

**“And the key for us -- when I say us, I mean Americans, but I think particularly for progressives, is to say, your concerns are real, your anxieties are real. ... Offering prescriptions that are actually going to help folks in communities that feel forgotten. That's going to be our most important strategy.”**

**President Barak Obama**

**(First press conference following**

**November 2016 election)**

**\*\*\*\*\***

## **HOW DEMOCRATS CAN WIN BACK THE VOTES OF AMERICA’S WORKERS AND STOP LOSING ELECTIONS OVER THE ABORTION ISSUE**

The 2016 election has created an historic opportunity for the Democratic Party to realign the American political scene. To do this, the party must win back the votes of America’s workers and stop losing elections over the abortion issue. The voter base of the Republican Party is surprisingly vulnerable. By winning back the votes of working Americans and being proactive on the abortion issue, Democrats can create an historic realignment for decades to come.

This paper presents strategies for winning workers’ votes that are based on recommendations from a December 2016 report from President Obama’s top advisers. These strategies are, in short, to assure that workers have a voice where they work and that workers have a right to a remunerative place in our economy, no matter what changes technology brings. It also presents strategies for winning elections on the abortion issue by promoting the recommendations of a committee of the national Institute of Medicine.

There are several reasons for the Electoral College loss in 2016, but none is more evident than the failure of white American workers, of both genders, to support the party that they once viewed as its friend and advocate. Mr. Trump’s margin was especially strong in communities where industrial workers have lost the most jobs – places like Ohio, Pennsylvania and Michigan. Without the support of working Americans of all origins, the party will never build a solid base to pursue environmental and workplace justice and better opportunities for all Americans. Fortunately, there are ample opportunities to create an historic realignment.

Republicans have been able to persuade workers that their party is more concerned about creating jobs. Much of their party's domestic platform has been framed in terms of jobs for workers. Why should financial institutions be deregulated? – Jobs. Why should immigration be restricted? – Jobs. Why should we step back from a commitment to free trade? – Jobs. Why should government bureaucracy be slashed? – Jobs (“government does not create jobs”). Why should environmental protections be repealed and climate change science be denied? – Jobs. For most of their lives, for at least four decades, America's workers have been hearing Republicans talk more about creating jobs for working Americans.

In 2016, the candidate that most forcefully promised to protect Americans' jobs is the candidate that prevailed in the Electoral College. That candidate was not a Democrat. Jobs for American Workers is an issue that Democrats should and can be winning!

The loss of good jobs, especially in America's factories, has been hard on workers of all backgrounds who lack a college education. But white workers in particular have not effectively coped with the changes in their workplaces. The pain and frustration that white workers revealed in the 2016 election is real. Two award winning researchers at Princeton University have documented that the death rates of middle aged white Americans, of both genders, with less than a college education have been worsening each year since 1998. Advances in preventing deaths from diseases like cancer and heart disease have been offset by what have been called the ‘diseases of despair’ – alcoholism, drug abuse, and suicide. Anne Case and Angus Deaton sadly concluded that their research helps to document “the collapse of the white, high school educated, working class after its heyday in the early 1970s, and the pathologies that accompany that decline” (Brookings Papers, 2017). Losses of factory jobs have affected all workers, but other groups have coped better than middle aged white Americans have. Mortality rates have continued to improve among black and Hispanic American workers in this century (and they have also improved for workers in other advanced countries).

Many working Americans began to leave the party during the turbulent decades of the 1960s and 70s. Those were the decades of the Vietnam War, long-overdue civil rights laws, and the Roe v. Wade decision on abortion. In spite of the 2016 election, ample evidence points to positive changes in racial attitudes, especially among the nation's youngest voters who voted heavily Democratic. The Vietnam War is long over and Americans of all persuasions now honor our veterans. But the 1973 Roe v. Wade decision has remained, for over four decades, a polarizing litmus test for many voters. Democrats have been losing elections over the abortion issue for the past four decades, including 2016.

There is no more divisive issue in American politics. The abortion issue causes large numbers of working Americans to vote for candidates who are opposed to the interests of workers. Some 46% of Americans are either evangelical protestant or Catholic, groups that strongly emphasize the ‘potentiality of human life’ [a term respectfully used by Justice Harry Blackmun, a Republican who wrote the Roe v. Wade decision]. *Any strategies to regain the*

*support of American workers must include a strategy to lessen the divisive effects of the abortion issue.* It is easy to assume that there can only be polarization on this issue – the ‘right to life’ or the ‘right to choose’. But that assumption is wrong. There is a third way that can help unite Americans on this issue.

