

THE GREEN TANK

CONCORDANCE ADMINISTRATION

Social technology for democracy through listening, distributed power and shared consent

VERSION 1.0 | PUBLIC DISCUSSION AND EXPERIMENTAL PILOTING

Alex Anderson | The Green Tank | August 2026

Human-led concept, developed through collaborative AI-assisted research and drafting

A gift offered for improvement

Publishing intention

This is not a doctrine and does not ask readers to surrender their judgement. It is an open design offered for testing, criticism, adaptation and improvement. Its method should be applied to the paper itself: every concern is information, every correction is welcome, and no contributor is required to defend an earlier position.

This paper grew from a simple question: what would politics look like if its purpose were not to win control, but to help people hear one another well enough to solve shared problems? The proposed answer is Concordance Administration - a network of relevant councils, transparent records, distributed authority and iterative decision-making designed to turn disagreement into collective intelligence.

The proposal is intentionally incomplete. Some elements draw on established evidence; others are design hypotheses that require lawful pilots and independent evaluation. The document distinguishes between them so that hope is not mistaken for proof.

Open sharing statement

The original text is offered under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). Readers may copy, share and adapt it, including commercially, provided they acknowledge the source, link the licence and indicate material changes. Preserving version history is encouraged because disagreement and improvement form part of the public record.

Licence: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Executive summary

Modern representative democracy protects important freedoms, but competitive electoral systems can also reward message control, factional loyalty and short-term victory. People whose experiences are excluded may feel powerless or threatened; officials with concentrated authority can become insulated from correction; and public consultations without visible consequences can deepen distrust rather than repair it.

Concordance Administration is proposed as a complementary social technology. It does not abolish elections, law, expertise or emergency services. It reorganises how public questions are framed, discussed, recorded, tested and reviewed.

- Public problems are assigned to relevant tables close to the people affected, with nested coordination for wider consequences.
- Each session is supported by two rotating co-facilitators and two independent recorders, providing comparison without creating a commanding chair.
- Facts, lived experience, assumptions, interests, uncertainty and disagreement are recorded separately.
- Lasting or irreversible action seeks concordance: consent, acceptance or a freely chosen stand-aside by every properly constituted participant. A reasoned block returns the proposal to design.
- Rights cannot be removed merely because everyone present agrees. Absent people, future generations and minorities require explicit protection.
- Public administration is treated as stewardship. Named officeholders remain answerable through audits, courts, ombudsmen, mediation and restorative remedies.
- Two constituency representatives provide comparison and continuity, but independent civic oversight is still required because two people may collude.
- Every important decision is treated as a revisable hypothesis: pilot safely, measure consequences, publish results and redesign when necessary.

Central proposition

Power should be visible, distributed, temporary and correctable. Democracy should make it safe to speak, safe to change one's mind and difficult for any person or faction to convert temporary authority into domination.

Contents

- 1. The problem: control is a poor organising principle
- 2. What the evidence supports - and what it does not
- 3. Precedents and practical lessons
- 4. The Concordance principles
- 5. Institutional architecture: relevant tables and nested councils
- 6. The four-person stewardship team
- 7. A daily council protocol
- 8. Concordance: agreement without coercion
- 9. Paired constituency representation
- 10. Administration, courts and restorative justice
- 11. Records, transparency and public memory
- 12. Human rights, accessibility and absent voices
- 13. Failure modes and protective responses
- 14. Pilot programme and evaluation
- 15. Open research questions
- Conclusion
- Appendices: session, record and decision templates
- References

Status of this document

A public-interest working paper. It is suitable for discussion and small-scale piloting, but it is not a finished constitution, legal code or claim that consensus will solve every conflict.

1. The problem: control is a poor organising principle

Conventional politics often treats disagreement as a contest: assemble a majority, defeat an opponent and use the resulting mandate to impose a programme until the next contest. Majority voting remains indispensable in many circumstances, but victory alone does not establish understanding, factual accuracy, fairness or durable consent.

