the incentives and all that is good, but it's not the total solution.

MR. ALLEN: Just so you know, I'm not convinced that's the best way to go. I think that you have a run off. If someone doesn't get 50 percent -- maybe it's because I was in sports and all, you have playoffs, you have playoff games, and if you don't get 50 then you have a runoff between the top 2 vote getters, which is the way some states operate presently -- Louisiana, Georgia, a few others.

MR. GALSTON: Yeah, but if the runoff begins by excluding most of the

contenders the way, you know, the championship --

MR. ALLEN: Well, they got knocked off and they didn't 50 percent.

MR. GALSTON: I'm joking. I'm just referring to the fact that a lot of people don't think that four teams for the BCS is enough. (Laughter)

MR. ALLEN: Well, as soon as the colleges get more money from the network they'll go to eight. (Laughter)

MR. GALSTON: Okay. I'm now going to go to the back of the room for a minute. There's someone back there. Yes, you.

MR. ALLEN: Are you an Ohio State fan I supposed with that comment?

MR. GALSTON: No. (Laughter) I'm a fan of procedural fairness.

MR. ALLEN: I agree, I agree, I agree.

MR. REISMAN: Hello, my name is Avram Reisman; I'm a master's candidate in the democracy and governance program at Georgetown. I'm really interested in this citizen cabinet proposal. My question is just considering the monetary constraints of your average congressional office, you know, how much would this cost to implement? And, also, how can we be sure that if it were performed on line it would be secure?

MR. GALSTON: Steve, to you first.

MR. KRULL: On the security issue, there are a lot of controls built into the system. You do have a large national sample. We do it large enough so that we can break out very red to very blue districts. And so we get a pretty good feel of what kinds of things we're apt to find. And, surprise, surprise, there's not that big a difference between very red and very blue districts in most cases. Basically, if you've got a majority you're probably going to get that.

In building the citizen cabinet at a district level, even the model where the member does direct invites and recruits, you also would have a sample selected by a sampling company that's representative sample as a core. And so that gives you some sense of like some kind of a range of what the ultimate views would be, because even with

that margin of error of that core. Then you add more to it. You get more granularity, you see more subgroups, things like that. So that's a second constraint on some kind of mistake happening.

Another concern is that people are going to -- you'll be doing one on gun control, the word will get around, and then people will flood in there and, you know, pack the thing. A key rule is you recruit people to be part of the citizen cabinet and then you close it down, you don't take any new people once you start a survey so that the word doesn't get around and then you flood it.

The whole question of how you pay for it, that's a complex subject and there are ethics committee issues and they are different ways that it can be done, 501(c)(3), through the members' office. They do have some funds for this kind of purpose. But campaigns could be involved in it as well. So there are different ways that it could be done.

MR. GALSTON: Wow, a sea of hands. I don't know what to do here. I see a gentleman back there and then I'll come forward.

DR. FINE: Yes, my name is Edward Fine and I'm an M.D. I come from the University of Buffalo in the Department of Neurology. One question, is this a good idea or not that you simply look at the plurality of votes and if say you have 10 electoral college votes and candidate A got 60 percent of the popular vote, 6 electors would vote for that candidate. That's a proportional system, it's direct. You look at the present situation, what is it, winner takes all in most states. And that means that only a hair's breadth can make a difference in the way the votes are counted, and that's how you get a president elected by a minority of popular votes. So, panel, good idea, dumb idea? Each state, if I remember correctly can choose how they elect their representative to the House.

MR. RASKIN: Well, what you're describing moves us in the direction of the correct value, which is we should elect the president the way we elect United States senators and governors and mayors, which is whoever gets the most votes wins. We only have one president. So if the person who doesn't get the most votes wins, the person who

gets fewer votes is going to win. And of course that has happened in two of our last five elections. And the other important part to note is that the current system depresses turnout dramatically in the non-swing states and it concentrates the campaigns and expenditure of campaign money, time, appearances, so on, in seven or eight state, which are the swing states. And most of our states are like my state, Maryland, which is a blue state, which just gets ignored. And, you know, New York is a big blue state that gets ignored, and California. And Texas is a big red state that gets ignored, like Alaska and Mississippi and Alabama and Georgia. Most of the country is fly over territory and a national popular vote would restore a presidential election.

