

HEALTHY DEMOCRACY

A Retrospective
and
Look Ahead

Ned Crosby
December, 2013

In 2003 I published *HEALTHY DEMOCRACY: Empowering a Clear and Informed Voice of the People*. Now, ten years later, it is worth reviewing what I wrote then and looking ahead to what needs to be done to make democracy work. There have been many successes, a few failures and much more that needs to be done.

There still are parts of the book worth reading. The Introduction is a useful way to explain what the book is about and how Citizens Juries can contribute to a healthy democracy. Also, the short introductions to the three main sections of the book are worth reading. But rather than imposing the chapter format of the book on the way I see democracy now, I have picked some topics that are worth consideration. Some of these review what has been accomplished in the last ten years and some look to the future and cover things not included in the book.

Each of the following topics is a brief summary, with references to other materials that the curious reader can explore.

	Page
1. The Citizens Jury process and how it has spread	2
2. Scientific Manipulation	2
3. Citizens Initiative Review	2
4. Citizens Election Forum	3
5. A Big Win for Democracy	4
6. An Informed Policy Dialogue	5
7. Global Climate Change	7
8. Economics and budget	8
9. Health Care	9
10. National Security	10
11. How Should We Live Together?	10
12. Other Approaches	11
13. A New American Democracy	11
14. Essays	12

This expresses my vision for the future of democracy. The specific programs of the Jefferson Center and Healthy Democracy in Oregon can be seen on their websites.

The Citizens Jury Process

The description of the Citizens Jury process in Chapter 2 of *Healthy Democracy* is still a good introduction to the method. Those who prefer something shorter can refer to the Jefferson Center website <http://jefferson-center.org/what-we-do/citizen-juries/>.

In 2003 the Citizens Jury process was used frequently in Britain and Germany. At about that time, interest was picking up in Australia. Since then it has been used in Australia, where there is a growing interest in deliberative methods. Citizens Juries have been introduced in Spain, Japan, and Africa. While the interest in the method is falling off in some countries, such as Spain and Britain (where government misuse of the process was quite damaging), in other places, such as France, the method is being used by a number of regional governments. Currently there is no definitive review of where the process is being conducted and how well these projects are conducted.

Scientific Manipulation

Arguably the greatest danger to democracy is the manipulation of the public through the use of sophisticated methods based upon social science research. Chapter 1 of *Healthy Democracy* covers this topic quite well, but it is dated.

The current use of micro-targeting has made the manipulation of the public even more sophisticated. Computers are now able to track personal profiles of a large portion of the American public. This means that well-funded organizations can send messages to individuals specifically crafted to influence them. (*Insert here a good on-line reference to micro-targeting – Wikipedia?*)

In other words, the need for some method to inform citizens and help them agree on what is in America's long-term best interests is even more important than when the book was written. The Jefferson Center is working on a few key projects to accomplish this.

Citizens Initiative Review

The application of the Citizens Jury process to the evaluation of ballot initiatives in Oregon is to date the biggest success of the Citizens Jury process. The idea was created in Washington state in 1999 by a bipartisan committee and was adopted into law in Oregon in 2011. The basic concept of the Citizens Initiative Review is presented in Chapter 4 of *Healthy Democracy*. It is exciting that a concept spelled out in a 2003 book becomes law 8 years later. The main error in the chapter was that I thought it could be adopted in 3 to 5 years. The group in Oregon set up to implement this is called Healthy Democracy (I am currently co-chair of this group). See www.healthydemocracy.org.

Citizens Election Forum

One of the most important uses of the Citizens Jury process is to evaluate candidates on their stands on issues (See Chapt. 5 of *Healthy Democracy*.) The Jefferson Center is unique among organizations working on deliberative democracy in terms of the length of time and continued interest we have shown in using a deliberative method to review electoral politics. The first pilot project on this was in 1976, when the second CJ conducted by the Center drew together a randomly selected group of church members to evaluate Carter vs. Ford in that year's presidential election. Although the method worked well in this test, it was difficult for us to see how to move ahead with this.