American workers are justifiably worried about their futures. The wage gap is real and growing. Over 19 million Americans used to work in manufacturing; barely 12 million do today and that number is still fast decreasing. Technology is changing our society fundamentally in ways that neither party has grasped. New technology has definitely improved productivity in America but it is doing that in ways that are making life harder and less secure for millions of American workers. New technology always brings both opportunities and threats. There is nothing new about that. But when the prophet Isaiah admonished his people to turn their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks, there was no doubt that there would be plenty of jobs for farmers to do the plowing and pruning. That is no longer true. Increasingly, electronic technology is replacing workers’ jobs with no adequate employment opportunities in sight. In 2016 in Indiana, a key swing state, workers who were forced to move from manufacturing jobs into lower paying service jobs lost about \$20,000 a year in income (NY Times report).

For several decades, new technology – especially miniaturized computing, the Internet, and containerized shipping – has enabled globalization to occur on a scale previously unimagined. Containerized shipping sharply reduced the costs of moving goods, but it also displaced large numbers of workers and created prolonged unemployment in port cities like New Orleans. Standalone desktop computing quickly increased worker productivity, but it also reduced the need for clerical workers in offices. In the 1990s, the Internet began to boost productivity by enabling people to access, create, and exchange information in previously unimagined ways. But it has also facilitated widespread outsourcing of well-paying manufacturing jobs from our country. It has been an article of faith, among many scholars and policy makers, that entrepreneurs will always create enough new jobs when workers are displaced. We can no longer afford to have blind faith in that belief.

Artificial intelligence – electronic technology that enables machines to make decisions that formerly only humans could make – is advancing with increasing speed. It will soon advance to the point that machines could replace many office workers and most vehicle operators. Scarcely a week passes without some news story describing how companies like Google, Intel, Tesla, Daimler, and even Ford are working to build self-driving cars and trucks. When it started its ridesharing business, Uber promised widespread job opportunities for people across America. It is now evident that the company’s business model is to replace every driver with an automated self-driving car.

In December 2016, the President’s top economic and technology advisers reported that between 2.2 and 3.1 million existing jobs may be threatened by automated vehicle technology.

Long distance truck drivers are the last large group of industrial workers who can earn middle class incomes without college educations. If technology is allowed to continue to replace workers with no questions asked about the effects on Americans' ability to earn a living, then vehicle operator jobs are likely to disappear. Good companies that want to provide jobs for drivers will find themselves unable to compete with completely automated fleets of operator-less vehicles. America's workers know these things and they are justifiably worried about their futures.

Office work has been less susceptible to job losses caused by new technology, but that is changing as well. Many office workers do jobs that are highly repetitive. They use data to make routine decisions. For example, workers in insurance companies who categorize claims holders and workers in government offices who decide whether applicants for assistance are eligible for benefits are workers who make a living by making routine decisions. Artificial intelligence technology increasingly threatens these jobs. It is a fact, not alarmist rhetoric, that artificial intelligence has the potential to create mass unemployment if policy makers do not steer new technology in directions that will help workers, not replace them.

New technologies have enabled the outsourcing of American manufacturing jobs across the globe. When smart machines become less expensive than even low paid foreign workers, a lot of manufacturing will return back to America, but that return will generate far fewer jobs. Data from the Bureau of Labor statistics show that jobs in manufacturing computing equipment are rapidly declining in America. Much of that decline is due to automation. In December 2016, a report from President Obama's top economics and technology advisers concluded that over 80% of jobs paying less than \$20/hour and nearly a third of all jobs paying between \$20 and \$40 per hour are susceptible to elimination due to automation.

The Democratic Party has been right in promoting better education for all Americans and in wanting to re-train workers for more sophisticated jobs. But it is no longer wise to assume that a high-tech economy will create enough new job opportunities. Professional jobs are increasingly threatened as well. Even accountants' jobs are becoming threatened by software that analyzes financial transactions and does tax preparation. Artificial intelligence is enabling fewer people to do the designing and engineering that an advanced economy needs. Too little is being done to protect the jobs of American workers and they know it.

**American workers are not stupid; they are among the best educated in the world. In 2016, they voted in large numbers for the candidate they thought would best protect their jobs in rapidly changing times -- that candidate was not a Democrat.** The media focused on the smoke and mirrors of character issues, but clearly the election was not decided on the basis of personal character. It was an election that pivoted around an old fashioned issue – jobs. Immigration and trade are jobs issues. De-regulation is sold as a jobs issue. Even global climate change and environmental protection have become jobs issues. Each is about the loss of

American jobs. The candidate that most forcefully promised to protect Americans' jobs is the candidate that prevailed in a majority of states and in the Electoral College.

