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## Throat-clearing

- Fundamental finding of unidimensional spatial model
- Pure majority rule: the median prevails
- More generally: the pivot prevails
- Fundamental finding of multidimensional spatial model
- The center doesn't hold
- Preferences can't induce equilibria
$-\therefore$ institutions (or something else) must enter to provide stability


## Basic set-up: Ideal points



Gov't intervention in economy

## Basic set-up: Utility curves

$$
U_{\text {Obama }}=\alpha-\beta\left(x_{\text {Obama }}-x\right)^{2}-\gamma\left(y_{\text {Obama }}-y\right)^{2} \pm \delta\left(x_{\text {Obama }}-x\right)\left(y_{\text {Obama }}-y\right)
$$



## Basic set-up: Indifference curves



Gov't intervention in economy

## Basic set-up: Indifference curves



Gov't intervention in economy

## Basic set-up: Indifference curves



Gov't intervention in economy

## Why this makes a difference: Voter ID (the Wall?)



## The Simple Euclidean System: The Equation

$$
\begin{gathered}
U_{i}=\alpha-\left(x_{i}-x\right)^{2}-\left(y_{i}-y\right)^{2} \\
U_{i}=-\left(x_{i}-x\right)^{2}-\left(y_{i}-y\right)^{2}
\end{gathered}
$$

## The Simple Euclidean System: The Picture



## The Simple Euclidean System: Preference relations



## The Simple Euclidean System



## The Win Set, $\mathrm{W}(\varphi)$



## The Contract Curve



## The Pareto Set



## You are always off a contract curve

## McKelvey Chaos Theorem

- With multiple attributes and multiple decisionmakers
- There is no equilibrium of tastes
- Anything can happen
- I.e., the median voter result doesn't hold
- This is really important


## What Might Induce Stability?

- Tastes
- Uncertainty
- Impatience
- Rules


## Tastes may induce stability

- Ideology
- "Median in all directions"



## Tastes may induce stability

(Make s.q. the "median's" ideal point, then draw the indifference curves)


## (Rotate this graph)




## The result is knife-edged



## Uncertainty may induce stability



Abortion Availability

## Rules may induce stability

- Floor rules, e.g.
- vote on status quo last
- Not stability so much as guarding against "anything can happen"
- Germaneness rules
- Committees


## Status quo last



## Germaneness



## Germaneness

Butter


Guns

## Germaneness



## Stability-inducing powers of leaders and committees

- Committees reduce dimensionality
- Committees and leaders have agendasetting powers


## Examples of Multidimensionality in Action

- Informal decisionmaking
- Riker's "heresthetics"
- Heresthetics: the strategic introduction of "extraneous" issues
- Classic example: Popular election of Senators
- Human trafficking


## Simple human trafficking bill



## Abortion gets introduced

Abortion

- ${ }^{\phi}$
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 



Human trafficking

## Unresolved Issues

- Salience
- Sophistication




## Abortion made salient



Salience can distort the win set


## Salience can distort the win set



Guns


Guns

## Sophisticated Voting

- The strategy of preferring one alternative at time $t$ even through the immediate alternative is better, in order to prevent an even worse outcome in the future


## Sophisticated Voting Example

| Democrats | Hawkish R | Dovish R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't <br> negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists |
| Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't <br> negotiate |
| Don't <br> negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone |

## Agenda

- Add "proviso" to negotiation strategy
- If the proviso passes, pair the negotiation strategy proviso against the status quo (continue no negotiation)
- If the proviso fails, pair the negotiation strategy against the status quo


Neg., not Q with terr.

## Agenda

| Democrats | Hawkish R | Dovish R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists |
| Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't negotiate |
| Don't negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone |

The proviso passes
The amended negotiation fails, even though a majority would have

Neg., not Q with terr. favored the original strategy over
 the status quo

## Outcome

- The proviso passes
- The amended treaty fails, even though a majority would have favored the original treaty over the status quo
- How to save ourselves? Sophistication
- Backward induction


## Agenda

| Democrats | Hawkish R | Dovish R |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists |
| Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone | Don't negotiate |
| Don't negotiate | Negotiate, but <br> not with <br> terrorists | Negotiate with <br> anyone |

Neg., not
with terr.
(D+DR)

$\begin{array}{ccc}Q & Q & \text { Neg. with }\end{array}$
(HR) $(\mathrm{HR}+\mathrm{DR})$
anyone
(D)
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