But the presidential election of 1988 brought so much criticism of how the campaign was conducted that it seemed worth trying this use of CJs again. The Center teamed up with the League of Women Voters to conduct three major projects to evaluate candidates on their stands on issues: the St. Paul, MN mayoral race in 1989, the gubernatorial election in Minnesota in 1990 and the U.S. Senate race between Arlen Specter and Lynn Yaekel in 1992 in Pennsylvania. The latter project received wide praise, leading the *Philadelphia Inquirer* to comment that it was "a portrait of democracy the way democracy was supposed to be". Regrettably, the Internal Revenue Service took action against the Center, claiming that these projects violated IRS regulations regarding the involvement of a 501-c-3 organization in electoral activities. It took three years and a very high-powered lawyer to prevent the IRS from taking away the Center's tax-deductible status, but the Center was not allowed to conduct these projects again. The momentum for this use of the method was killed.

Nevertheless, we continued to believe that the evaluation of candidates was one of the best uses of the Citizens Jury method. Therefore, in 2012, an affiliated organization, Jefferson Action, conducted a three-segment Citizen Election Forum. The Citizens Jury Method was used to evaluate candidates for Ohio's 16th Congressional District where, due to redistricting, two incumbents were pitted against each other. In the final forum each candidate spoke with participants for 75 minutes about the economic issues facing Northeast Ohio. Participants then produced a Voters' Guide to inform their fellow voters of their findings. Voters in the district indicated that they trusted their neighbors who participated in the Citizens Jury process.

Nearly 2/3 of the voters (61%) who were aware of the project indicated that they found the materials useful and informative in their electoral decision-making process. One out of every four (27.7%) voters in Ohio's 16th Congressional District who were aware of the project indicated that materials and information produced during the project directly influenced which candidate they selected for US Congress in the 2012

But this project did not lead to continued funding for Citizens Election Forums. One problem was that we discovered that we didn't give the jurors enough time to make really solid evaluations, in spite of having conducted three separate CJs. The other problem was that it was too demanding for the staff and the basic work needed to sustain funding for the Center had been neglected. We are now rectifying this in 2013 and 2014.

A Big Win for Democracy

The Jefferson Center is developing a project that could create a “big win” for democracy. This is not found in *Healthy Democracy*. Here is the basic idea:

1. Something must be done about our dysfunctional democracy.
 - A. We need to start by enacting at least one sound policy in the long-term public interest.
 - B. The public must recognize that this was done because of a new approach to making democracy work. It is vital to overcome public cynicism about our governments and democracy in general. We need to create a **big win for democracy**.
2. This will require support from one or more very wealthy people.
 - A. Many billionaires are already becoming involved in politics.
 - B. The more that join in supporting one side or another, the more dysfunctional our democracy will become.
 - C. It is vital to engage a few billionaires soon to support reforms that will enhance democracy and lead to sound public policies.
3. It is now possible to create an informed national dialogue that can lead a strong majority of Americans to support a sound public policy on some specific issue.
 - A. This dialogue will be based on deliberative methods developed over the last three decades: the Citizens Jury process, the Citizens’ Assembly and the 21st Century Town Meeting.
 - B. Citizens Juries have blossomed in the last few years:
 - i. Oregon: In 2011 the Citizens Initiative Review was made part of state law to evaluate ballot initiatives. It was voted “project of the year” by the International Association for Public Participation, 2013.
 - ii. Ohio: The Citizens Election Forum in 16th District in 2012 showed how Citizens Juries can introduce an informed voice of the people into an election, even when outspent 50 to 1.
 - iii. Minnesota: The Citizens Jury on federal debt and deficit in 2012 showed how everyday citizens can gain a solid understanding of this complex issue in only six days.
4. A small team of political scientists needs to be gathered to design the Informed Policy Dialogue to make it credible in the eyes of a few billionaire philanthropists. It could be used on a variety of issues.
 - A. The Jefferson Center would support this effort.
 - B. The first steps should be relatively simple to take.

An Informed Policy Dialogue

Many political analysts will view the idea of an Informed Policy Dialogue as naïve, especially when proposed at the national level. In the era of micro-targeting, backed by major media campaigns, how can we expect to create a process through which the nation as a whole can engage in an informed dialogue?

The answer is that the major elements making up an informed national dialogue have been created and tested over the last quarter century. What remains is to put these together in a sophisticated way and support the effort with sufficient funds to make it something the public will pay attention to. There is no claim that this is certain to work, merely the claim that it is within the realm of the possible, that the need is great and that it will be relatively inexpensive to test the dialogue as the design work progresses.