Neither candidate was far sighted enough to take on Americans' justifiable worries about losing jobs to technology. What is the future of American workers if artificial intelligence replaces large numbers of their jobs without creating enough new employment opportunities? Some people who worry about this, from both ends of the political spectrum, are advocating that everyone should receive a guaranteed basic income. That is not a viable strategy for America today and likely will not be for a very long time. In 2016 in Switzerland, a referendum was held on whether that nation should adopt a guaranteed minimum income policy; it was soundly defeated by a 3 to 1 margin. The Swiss did not want to see a break in the link between incomes and jobs. They saw that technology displacement -- coupled by a guaranteed incomes policy -- could create a dependency society. It would be a society in which large numbers of people who have been displaced by technology would be dependent on handouts from government. The Democratic Party already suffers from a widespread perception that it is a party of entitlement handouts.

In 1942, science fiction writer Isaac Asimov wrote that the first law of robotics should be that smart machines should do no harm to humans. Science fiction is now becoming reality as new technology threatens to replace workers without creating sufficient new job opportunities. American workers know this, even if policy makers do not. A job is not merely a source of income; it is a source of dignity and self-worth. Jobs hold families together.

Jobs for Americans has been a core issue for Democrats for generations. In an address to Congress at the height of World War II, President Franklin Roosevelt proposed an Economic Bill of Rights. It asserted the vital importance of free enterprise, the right to a 'useful and remunerative job,' and the "right to adequate medical care." Democrats under Harry Truman led the way in enacting the Employment Act of 1946 which promised to "promote maximum employment." The Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, signed by Jimmy Carter, was spearheaded by Hubert Humphrey and Representative Gus Hawkins who was one of the founders of the Congressional Black Caucus.

**In December 2016, the White House report on "Artificial Intelligence, Automation, and the Economy" said that, instead of a guaranteed minimum income policy, "our goal should be first ... to make sure people can get into jobs."** The new technology creates vast opportunities to make our lives better without doing harm. It creates opportunities to make workers' jobs better without replacing them. **The future of the Democratic Party will likely depend on how well it can rediscover its historic role as the champion of American workers in a world increasingly being shaped by new technology.**

In short, all of humanity is now facing two crises of unprecedented magnitude. One of these is the rapidly advancing capability of 'smart' machines to take over the jobs of workers.

The world is now becoming one in which too many workers across the globe, American workers very much included, could be made redundant – unnecessary to their economies. The other crisis is global climate change about which there is really no scientific controversy. Fifteen of the sixteen warmest years on record have occurred since the year 2000. Technology, or rather how we choose to use it, is behind both crises. These crises challenge us to think about the long range future -- to find ways to sustain high employment for ourselves and our children and to protect our planet for generations to come. Fortunately each crisis presents opportunities for good jobs. Instead of allowing technology to outsource or replace jobs with no end in sight, the same technology can be used to improve the quality of jobs rather than replace them. Shifting our nation's economy to clean and sustainable energy can only happen if tens of thousands of high-tech jobs are created to accomplish that goal.

Each of these crises is pointing in one direction – sustainability. We need to promote **sustainable ecosystems and sustainable jobs**. Loss of ecosystems and sea rise will cause profound economic harm, including job losses and widespread coastal property damage, as well as convey a depleted, uglier planet to future generations. Permanent and widespread losses of jobs to outsourcing and automation could cause severe social problems. One of America's greatest sociologists, the late Philip Selznick, said that the likelihood of crime increases when a society fails to instill “character and conscience” in its young people and when it fails to create enough good opportunities for young people to participate in the economy and in their communities. Jobs are essential in preventing social unrest and crime -- so is character and conscience and personal responsibility.

### **ASSURING AN AMPLE SUPPLY OF JOBS**

New technology does not treat everyone equally. It creates winners and losers. The growing income gap is evidence of that. American workers who used to work in manufacturing jobs have born the greatest burden of automation and its technological cousin, globalization. In September 2016, the Pew Research Center reported that nearly four in ten voters believed the economy was the most important issue even though overall unemployment was low. The issue was not unemployment. The issue was the loss of good jobs for working Americans. Voters who felt their family's financial situation was worse than before voted strongly for Mr. Trump. Some two thirds of white voters without college degrees, voters who once voted solidly for Democrats voted for the Republican candidate. In doing so they went against the recommendations of labor leaders who again supported the Democrats.

Organized labor has been enfeebled by technology induced change. When federal legislation recognized the right of workers to organize back in the 1930s, unions began to successfully bargain with companies. They could bargain effectively because America's economy largely existed within our own borders. But globalization has made it possible for

companies to locate manufacturing outside our borders. Now, companies that previously had to bargain with their workers can move the work to other countries. In the 1950s, about a third of America's workers belonged to unions; now less than 7 percent in the private sector do.