MR. ALLEN: I respectfully disagree. I think that your approach that you're taking, the states can do that presently. Again, Maine does it and so does Nebraska in that whoever wins the state they get the -- and I'm one who cares -- you're quoting James Madison in all of this. James Madison, the states created the federal government, not the other way around. And I think the states are more reflective of the people than the national government, and so forth. So that's just a fundamental difference. But the electoral college is each state -- I mean you could say why is Rhode Island a state, or why isn't Texas five states, it's bigger than France, and so forth and all these kinds of things. But the states are what created the federal government. Two electoral votes or who wins statewide and then you can have the other allocated by congressional districts, which is the way congress is done.

Jamie and I both agree that redistricting ought to be done more fairly, taking into account the Voting Right Act as well to make sure minorities are not disenfranchised from it. But that's the way to --

MR. GALSTON: I can tell from the body language here that we're about to have a constitutional debate break out.

MR. RASKIN: Forgive me, I think the audience will think less of me if I don't respond to just one thing George said here, which is -- and he said it twice. I was going to

resist the first time, but when he said the states created the federal government, of course that's what the Civil War was about. And Lincoln said it very clearly, that --

MR. ALLEN: And he got 41 percent of the vote. (Laughter)

MR. RASKIN: But we won the war.

MR. ALLEN: The point is the electoral college worked out well, even with 41 percent of the vote.

MR. RASKIN: But he won the constitutional argument, more importantly, which is the first three words of the Constitution settle it. It's "we the people" that bring both the states and the union into being. And that's what the Civil War was about, and that's why no state has the right --

MR. ALLEN: The Civil War was not over that.

MR. RASKIN: Well, it was over slavery. I was putting it in a gentle way --

MR. ALLEN: Yes, over slavery.

MR. RASKIN: -- for the Virginians present. (Laughter)

MR. ALLEN: They weren't arguing over the electoral college and how you apportion those votes.

MR. RASKIN: The electoral college has very strong roots in slavery because what it did was it reproduced the bias towards the small states, which were southern, and then the Three-Fifths Compromise inflated the power of the congressional delegations from the south and gave them extra electoral college votes. So you've got to check out Garry Wills' book written about the 1800 election called "Negro President", which was about how Jefferson, despite all of his greatness and his virtues, was elected by virtue of those dozen extra electors that came from the southern states.

So I mean I don't think we need to re-litigate the history. I thought it was settled that the union was created by the people through the Constitution and so were the states. And the states did not create the federal government. That was precisely the argument that was rejected in the Civil War.

MR. GALSTON: I am going to bite my tongue (laughter). I have a dog in this hunt too, but it's neither of yours. Okay. But this should be about you, not about us, so I see a hand over there.

MR. SKINNER: Hi, I'm Richard Skinner from Johns Hopkins University. We already have really low rates of participation in national public opinion surveys, and the thing I worry about with the system--

MR. ALLEN: Low rates of what?

MR. SKINNER: Participation.

MR. ALLEN: Okay.

MR. SKINNER: People don't answer their phones anymore and when they do they tend to hang up. And I'm wondering how would get like the apathetic, the uninformed, the really, really busy, you know, the single parent who works 60 hours a week, to participate in this? Because their opinions matter too. Even if you're getting a demographically accurate sample, you know, not everyone is equal in their interest in politics or are willing to put forth their time. I'm very active in local politics and I've got to tell you, you really see the differences in who's willing to become active and who just doesn't have the time, doesn't have the interest.

Thank you.

QUESTIONER: I'll answer that real quickly. What you're raising is the problem of response rates in polls, which have come down. The number of people, the percentage of people who answer has gone down. Big question, heavily researched. Does that mean that that outcome is significantly different? As a group, are the people who are willing to answer different in their distribution of attitudes than people who aren't? And there has been a lot of research on it and it all pretty much says the same thing, the answer is no, they are basically the same.

So, everybody from a pathological perspective, we all want response rates to be higher, but the fact that they have come down has not invalidated the accuracy of the

polls. Yes, you want to reach out to as many people as you can and a lot of the reluctance to participate -- and I know because we worked on recruiting people for citizen cabinets -- is they say I don't think that my member cares, I don't think they're going to listen, so why should I bother, why should I bother getting informed. And the whole idea is to change that dynamic, for the member to actually reach out and say I want to hear from you, you know, through an image, through an app, through a robo call, whatever, to really reach out and say I want to hear from you and change this dynamic. And the evidence suggests that people will get more involved. The research says that if people believe that it matters, that they have effectiveness, that they're having some impact, they're much more likely to get informed and participate.

QUESTIONER: Are people paid to participate?

QUESTIONER: No.

QUESTIONER: Is there food there? (Laughter) Pizza, free cold beer.