Here are the main points:

1. It would be easiest to start with an issue at the state level, picking something the public really cares about, such as education or children.
2. Start with the Citizens Jury process. This will give a microcosm of the public the opportunity to review various proposals regarding what needs to be done over the next decade or two. Citizens Juries are the best way for a microcosm of the public to take an in-depth look at an issue. The Citizens Jury on federal debt and deficit in Minnesota in 2012 showed how everyday citizens can gain a solid understanding of this complex issue in only six days. Several of these should be conducted in various parts of the state to review a large variety of reforms.
3. Use a larger group of randomly selected people to review what the Citizens Juries are proposing. These might participate on-line. They can give immediate feedback to Citizens Juries during their last day or two of their deliberations.* This should be augmented by public opinion polls to help the jurors see whether the public is tracking the project and what their reactions are.
4. There should be a major public information campaign to be sure that the public is paying attention. The amount spent should be comparable to what is spent in an initiative campaign in the state or the race for governor. Here is where it is important to find some very wealthy people to back the effort. If a billionaire can be convinced that this is not just an investment in a single issue in one state, but rather an investment in making democracy work, then funding at this level should be possible.
5. Use 21st Century Town Meetings two or three times a year to review what the Citizens Juries are recommending. This method allows for several thousand people to be gathered for a day, meeting in different parts of the state, but linked together by video, so they feel they are meeting as one big group. The purpose of these is to be show the general public that large groups of state residents, meeting

* When several Citizens Juries are used in conjunction on an issue, they could be run as part of the Citizens' Assembly method, successfully demonstrated in British Columbia in 2004. These are the kinds of details that would be looked at closely during the design phase, but do not need to be discussed here in order to clarify the basic concepts.

- for only a day, support the evolving agreement about what should be done. Such events are sure to attract media attention and add legitimacy to the work being done by the Citizens Juries.
6. These methods should be run on a continuing basis for a year or more.
 - A. The Citizens Juries should be run on a monthly basis, held in different places in the state. Each should be made up of a microcosm of the state as a whole, but should be run in a different places so that the people from that area feel that they are included in the dialogue.
 - B. Conducting Citizens Juries in a serial fashion like this will allow the participants of one Citizens Jury to help shape the agenda for the next Citizens Jury. In this way, the effects of staff bias in setting the agenda will be greatly reduced.
 - C. A key aspect of these discussions will be the use of technical advisors, chosen by the participants in the CJs, to examine key factual issues. These will form the basis of the factual claims that will be used to demonstrate that the discussion is informed. The use of such technical advisors was a successful element of the Citizens Jury conducted in May 2012 in Minnesota.
 - D. Another key aspect will be the gathering of 24 people who disagree with the evolving recommendations of the CJs. These will be drawn at random to be a microcosm of those in disagreement. This must be done with considerable publicity so that the general public can see how these discussions are designed to reach out to different factions of the public in a respectful way.
 7. Initial tests of these methods can be undertaken for less than \$1 million, in order to show potential wealthy supporters that the proposal is worth further support.
 8. A steering committee should be formed along the lines of the CIR commission that is part of state law in Oregon. There are at least three key decisions that should be made by the steering committee:
 - A. They should oversee that the steps to insure quality are being done correctly and that appropriate steps are taken to fix any problems. They may also consider whether to accept funds from a controversial group.
 - B. They should have the ability to make modifications in the process if such are recommended by one of the Citizens Juries and approved by a 21st Century Town Meeting.
 - C. They should have the power to recommend at some point that the project turn from a 501-c-3 operation to a 501-c-4. Once the dialogue has clear recommendations, these should be lobbied with the state legislature. As soon as they are going to do this, they should establish a 501-c-4 operation to insure that the IRS regulations are followed properly.
 9. One advantage of this dialogue is its flexibility and its ability to call special Citizens Juries to deal with clever PR campaigns that are attacking it.
 10. The goal of this project is not only the creation and implementation of a sound public policy on some issue, but getting the public to trust a new set of democratic processes.

Global Climate Change

It is essential that new ways be found for Americans to pay attention to global climate change. The 2013 report, *Too Polite Revolution*, shows how difficult it is to get Congress to act on global climate change, even when hundreds of millions of dollars are spent, as in 2010 on the cap and trade bill. Without a deeper understanding by the American public, it is unlikely that Congress will take effective action.