Growing inequities in incomes and wealth threaten the viability of any democracy. The right to organize and bargain once narrowed the gaps between workers' wages and executive's salaries. Greatly increased CEO salaries, relative to workers' earnings, are a visible indicator of the shrinkage of workers' influence in the places they work. **The Democratic Party has offered little to workers to offset their lost influence in the workplace. America's workers know this. That is why, in 2016, some two thirds of white voters without college degrees, Americans who once voted solidly for Democrats, voted for the Republican candidate.**

The party's primary remedy for job losses has been to promote training for new jobs. That is still important. But there is no longer assurance that there will be enough good jobs – even for people who are well trained. America's universities are already producing more science and engineering graduates annually than there are new jobs for scientists and engineers. For several decades following World War II, increases in new jobs kept pace with increases in productivity. That changed at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In the new millennium the US economy has experienced steady growth in productivity, but job creation has consistently lagged behind. The result has been a so called 'jobless recovery.' Technology continues to increase productivity but it is not creating enough new jobs comparable to those lost by many workers. Lower paying service jobs with minimal benefits do not enable workers who have been displaced by technology to stay in the middle class. America's workers also know this very well.

What is now needed is a more balanced approach to making our economy work. We do have a national policy toward technology. Our national policy is to allow the owners of new technology to eliminate American workers' jobs, as rapidly as possible, with no questions asked. Policy makers have forgotten some of the roots of economic theory.

What is economics about? – – The most important philosopher you have probably never heard of was named Francis Hutcheson. Hutcheson was the teacher of a fellow named Adam Smith. Hutcheson inspired Thomas Jefferson's writing of the Declaration of Independence by listing the reasons that justify declaring independence from a colonial master. Frances Hutcheson and Adam Smith, two of the earliest founders of the field of economics, both cautioned against too much concentration of wealth in too few hands and they both supported progressive taxation. Hutcheson said that an economy should produce "the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers." Productivity will always be important. But producing enough jobs to enable all workers to participate in the economy is arguably far more important – and in the long run enabling all workers to work will give us a more efficient economy.

In the long run a more progressive tax structure will be needed, but that promise alone was not persuasive in 2016. Workers voted in favor of a candidate who promised to cut, not increase, the taxes of the richest one percenters. That candidate promised to protect workers' jobs from illegal immigration and globalization. Those voters sent a very clear signal – jobs matter! **Technology and globalization will likely threaten to replace workers' jobs for generations to come. The party that is first perceived to be the champion of American workers on this issue is likely to have an electoral advantage for a very long time to come.**

#### • A VOICE FOR WORKERS AT THE TABLE

When Democrats passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, they stood up for workers' right to be heard. **Now, America's workers are among the least empowered and most silenced in the developed world. For too many decades, Democrats have mostly been silent while America's workers have been silenced.** It almost seems that Democrats have forgotten how to stand up for American workers.

One way to help workers is to assure their right to be heard on issues about workplace governance. Workers have a right to be heard, whether they are unionized or not. The opportunity now exists to advocate this right as a matter of national policy. Workers have important information and perspectives that can benefit the companies for which they work. Decisions that are made without worker input – especially decisions about improving productivity, outsourcing, or replacing jobs with machines – are decisions that are not fully informed.

Assuring that workers have a voice in corporate decisions might seem a radical idea in our country. But countries that are some of our biggest competitors and trading partners have been giving voice to workers for decades. In Japan, for example, many members of companies' boards of directors are also employees. Germany has long had a system called co-determination, established by law, that establishes the right of workers to choose representatives to participate in corporate governance. Many of the countries of Western Europe have enacted legislation that requires worker representation on corporate boards. The legislation varies widely about the size of the companies that are required to have employee representatives. The number of employees that are needed in companies to trigger a requirement for worker representation varies from 5000 in France to only 25 in Sweden. The right to have a voice in corporate governance is not generally limited to workers who belong to unions; it is a right of all workers. In these countries worker representatives typically participate in all corporate decisions, with the exception of decisions about collective bargaining strategies.

The impacts of worker representation have been studied in the countries that have it. One of the benefits of worker representation is that workers are especially concerned with the long range survival and success of their companies. For several decades, changes have occurred in the

ownership structures of American companies that encourage companies to take a short range point of view, one that maximizes short term profits and tends to ignore long range success. We especially do not need the kinds of short term profits that come from stripping companies of their assets. Our economy needs the voices of American workers at the table to encourage long range thinking. Long range thinking stimulates investment strategies for the future – investments in both infrastructure and in human capital, the training and skills of workers. Research has shown that well designed representation of workers in companies’ governance can increase both their efficiency and their market value. This seems to be especially true in industries that require intense coordination. In addition, giving workers a place at the table better informs workers about ways in which they can help improve their companies’ competitiveness.