A control-oriented system creates predictable pressures. Parties simplify complex questions into identity signals. Institutions protect their own continuity. People learn that admitting uncertainty can be punished as weakness. Those who lose repeatedly may conclude that peaceful participation cannot affect outcomes. Public officials receive filtered information and can mistake institutional confidence for public consent.

The proposed alternative begins with a different purpose: public power exists to administer shared responsibilities on behalf of people, not to govern over them. The task is not to make every person identical. It is to create enough shared understanding that people can act together without denying one another's humanity.

Fear, exclusion and manipulation

The psychological claim must be made carefully. Exclusion does not turn a person inevitably toward anger or violence. A 2023 meta-analysis of 92 studies involving 65,564 participants nevertheless found a significant positive association between social exclusion and aggression ($r = 0.38$), with substantial variation by age, method and context [10]. Research on self-uncertainty also indicates that uncertainty can strengthen identification with groups offering clear boundaries, rigid norms or radical certainty [12].

This supports a preventive democratic principle: do not manufacture exclusion and then act surprised when fear and hostility become easier to mobilise. Listening is not surrender to every claim. It is a way of reducing avoidable threat while bringing claims into contact with evidence and other people's consequences.

Power and correction

The familiar phrase 'power corrupts' is too absolute; people respond differently to authority. The safer institutional conclusion is that power can reduce exposure to correction and increase the consequences of personal blind spots. Therefore, a trustworthy system should not depend on finding permanently virtuous leaders. It should make authority attributable, contestable, time-limited and observable.

2. What the evidence supports - and what it does not

The empirical case for structured public deliberation is substantial but conditional. The OECD had tracked 716 representative deliberative processes across 28 OECD countries by 2023, involving more than 80,000 randomly selected citizens. Most recent cases were local or regional, where questions are often closer to daily life and participation can have a more visible effect [1].

The evidence does not say that any conversation reduces polarisation. A multidisciplinary review found mixed results: deliberation reduced affective polarisation in 54.2% of relevant studies, while some forms of discussion increased ideological polarisation. Independent facilitation, balanced briefings, time, group composition and decision rules materially affect results [11].

Claim	Assessment	Responsible formulation
Exclusion causes hatred	Too deterministic	Exclusion is a documented risk factor for distress and aggression; outcomes depend on people and conditions.
Discussion agreement brings	Not reliably	Structured, informed and facilitated deliberation can improve judgement; unstructured discussion may harden factions.
Two officials prevent corruption	Insufficient alone	Paired responsibility improves comparison, but requires audit, disclosure, civic oversight and legal accountability.
Everyone must agree	Requires definition	Lasting action seeks free concordance among a legitimate, representative table within a non-negotiable rights floor.
No leaders means no hierarchy	False in practice	Authority should be explicit, narrow, rotating and recallable so informal power cannot hide.

Evidence base: OECD [1-3], Jin et al. [10], Caluwaerts and Bernaerts [11], Freeman [14].

3. Precedents and practical lessons

No historical example proves the complete model. The relevant evidence comes from different institutions that each demonstrate one component: accountable representation, multiparty negotiation, power-sharing, civic lottery, participatory budgeting, polycentric governance or restorative practice.