Although many more Americans now believe there is global warming than did a decade or two ago, in fact the deeper attitudes they hold have been relatively stable over the past few years, as shown by work done at Yale and George Mason Universities:

	Fall 2008	Sept. 2012
• Alarmed:	18%	16%
• Concerned:	33%	29%
• Cautious:	19%	25%
• Disengaged:	12%	9%
• Doubtful:	11%	13%
• Dismissive:	7%	8%

The Citizens Jury process of the Jefferson Center has shown how it is possible to bring about major changes in the attitudes of a microcosm of the American public. For example, in Oregon in 2010 (where the Citizens' Initiative Review is part of state law on the ballot initiative process) a group of 24 randomly selected citizens voted 21 to 3 against an initiative which surveys showed was supported by 2/3 of Oregon voters. Later polling showed that the report of the Citizens Panel changed the statewide vote by 9%.

In 2012, survey results on Jefferson Action's "Reclaim November Ohio" project showed that more than 2/3 of voters in Ohio's 16 Congressional District who were aware of the project found the materials "useful, effective and trustworthy". Furthermore 1/4 of voters familiar with the project indicated it influenced how they voted on that race.

The Jefferson Center wants to explore what changes in the attitudes of a microcosm of the public can be brought about by a Citizens Jury. We believe that major shifts are likely. In 2002 the Center ran a Citizens Jury on global climate change for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. After five days of hearing witnesses on different sides of the issue, and discussing the issue among themselves, 61% of the panelists voted that the impacts of global climate change will be "very serious", 28% voted "serious" and 11% voted "not very serious" (none voted "not at all serious").

The Center now plans a range of projects called "Reasoning Together about Global Climate Change". A single Citizens Jury can be conducted to learn how Americans in a Citizens Jury now view global climate change. Will their views be convincing to a sample of the general public? More elaborate projects, using several Citizens Juries have also been designed.

Main goal of project: To learn to what degree the general public will trust the views on global climate change that evolve in the Citizens Juries. Does a majority of the public in the initial tests believe this approach should serve as a model for Americans as a whole?

Economics and Budget

The Citizens Jury process has been used several times on economic issues and budgeting:

- In 1993, the first national Citizens Jury in the U.S. dealt with the federal budget. It was very successful. William Raspberry wrote in the *Washington Post*: “This Citizens Jury has done what the Founding Fathers intended Congress to do”.
- In 1996 a smaller Citizens Jury was conducted on the MN state budget.
- A 1999 Citizens Jury dealt with property tax reform in Minnesota. Although interesting in some ways, this is an example where staff did not run the project properly. The jurors gave the project the lowest rating of any Citizens Jury with regard to how fairly, and without bias, it was conducted. See page 39 of *Healthy Democracy* for a list of the otherwise very good ratings given projects.
- A 2012 Citizens Jury did a careful analysis of what should be done about the federal debt and deficit. This was an exploration of how well the jurors could understand such a complex topic. They did well in a six day event, but it still became clear that future Citizens Jury projects on budgets must be run for much longer than the typical five-day events of the 1990s. It was this project that was an important step in demonstrating the need for something along the lines of the informed empowered dialogue described on pp5 and 6 above.
- In 2012 Jefferson Action, the 501-c-4 affiliate of the Jefferson Center, conducted a major project in the 16th congressional district of Ohio to show that an informed discussion of economic issues could play a significant role in an election.

Given what has been learned through these projects, a strong case can be made that an informed empowered dialogue could have a major impact on overcoming the dysfunctional way in which Congress deals with budgeting. Although the current gridlock arises in large part because of the power struggles between and within the political parties, much of it rests with the disagreement over whether stimulus or austerity is the best way to deal with the federal debt and deficit.

It is my belief that an informed empowered dialogue, as described on pp5 and 6 above is much more likely to make a rational decision on this matter than Congress the way it currently operates. There is little doubt that the Congressional Budget Office offers high-quality information to Congress. It is highly unlikely that an informed empowered dialogue could improve on this source of information. But the elected members of Congress do not use this information to discuss matters rationally among themselves. Instead, they are determined to fight with each other in hopes of gaining political advantage.

How much might an informed empowered dialogue improve the way Congress deals with the budget? The answer to this hangs on how much the public decides to trust the method. If a significant majority of Americans decide to trust it, if it is as well-funded as those who oppose its recommendations, and if it influences how people vote for Congress, then it can play a major role. The method is solid enough to be worth a significant investment to test it out.

Health Care

The Jefferson Center has conducted two Citizens Jury projects on health care. The first Citizens Jury conducted, as a test in 1974, was one in which a group of randomly selected citizens built their own health care system. It showed the capabilities of a randomly selected group of people, but was not sophisticated enough to produce something of value to the public discussion of health care at the time. In 1993, we conducted a Citizens Jury on the Clinton health care plan. Again, it showed the abilities of randomly selected citizens to deal with the topic, but also showed how complex the issue is and how several Citizens Juries are likely to be needed to do justice to the topic.