The growing inequity in the distribution of income is one of the gravest problems for the future of our nation. Worker representation could be an important step toward reducing the gap in compensation between workers and top management. The December 2016, White House report on technology’s effects on workers said that, “Policymakers should explore ways to empower worker voice in the workplace through strengthening protections for organizing and creating new and innovative ways for workers to make their voices heard.” In Great Britain in 2016, Prime Minister Theresa May announced her support for legislation to require worker representation in the governance of corporations. Her reason was that, “There is an irrational, unhealthy and growing gap between what these companies pay their workers and what they pay their bosses.” Prime Minister May is the leader of that country’s Conservative Party and income inequities are not as great there as in America. Assuring that America’s workers have a right to be heard in decisions that affect the futures of their companies is an idea that is long overdue. Advocating clearly and consistently for the right of workers to be heard is a reasonable strategy for the Democratic Party to begin to re-establish itself as the party of choice for America’s workers. But the pace of technology induced change is far too rapid for this strategy to be sufficient by itself.

#### • A 20 YEAR MORATORIUM ON REPLACING VEHICLE OPERATORS’ JOBS

Two things about new technology are clear. First, new technology can be very helpful. It can be used in many ways to help people and even to save lives. Our nation’s economy depends on our being a world leader in technology innovation. Second, new technology is rapidly becoming a threat to the jobs of a great many workers. America must never have a large surplus of workers who have been replaced by technology with no place to go. Our national debt is already a major challenge. We cannot afford to bear the financial and social costs of widespread unemployment caused by technology.

The last large category of industrial type jobs that American men (and many women) fill is driving trucks and other vehicles. Driving vehicles is often the best job option for workers in key swing states throughout the Midwest and South. Driving vehicles is an occupation that has largely been immune from both globalization and automation. There is much that can be outsourced today – factory jobs, call centers, and even engineering design centers – but moving things within our borders cannot be outsourced. Workers in India or China cannot move goods from Georgia to Idaho or from Maine to California. Until recently, machines could not drive vehicles. Now, self-driving vehicles do exist and the technology is rapidly advancing. It is being funded by corporations such as Google, Tesla, Nissan, Mercedes-Benz, Intel, and Ford. When Uber started, it proudly stated that it intended to provide income earning opportunities to thousands of Americans. It now states frankly that its business model is to replace every one of its drivers with a machine. Many observers say this will be possible within a decade.

We are now at an historic turning point. Technology is rapidly being developed to replace vehicle operators who are clinging to the last vestige of large scale industrial employment. In December 2016, the report on automation from President Obama’s top advisers estimated that between 2.2 and 3.1 million existing jobs could be replaced by automated vehicle technology. There are no apparent new jobs in sight for so many workers to move to. Our national policy on replacing workers with machines gives them little hope. Our nation’s current policy – to go full speed ahead on replacing workers with machines – is based on a misguided understanding of what “economic efficiency” means.

**The Democratic Party needs to show America’s workers that it is on their side in this critical point in history when technology is becoming increasingly capable of replacing workers.** A good start is to understand the difference between production efficiency, in which the goal for a company is to produce something as inexpensively as possible, and economic efficiency – which is about the overall efficiency of an entire economy. If companies replace workers with machines to operate vehicles they might be able to reduce their prices -- but not by very much. Most companies spend well under 5% of their total sales value on domestic transportation. But laying off millions of workers, with no apparent alternative employment in sight, will greatly increase other costs to our society. Taxes would inevitably have to be increased substantially to provide even a fraction of their former incomes to unemployed workers. If our economy fails to produce enough opportunities to work at jobs that produce adequate incomes, increases in crime are likely. Money spent to apprehend, adjudicate, and warehouse people in jails is utter waste -- the biggest form of economic inefficiency. States like Florida are already spending more on corrections than on higher education. **In the long run, keeping people gainfully employed is much more efficient than creating a society of unemployment and dependency.**

Opportunity, not dependency, is what the American dream is about. We now need to rethink what the purpose of our economy is all about. What policies will yield “the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers?” Such a question cannot be answered overnight and will

require careful deliberation. Widespread unemployment, caused by technology such as self-driving vehicles in the transportation industry, is now foreseeable but not inevitable. The December 2016 report from the White House emphasized that, “Technology is not destiny.” Whether widespread unemployment occurs or not will be a matter of national policy. Our nation’s current policy -- letting technology rapidly replace workers without weighing the consequences -- no longer seems prudent, nor economically efficient, on a national scale. A more cautious policy would slow the rate of replacement. An obvious place to start is to encourage technological innovation to improve the safety and quality of life for vehicle operators rather than replace them with machines. A moratorium on replacing vehicle operators with machines would be a sensible first step. A duration of twenty years could allow time to create sufficient new opportunities for America’s vehicle operators. If not, the moratorium could be extended. If a moratorium is not adopted, the many American employers who want to continue to provide good jobs to drivers will face increasing competitive pressures from companies that are the quickest to replace operators with machines.