MR. GALSTON: Speaking of changing the dynamic, I think it's incumbent upon me to change the gender dynamic in the room. So, yes, ma'am, thanking you for responding.

QUESTIONER: Yes. With California's 40 million population and Rhode Island and Delaware, something less than 1 million, do you see a day where there will actually be fair representation in our senate for our citizens for our country? I know our founding fathers, they wanted our senate to be different and to have a different function than our congress, but I think it's incredibly unfair for a state like California to only have two senators and many states having less one million having the same amount. Do you see that changing with an amendment?

MR. ALLEN: No. (Laughter) To pass an amendment you'd need three-quarters of the states to -- assuming congress actually put that amendment -- changed it, you need three-quarters of the states to do it. The Constitution, there's all sorts of checks and balances in the house and the senate, the executive, the legislative body, which is the

representative bodies, the first, and then you have the judicial for fair adjudication of disputes and protection of our natural god given rights and expression of religion, property and due process, equal protection, and so forth. And then the states are also to guard their responsibilities and jurisdiction. And so that's just part of all the compromises and the Three-Fifths Compromise, which is wrong, which is the worst thing that's ever been allowed in this country, slavery, and then subsequently racial discrimination and the treatment of American Indians. Our country, as Lincoln said, is always striving to be a more perfect union, but I don't see the smaller states saying, yeah, we want to give up our power to Washington and New York City. If you had a national election -- and Jamie has great ideas, and I love the way he expresses them, and I understand he was saying, the flyover. If you had a national election all they would be doing is advertising in New York City, Philadelphia, Washington, DC, San Francisco, and Seattle and LA, and they'd probably have to go in Houston and Dallas, Fort Worth area as well, and that would be the votes. And they would completely ignore rural areas all together. And you'd have the urban areas deciding who are president is.

MR. GALSTON: Next question? This gentleman here.

MR. PESTRONK: I'm Bobby Pestronk, a former appointed governmental official and now an artisan, and actually so that I'm also from the Congressman's district. So the first is I'm curious about whether these deliberative councils would actually meet in person because it is the conversations among informed people, regardless of what their points of view are, in my estimation would produce a greater consensus and a more informed consensus.

And, secondly, what about the hypothesis that congress is actually functioning as intended? And it is the polarities now that are producing the visceral reactions, which are encouraging more people to become engaged and therefore changing how it might work in the future because different people will be elected. It's often what you see at the local level, where I worked for many years.

MR. RASKIN: So I love both your points, and not just because you're my constituent (laughter). So the first one I think is absolutely right, and we'll let Steve answer, but it's got o be an actual deliberative process. I think that the trenchant critique of congress is how little real conversation, how little real debate goes on, so much of it is totally performative and cosmetic and there's not the real deliberation. I don't know if any of you guys saw me this morning, I was trying to have a real discussion about whether the federal workers need a pay raise and try to engage my colleagues on that. We passed some legislation increasing the civilian pay along with the military pay this morning.

But I think your second point is right too. I mean when we get in these discussions I go to them and it seems like the big piñata is always the political parties. And, you know, I'm not like any kind of big theorist about why political parties are the be all and the end all or anything, but I don't really get it. I mean I think it was the political scientist Maurice --

QUESTIONER: Duverger.

MR. RASKIN: Duverger? Is that his name? Duverger? Okay. Who said that if you're going to have single member elections in large jurisdictions, whether it's a congressional district or a state, the public's going to sort itself out into two big parties? That's just what happens. And the same thing happens when you get into a legislative assembly based on that system. Then the parties actually play a real public function, which is they articulate different political programs and they sharpen the contrast and they do send a signal to the voters about what the different programs are. I think 2018 is a great example of how the public got mobilized around two radically different visions of where the country is going to go.

Now, there are those of who are middle children, like me, who like to think of ourselves as moderates. And so we always think the answer is between this side and between that side. And it may be, but it may not be. I mean certainly during the Civil War the solution was not to create the compromise like the Kansas-Nebraska Act, which was

Stephen Douglas' big solution that was going to solve everything, and it just ripped the country apart further.

Certain issues need to be grabbed by the horns. Slavery is one of them, pro-choice is another one. You've got this clash of absolute views and you just have to decide which way are you going to go, and we like to think maybe you can split the difference on these things, but maybe you can't. And I think it's just a fallacy to think that the answer is always somewhere between two opposed, or three or four or five opposed positions.