In 2003 I wrote an 8-page paper on why CJs are so important in dealing with health care, but also why research is needed to learn how several CJs can be run serially in order to deal with the topic properly. Here are the first three paragraphs of that paper:

The health care issue is a paradigm case where the public can't have its cake and eat it too. The marvels of modern medicine have presented us with a set of dilemmas which societies of the past never had to confront. The problem is easy to state: how can we achieve universal health care coverage while keeping prices down and avoiding rationing? The answer is simple: we cannot. If we want to keep costs down, we must either ration the services given out or we must avoid guaranteeing health care to all citizens. The lack of universal coverage is really just a form of rationing, but one which harms the poor at the benefit of the rich. If we insist on universal coverage, then we must either be content to see health care costs rise to a very high level, or we must ration.

In our current political climate, it is very difficult for a politician to be straight with the public about this. Health care rationing is such an unpopular concept that virtually no politician dares to propose it. This means that we have to be satisfied either with no universal coverage or else we must pay a lot. Americans are very reluctant to see taxes rise, meaning that universal health coverage by the government will be very difficult to enact. This leaves us with our current approach, payment through a system of private insurance companies. But this is not popular either, with the public complaining about the HMOs and the insurance companies as they take steps to keep costs down.

All of this plays beautifully into the current game of politics. The Democrats can blame the Republicans for their hard-heartedness in opposing universal coverage. The Republicans can blame the Democrats for being those tax-and-spend liberals who want to adopt socialized medicine. This helps each party to play to its core constituencies and raise the funds needed for election. The public, accustomed to a political system which seems unable to make progress on key issues, willingly joins in on this blaming without realizing that there is a core dilemma which cannot be solved unless the citizenry as a whole is brought into the discussion in a meaningful way.

I still believe that Citizens Juries can play an essential role in creating a sound health care system that is both workable and that has strong public support. But with the recent adoption of the Affordable Care Act, now is not the time to undertake this.

National Security

This topic is discussed in Chapter 7 of *Healthy Democracy*. Some readers have commented that this is the best chapter in the book. In spite of the fact that the only Citizens Jury conducted on foreign and military policy was in 1981, I still believe that this is a very important issue to be dealt with by an Informed Policy Dialogue. Here are the first three paragraphs of that chapter:

Clemenceau said that war is much too serious a matter to be entrusted to the military. To this it must added that war is too important to be left to an uninformed public and an unreflective political leadership.

Few areas of public policy are as arcane as the foreign and military policy matters that lie at the heart of our national security. How many Americans have ever bothered to wonder what is in the SIOP, the Single Integrated Operating Plan, which details how we would use our nuclear weapons were a major attack made on the United States? This plan has existed for decades, yet is virtually unknown. Few things have been as vital for our safety and few as difficult to learn about and understand.

On the other hand, public emotions play an essential role in the conduct of our foreign and military policy, and these emotions are often fickle. Most Americans pay little attention to the details of foreign policy, but they can be roused to care deeply about the big picture of what is going on. This creates a dangerous situation. Historians are fond of pointing out how leaders who are in trouble domestically will raise the specter of foreign threats to take the public's mind off of internal problems. Conversely, a public too eager for peace and averse to placing its own young men and women at risk can persuade leaders not to take military actions that in retrospect seem warranted. It seems clear now that the French should have taken action against Hitler in 1936 when German troops reoccupied the Rhineland.

How Should We Live Together?

Perhaps the most important Citizens Juries that can be run are ones on the topic of how we should live together. If set up properly, it can allow the citizens of a state, nation, or even the world to discuss their future and how steps can be taken to create a society that respects its members and moves towards the common good.

The Citizens Jury process was invented in the process of my writing a social ethics for my Ph.D. thesis. Thus, reflections on moral philosophy have been important to the creation of CJs. In 1991 I presented a paper at the University of Texas, Austin which posited that the key question of moral philosophy was not Socrates question, "How should I live?", but rather the question of social ethics, "How should we live together?"

It is likely that the effort to implement the Informed Policy Dialogue will take precedence over CJs on how we should live together, but ultimately it will be very important to conduct these.

Other Approaches

Other deliberative methods are discussed in Appendix B of *Healthy Democracy*. In the process of writing a detailed paper on the Informed Policy Dialogue, it will be important to review these, along with other methods that have been introduced since 2003. Here is a list of the methods discussed in Appendix B, along with the newer methods that deserve to be examined carefully.