Technological innovation needs to be redirected, not discouraged. Policies are needed to encourage wise use of smart technology to accomplish things like preventing accidents, preventing pollution, and reducing energy wasting traffic congestion by better spacing vehicles on highways. Deliberations are also needed about the effects of technology on other categories of jobs in which there are foreseeable prospects for widespread unemployment. More Americans work as retail sales persons and cashiers than in any other category of jobs. Any thoughtful person who has used a self-service checkout machine, or made an online purchase, has seen that many retail sales jobs are also vulnerable to automation.

A moratorium is a strategy to buy time to seek sensible economic efficiency in our economy. It makes sense to use technology for what it is best suited, enhancing the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers. It does not make sense to knowingly create severe social problems and unending dependency. We, as a nation, need to learn to use technology to make jobs better, not obsolete. In the 2016 presidential election, workers who voted in a majority of states made something very clear – they want to work and they feel they need some protections for their jobs. **The party that will be seen as having the best ideas for protecting America’s workers from being replaced by machines and by further outsourcing should have an advantage for many years to come. Assuring that workers have ample opportunities to work makes good economic sense and good political sense as well.**

#### • **JOBS FOR (NOT AGAINST) THE ENVIRONMENT**

The Democratic Party is clearly the leader in wanting to protect the ecosystems of our planet. This is one of the reasons that Secretary Clinton received a strong majority of votes cast by voters who were 29 and under. It is their generation that will have to bear the growing costs of climate change. But the party has not been effective in telling people how clean energy

technology can produce good jobs in America that are not vulnerable to outsourcing. Even if more coal is mined in the future, that industry is being increasingly mechanized with fewer people needed to produce coal. The party needs to more effectively tell voters how clean energy technology can generate new, well paying, jobs in every congressional district in the nation. The party badly needs to improve its messages at the state and local levels. It needs to be seen as having a strategy to generate jobs that are widespread across the nation.

Democrats need to stop being on the defensive when it comes to the environment. Talking about jobs is a way to take the offensive. Clean energy technologies can create good jobs everywhere, not just in a few states. The party has allowed itself to be placed on the defensive by opposition candidates who convey an incorrect and warped message – that voters must choose between jobs and the environment. Instead, **the party and its candidates need to take the offensive by convincing voters that the best path to good sustainable jobs – now and for generations to come -- is working for the environment, not against it.**

**WHEN DEMOCRATS CONVINCED VOTERS THAT THEY ARE WORKING HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT WORKERS HAVE A VOICE IN THEIR WORKPLACES AND THAT THERE WILL BE JOBS IN THE FUTURE FOR AMERICANS WHO WANT TO WORK, THEY WILL BE WELL ON THE WAY TO REALIGNING POLITICS IN AMERICA ... BUT THERE WILL STILL BE THE ABORTION ISSUE.**

#### **PREVENTION AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY:**

#### **A PROACTIVE APPROACH TO THE ABORTION ISSUE**

Polarization in American politics has increased steadily since the Supreme Court issued the Roe v. Wade decision in 1973. Politicians are pressured to choose sides – either support the ‘right to life’ or the ‘right to choose.’ Abortion is the most emotional issue in American politics. It has placed Democrats on the defensive for over forty years. In the 2016 election, the issue revolved around the ideologies of Supreme Court justices to be named by the next president. Democrats lost that issue. Exit polls indicated that voters who said they cared greatly about the Supreme Court favored Mr. Trump over Secretary Clinton by a large margin. The ‘right to life’ carried that vote over the ‘right to choose.’

Some 46% of Americans are either evangelical protestant or Catholic. About 60 percent of white Catholics and over 80 percent of white evangelical voters voted for Mr. Trump. These Americans’ concerns should not be dismissed by either party. Catholics and evangelical voters used to vote solidly for Democrats. Many supporters of ‘the right to life’ are from working families who would probably otherwise vote for candidates they feel best represent workers’ interests. That is unlikely to happen as long as this issue remains sharply polarized.

The platforms and rhetoric of both parties have worsened the polarization. Deeply personal issues are involved. Women's rights to privacy, to be free from government intrusion, and to have access to safe medical care conflict with concerns about the sanctity of life. Americans are justifiably concerned about all aspects of the abortion issue. The platform of the Democratic Party affirms the rights of women. The platform of the Republican Party asserts the sanctity of life. To the public, there seems to be no middle ground on this issue. That is a wrong assumption!