MS. REYNOLDS: So I think just to build on the Congressman's point, I do think that we see some evidence of sort of anger can be a mobilizing force. And I think that for many voters that was true in 2018 election, for voters it was true in the 2016 election. I think that sort of frustration with the way that congress is working, even if it can mobilize people to participate, I don't think that's the only way we can mobilize people to participate, and I don't think that congress is working as intended internally, even if it's dysfunction does have the consequence of turning more people out to vote because they feel frustrated with the system. I think there are other ways that we could do that that are compatible with a more functional congress.

MR. KONAR: And I'm going to leave the question on the conduct of the citizen cabinets to you, but I can't agree that congress is working as intended. And I don't think there's anything innately wrong with political parties, but nobody gives political parties the right to control committees in congress, they gave themselves that right. There's no saying that both parties can't call witnesses in a hearing and that we can't have real deliberation. You know, I go back -- I'm old enough to go back to the Tax Reform Act of '86. Look at the difference between how that was done and how tax reform was done last year. In 1986 we had Treasury 1, we had Treasury 2, we had hearings, we had witnesses and experts testify, we had congressional budget office estimates. I'm not sure if the White House budget office was in place yet, but it was a long process. It took over a year and a

half and when it was finally done we had a Tax Act that lasted for over 30 years. We don't see that anymore. And that to me is the result of how parties control the inner workings of congress and squelch discussion.

So I can't say in any way that congress is working the way that it should.

MR. ALLEN: I can't imagine that the founders would see this -- Jefferson would be appalled by the debt, and I think all of them would be -- George Washington warned against parties. Even Jefferson, who was the republican democratic anti federalist, whatever you want to call it -- they worried about parties. But parties do broadly, as Jamie said -- you know, Jefferson said there will be some who trust the people and have that as a repository and others who are more elitist and think they know better and have the government make more decisions in people's lives.

And so then you say what are the priorities of a state government. You know, education and law enforcement. National government will be interstate commerce and national security matters. But the problem is there isn't that discipline. The great thing about Steve's idea, beyond the discipline of a balanced budget and so forth, is that this is actually something that people can be for. Too many people in politics are motivated by revenge or negativity or fear. Very few times you say, gosh, I love that idea, isn't that a darn good idea.

What's great about what Steve's trying to do is try to get people to find that common ground and there will be someone somewhere along the line, somebody is going to run for office and they're going to say I'm going to run on this idea -- I'm going to put a citizen cabinet and that person, whoever he or she is, is going to go through all the details of it. And when that person, whoever he or she is, wins then you're going to see the politicians say hey, do you see what someone did in the eastern shore of Maryland or what they did Omaha, Nebraska? Hey, that's an idea. And then others, typically politicians, will follow good ideas to help get elected.

MR. KONAR: Well, one of the subtitles to today's conference is "What Can

Congress Do". They can legislate. I mean they can act on trade policy instead of relegating that to the president to act by emergency authority, they can solve the immigration problem by acting with legislation. And time after time after time the problem is that congress does nothing. The executives fill in by executive order and then everybody complains because that's not right either. So I think congress can do a lot and hasn't done much, is my short answer.

MR. GALSTON: Steve, quickly on the --

MR. KRULL: Yes, there is a model and we have explored it partly with the support and the cooperation of Common Ground Solutions, of getting people together and going through these policy making simulations in groups where they had discussions and so on. It worked beautifully, people really enjoy it. And, yes, they tend to spontaneously move toward common ground. We found this in focus groups. It's like people kind of assume that if we talk for a while and listen to each other we're going to move toward common ground.

Now, to some extent this is also simulated on line where we present people pro and con arguments. And guess what? In most cases majorities find both the pro and the con convincing. At first people go, well, that's really weird, what's the matter with them. But they're basically going, oh, yeah, that's a good point, oh, yeah, that's a good point too. And then they kind of look for some way to integrate those values.

And how do they see what congress is doing? Well, they see, you know, a clash of parties is a zero-sum game, it's a power struggle. A clash of ideas is a deliberation. And they think that's what should happen, that there should actually be listening and trying to find, you know, some kind of integration, some way to balance the value, some way to bring about some kind of report of the values. And they don't see that happening. All they see is power struggle. And there is no doubt that the founders were very concerned that that would happen and they thought that would be terrible if it does. That's what they called the pestilential breadth of factionalism.

MR. GALSTON: With deep apologies to all of the people, and there are

many of you, who did not get your questions posed and answered, it's my sad duty to bring this event to a close. But join me in thanking everybody who participated. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2020