Example	Relevant mechanism	Lesson for Concordance Administration
Haudenosaunee / Onondaga governance	Clan Mothers select a spokesman for council and may remove him after warnings if he ceases to represent the clan [7].	Representation can be accountable and recallable without treating the representative as the source of sovereignty.
South Africa, CODESA and MPNF	Nineteen parties entered talks in 1991; the later process included 26 parties and technical committees [6].	Negotiation can be chosen over armed conflict, but deadlock, violence and unequal power require continuing safeguards. 'Sufficient consensus' may be more workable than literal unanimity.
Belfast / Good Friday Agreement	Multi-party negotiation combined power-sharing, parity of esteem, consent, rights and interconnected institutions [5].	Durable peace can require several linked tables and cross-community safeguards rather than one winning centre.
Irish Citizens' Assembly	Ninety-nine randomly selected citizens used expert evidence, public submissions and transparent meetings on divisive issues [8].	Ordinary people can develop informed recommendations when time, evidence and facilitation are provided. Government follow-through remains essential.
Brazilian participatory budgeting	Municipal participation shifted expenditure toward health and sanitation and was associated with lower infant mortality [9].	Participation can influence material priorities, not merely attitudes, when it has a real connection to budgets.
Ostbelgien Citizens' Council	A permanent 24-person council selected by lot rotates one-third of members every six months and initiates temporary panels [2].	Rotation, agenda-setting and mandatory parliamentary response can embed citizen deliberation without professionalising a new political class.

Elinor Ostrom's work provides the wider organising insight: complex shared resources can often be governed through multiple, nested decision centres when people affected by rules can participate in changing them, monitoring is accountable and conflict resolution is accessible [4]. Concordance Administration applies this polycentric logic to public problem-solving.

4. The Concordance principles

1. Human dignity. Every person enters as a human being, not as a category to defeat. Harmful claims may be challenged without declaring the speaker beyond return.

2. Relevant inclusion. People materially affected by a question must have a protected route into the process. Open attendance is supplemented by representative selection so organised interests cannot occupy every seat.

3. Evidence with humility. Facts, testimony, inference, uncertainty and values are distinct forms of information. None should be disguised as another.

4. Freedom to change. Changing one's mind is evidence of learning, not betrayal. Earlier statements remain in the record but are not weapons for humiliation.

5. Distributed authority. No single chair, representative, expert, funder or recorder controls the process. Roles are bounded, paired and rotated.

6. Free concordance. Agreement is invalid when produced by intimidation, exhaustion, exclusion, deception or coerced silence.

7. Rights before convenience. A unanimous room cannot lawfully remove the dignity or fundamental rights of people outside it.

8. Reversibility. When possible, test proposals on a safe, limited and measurable basis before making irreversible commitments.

9. Public memory. Records preserve evidence, reasons, dissent, interests and changes over time so later participants can understand how a decision formed.

10. Continuous correction. No institution is treated as perfected. Every process has review dates, evaluation and a lawful route for challenge.

5. Institutional architecture: relevant tables and nested councils

The system begins with the problem rather than the institution. A housing table examines housing; a transport table examines transport; a health table examines health. Questions that cross boundaries are referred to a joint table rather than forced into a department's existing frame.



Figure 1. The Concordance correction loop. Proposed design; not an established empirical standard.

Composition of a relevant table

- A civic-lottery group broadly reflecting the affected population.

- People directly affected, including those facing practical barriers to attendance.
- Relevant workers, service users and community organisations.
- Independent technical specialists who explain evidence but do not own the decision.
- Public administrators responsible for feasibility and implementation.
- A rights and accessibility adviser able to identify absent or disadvantaged interests.
- The four-person stewardship team: two facilitators and two recorders.

Open attendance remains valuable, but open attendance alone is not representative: time, money, confidence and organised networks affect who appears. Civic lottery and supported participation - expenses, remuneration, transport, childcare, caring support, interpretation and disability access - are necessary to reduce this distortion [3].

Nested rather than centralised

Local councils should decide matters whose consequences are genuinely local. Regional and national councils address spillovers, rights, resource equalisation and shared infrastructure. A higher council does not automatically overrule a lower one; it must explain the wider consequence that creates jurisdiction.

6. The four-person stewardship team

Each ordinary session is supported by two co-facilitators and two independent recorders. They are stewards of process, not leaders of opinion.