Fortunately there is a middle position about this issue. A third approach to the abortion issue was identified by a committee of the National Academies of Sciences in 1995. The Committee on Unintended Pregnancy of the National Institute of Medicine found that **outlawing abortions would not stop them**. The committee's scholars estimated that **one million abortions occurred annually in the U.S. before the Roe v. Wade decision in 1973**. The population of the United States was much smaller then, approximately 200 million. The number of abortions reported by the Communicable Disease Center for 2013 was 664 thousand and our population today is just over 325 million. In other words, **the abortion rate in our country was much higher when it was illegal than it is now**.

Outlawing abortions prior to 1973 did not stop abortions from happening any more than outlawing alcohol in 1920 stopped people from drinking. The reason that there are fewer abortions in our country today is that Americans are doing a better job of taking *personal responsibility* to prevent unintended conceptions. **The message that Democrats should be telling voters is that OUTLAWING ABORTIONS DOES NOT PREVENT ABORTIONS.**

Following extensive research, the Committee on Unintended Pregnancy came to a conclusion that has profound implications for both personal behavior and public policy. **The only sure way to prevent an abortion is to prevent an unintended conception**. This fact caused the committee to propose that the nation adopt **a new social norm: "No Unintended Conceptions."** A norm is a standard of behavior that is widely accepted as being the right thing to do. Striving hard to prevent unintended conceptions **is** the right thing to do. Every child born in America has the right to be a wanted child, to be loved and to be helped to become a good person and good citizen. **Working together to achieve the goal of no unintended conceptions is something that can help unite us in a common cause.**

Americans still have a long way to go. We have reduced the rate of unintended conceptions considerably in the last four decades, but we still have higher rates of unintended conceptions than occur in some other countries. An intermediate step would be to strive to reach those lower rates that already exist elsewhere. But we can do much better than that. **We have never mounted a truly major nation-wide campaign to encourage and help our people to prevent unintended conceptions.**

**Preventing unintended conceptions begins with emphasizing personal responsibility.**

Using a contraceptive is an act of personal responsibility. **By promoting the use of contraception, the Democratic Party is promoting personal responsibility.** Americans from all walks of life can do much to encourage the prevention of unintended conceptions. Persons in the arts and in advertising, and in every other occupation, can promote the idea that every child conceived in America should be a wanted child. All of us can reinforce that belief in our daily conversations. Americans who oppose the use of contraceptives can join with those who support contraception to promote personal responsibility in matters of conception. Better contraceptive technology could help but existing technology, if used wisely, is sufficient to prevent nearly all unintended conceptions. Wise use of the technology begins with a realization that any single contraceptive technology is fallible, but using two forms of contraception reduces the likelihood of contraceptive failure to nearly zero. This simple fact needs to be emphasized by parents, educators, and even Hollywood screen writers and performing artists.

Ultimately success in preventing unintended conceptions depends on emphasizing personal responsibility. It is important that our children be taught academic skills, but that alone is never enough. Our founders like Benjamin Franklin and George Washington knew that the future of our republic would depend on how well we raise and educate our children to have a sense of personal responsibility. Today, in order to defuse an issue that has sharply divided us for four decades, we Americans need to come together to share ideas on how to best promote personal responsibility. Government cannot make “no unintended conceptions” a reality – especially not by outlawing abortions. Achieving the goal of no unintended conceptions will require Americans to come together and do what each of us can in our own ways to make America a nation of wanted children, each from a wanted conception.

**The Democratic Party will also become less likely to lose votes over the abortion issue if its candidates do a better job of explaining what the Roe v. Wade decision actually says.** Many voters seem to believe accusations that Democrats support abortion on demand at any time during a pregnancy. That is not at all what Justice Harry Blackmun, a Republican, wrote in 1973. He wrote that a woman’s right to privacy and to be free from government intrusion prevails in the first trimester. He then wrote that concerns about the sanctity of life are legitimate and that states may limit “the abortion procedure in ways that are reasonably related to maternal health” in the second trimester and, in the third trimester, states may “regulate, and even proscribe, abortion except where necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.” Supporting Roe v. Wade does not mean support for abortion on demand at any time, far from it. Supporting Roe v. Wade means supporting appropriate limitations in the second, and especially third, trimesters. The time is long overdue for the Democratic Party to stop being on the defensive. Voters need to better understand what supporting Roe v. Wade really means. **Most importantly, voters need to see that the Democratic Party strongly supports the prevention of abortion in the only way that works – preventing unintended conceptions.**

## **CONCLUSION: Promote Personal and Civic Responsibility**

The Democratic Party has been viewed by too many as a party of entitlement, not as one that promotes civic duty and personal responsibility. Many American workers have come to view the party as a promoter of ‘giveaways’ that will take from, not help, working people. The party has been complicit in allowing this view to take root by promoting entitlements without supporting accompanying responsibilities.