Discussed in Appendix B

Televote
 Deliberative Poll
 Consensus Conference
 Future Search Conference
 21st Century Town Meeting
 Study Circles

New Methods to be Examined

Citizens' Assembly
 Citizens Cabinet
 Wisdom Council
 Participatory Budgeting

A New American Democracy

In 1980 I wrote *Towards a New Democracy*. It was a book of almost 400 pages, but I could not find a publisher for it. Robert Dahl, the Yale political scientist, commented that it was interesting, but had too many details and not a clear enough overarching message. The book made a case for the creation of a whole new form of democracy, with the last part presenting an example of what that might look like. The main point of the book was that American democracy still rests on an 18th century structure as we try to solve 21st century problems. No modern corporation could possibly survive with an 18th century business model. Why should we expect democracy to do so?

In 2007 I wrote a paper entitled "A New American Democracy" and published it in the *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 3: Issue 1, Article 1, under the pseudonym, Mark Twain IV. I chose a journal read only by scholars and used a pseudonym because I did not want anyone in Oregon to learn that the creator of the Citizens Initiative Review and primary donor to Healthy Democracy Oregon held radical ideas about the need to reinvent our democratic structures.

The paper presents the basic case: We Americans are immensely wealthy and have all the resources needed to create interesting new forms of democracy. The only thing lacking is the political will and foresight to do this. What I see now is that the creation of democratic structures is dominated more by ideology than by reason and the desire to enhance the public good. Be that as it may, the creation of new democratic structures is one of the most important tasks facing political scientists. But that profession is so dominated by the need to survive in academia that it seldom takes on such large, long range tasks. It may be that funding for this will only happen when the public demands that this work be done and done in a way that brings the best professional talents to the task of serving the public. The other option is to wait for reforms that are poorly designed, poorly tested and dominated by some ideology.

Essays

The foundations of my work are found in a set of essays that I started to write in 1965. This was at a time in my career when I had finished what was essentially a master's thesis on the validity of psychological tests and was trying to correspond the empiricism of the social sciences with the later philosophy of L. Wittgenstein. This may all seem very unrelated to my current work, but it was Wittgenstein's belief in the importance of ordinary language that led me to want to pay serious attention to the way ordinary people talk about politics, but doing this in a way that honors an empiricist approach, rather than concentrating on the traditions of most political philosophy.

I am ambivalent about the essays. Without them, I never would have created the Citizens Jury process, no less seen a way to turn these into a political reality. But how much time have I wasted on these? I often forget what I wrote a few years ago and wonder whether, with more discipline, I could have written half as many essays and published ideas that would have contributed more effectively to the growing field of deliberative democracy.

- Why would anyone be interested in looking at them? Here are some specifics:
- Those interested in the Informed Policy Dialogue, the use of the Citizens Jury process which is my focus now, can find the background to this starting with Essay #2818. About half the essays from that to #2844 are on a big win for democracy and how to create that through the Informed Policy Dialogue.
 - One of the most complex aspects of the Citizens Jury process is how to set an agenda for a specific project. I have dealt with this in hundreds of essays starting in the middle 1980s. In 2012 Larry Pennings and I tried to write a definitive paper on agenda setting, but the rush to conduct four Citizens Juries in 2012 prevented us from completing this. Anyone interested in my views about agenda setting would have to cull through these essays and search out the various summaries that I wrote based upon them. Some of the best summaries I managed to write were for a seminar that I taught with Prof. John Sullivan at the University of Minnesota in 2008.
 - A very interesting philosophical problem that I have wrestled with over the years is how to know when enough time has been spent on an issue to make a sound judgment. This has been of special interest to me starting in 2009. I would guess that I wrote perhaps 50 essays dealing with that in the five years to the present. It is at the heart of the use of "technical advisors" in the Informed Policy Dialogue and is what has led to my interest in holding a series of Citizens Jury projects on a policy issue. I still believe that the typical five-day Citizens Jury is sufficient for the Citizens Initiative Review, but believe that when creating a public policy stand that will be supported by the voting public, a series of projects will be needed. But how much is needed is a difficult philosophical question. In a recent essay, I conclude that how much is needed is a matter of risk management.
 - The Citizens Jury process was invented in Essay #429, written in 1971.
 - There is much, much more in the essays, of what value I am unsure. I have averaged about 60 essays a year. As of 1-11-14, the current essay is #2850.