In the 2016 election, for example, the party supported initiatives for free college tuition without emphasizing what students ought to give back to their communities in return for the financial help. The free college tuition initiative was a missed opportunity to promote the expansion of programs like AmeriCorps, programs that enable Americans to work doing things to make their communities better places to live. “Reciprocity” is a social standard of behavior that says people should attempt to give something back, when they can, if they have been helped by others. Americans in all walks of life, not just the scholars who study these things, know that a democracy functions better when people help one another and when those who have been helped do what they can to repay that help.

Civic duty and personal responsibility is what a newly inaugurated President Kennedy was talking about in 1961 when he said “Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.” Neither party promoted that message in the 2016 election. A moral nation is one that promotes both civic and personal responsibility. Dependency does not promote either civic or personal responsibility. As our nation looks ahead to the possibility of technology replacing far more jobs, the party will need to develop a politics of employment assurance with reciprocity, not welfare entitlement with no opportunity for people to give something back to their communities and country as best they can.

Since 1782, the Great Seal of our nation has included the words ‘e pluribus unum’ – from diversity, unity. America has been at its greatest when its leaders have led in bringing us together to resolve the problems that face all of us. Our national motto reminds us to seek not to polarize but to come together to create a better future for all Americans, especially our children. We now face several issues that can bring us together. Working together to create a nation in which ‘no unintended conceptions’ is a shared goal of all Americans would be a major step in healing the political rifts that separate us. The need to contain health care costs is a problem for all Americans. Doing so while retaining the extended coverage that workers badly need is an

issue that affects all Americans. Global climate change is clearly a problem that affects the children of every person on our planet. Technology induced unemployment is no longer a problem just for factory workers; the same technology is beginning to threaten good jobs in offices and in vehicles. The Democratic Party is now facing an historic opportunity to lead our nation in effectively dealing with each of these problems.

There is much about our diverse heritages that we Americans should justifiably, and joyously, celebrate with one another. But we also need to remember how to celebrate our underlying unity. Future elections will likely go to those candidates who best capture our imaginations about how we can work together to solve the problems that confront us all. In short, Democrats will surely do much better in future national, state, and local elections when working Americans can justifiably say, **“I’m voting for Democrats because they are working hard for working people, they are working hard to protect our planet, and they are working hard to prevent abortions by emphasizing personal responsibility.”**

**REFERENCES:** Two reports of the United States government are especially relevant to the strategies recommended in this paper. Together, they provide a framework for the Democratic Party to re-establish itself as the friend of American workers and redefine the abortion issue.

- Executive Office of the President, *Artificial Intelligence, Automation, and the Economy*. December 20, 2016 – The report was jointly signed by the following appointees of President Obama: Chair, Council of Economic Advisers; Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy; Director, Domestic Policy Council; U.S. Chief Technology Officer; Director, National Economic Council.

The report was a culmination of the White House Future of Artificial Intelligence Initiative.

In the cover letter President Obama’s advisors concluded that, “**Aggressive policy action will be needed to help Americans who are disadvantaged by these changes and to ensure that the enormous benefits of AI and automation are developed by and available to all.**”

- Committee on Unintended Pregnancy, Institute of Medicine, Division of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention. *The Best Intentions: Unintended Pregnancy and the Well-Being of Children and Families*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1995, Sarah S. Brown and Leon Eisenberg, Editors. – The report recommended that to prevent abortions, as much as is humanly possible, **our nation needs to adopt a new national norm: No Unintended Conceptions.**

\*\*\*\*\*

Author: William Earle Klay, Ph.D.

Earle Klay is a professor and former director of the Reubin O’D. Askew School of Public Administration and Policy at the Florida State University. His current research looks at how George Washington taught us to make government work in ways that build the public’s support for our democratic republic. Professor Klay was raised in an evangelical protestant family, was a captain in the U.S. Army, is an active Boy Scout volunteer, and strongly supports the Roe v. Wade decision. Having grown up in a segregated South, he saw how intolerance held everyone back; he also saw how rapidly we can change our society for the better when enough Americans work together to make that happen.

He created a course at Florida State called “Futures Studies” that is a part of the university’s Liberal Studies for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Curriculum. It helps students think about how trends in values, demographics, the economy, the natural environment, and especially new technologies can present us with both challenges and opportunities. Major new technologies always bring changes, but it is human values and public policies that determine whether those changes will be for the better or not. This paper is written from a futures studies perspective.

No public funds have been spent in the writing and sharing of the paper.

The ideas in this paper may be used freely, without attribution or authorship credit.

[4 September 2017]

\*\*\*Please visit **reasonablepolicies.org** for more information about us, talking points, and to help. Thank you!\*\*\*