Role	Primary duty	Counter-check
Facilitator A	Manages agenda, speaking order, time and transitions.	Facilitator B may pause the process if allocation becomes unequal or a participant is being crowded out.
Facilitator B	Observes fairness, accessibility, emotional temperature and whether questions have been answered.	Facilitator A checks that interventions do not silently redirect the substance of discussion.
Recorder A	Creates a chronological account of claims, evidence, proposals and decisions.	Recorder B prepares an independent record before reconciliation.
Recorder B	Tracks uncertainty, dissent, interests, unanswered questions and changes of position.	Recorder A checks factual sequence and attributed actions.

Pairs should rotate roles and terms. They should disclose conflicts and should not be selected as a permanent friendship pair. Where both facilitators or both recorders agree against a participant, agreement is not proof: the disputed point is preserved and referred to the full table.

A record is not reality

Two independent accounts reduce single-observer error but cannot eliminate shared blind spots. The authoritative record should preserve material discrepancies rather than silently merge them into false certainty.

7. A daily council protocol

A predictable procedure reduces the power of confidence, status and interruption. The following is a starting protocol, intended for testing.

1. Opening check. Confirm the question, participants, accessibility needs, conflicts of interest and whether urgent welfare issues require attention.
2. Evidence state. Record what is known, supported, suspected and unknown. Correct obvious errors without humiliating the person who raised them.
3. First listening round. Every participant receives an uninterrupted initial opportunity to describe what they see, what they need and what consequence they fear.
4. Clarifying questions. Questions seek understanding before rebuttal. Facilitators distinguish questions from disguised speeches.
5. Affected-person check. Ask whose daily life, safety, liberty, work, home or future would change under each option.
6. Option building. Combine compatible elements and create new options rather than forcing a premature binary choice.
7. Concern round. Record every material objection and the evidence or value behind it.
8. Revision. Modify the proposal to answer concerns without concealing trade-offs.
9. Concordance check. Each participant selects consent, acceptance, stand aside or block and gives a brief reason.
10. Closure. Assign actions, limits, owners, measures and review dates. Reconcile the two records and invite factual corrections.

Time and human limits

People become tired, overloaded, frightened or physically unwell. A process that continues until dissenters surrender from exhaustion has not reached concordance. Participants must be able to request a break, accessible communication, additional time or adjournment. Legitimate absence and disability must not be coded as indifference.

8. Concordance: agreement without coercion

Concordance is broader than enthusiasm and more demanding than a simple majority. It asks whether every participant can freely permit a proposal to proceed after evidence, consequences and alternatives have been considered.

Position	Meaning	Effect
Consent	I support this proposal and will help carry it.	Counts toward concordance.
Acceptance	It is not my preferred option, but my material concerns have been heard and I can live with it.	Counts toward concordance.
Stand aside	Do not represent me as supporting it, but I will not prevent it.	Counts only when freely chosen and recorded.
Block	I believe this causes serious unresolved harm, violates an agreed principle or rests on a critical unanswered fact.	No lasting or irreversible action; return to inquiry and redesign.

Limits on blocking

A block is not a command over the group. It must identify the unresolved harm, principle or evidence gap. The participant is not required to invent a complete alternative alone, but the table must help explore one. Repeated obstruction, undisclosed interests or fabricated evidence can be investigated through an independent integrity process without treating ordinary disagreement as sabotage.

Routine and emergency action

A system cannot reconvene the whole table for every routine act. Concordance therefore authorises bounded mandates: administrators may perform specified tasks within agreed limits, budgets and review dates. Immediate action to protect life or prevent serious harm may be taken temporarily where delay is dangerous, but emergency authority must be narrow, recorded, independently reviewed and allowed to expire automatically.

Agreement cannot erase rights

Even perfect unanimity among those present cannot legitimise slavery, torture, discrimination or the removal of equal legal protection. Concordance operates inside a human-rights floor, not above it [18].

9. Paired constituency representation

The proposal adds two equal constituency representatives rather than one. Their purpose is comparison, continuity and socioeconomic breadth. Neither is the other's assistant, and neither alone can claim to embody the constituency.

Proposed structure

- Both representatives are independently elected under a ranked or proportional system designed to prevent one organised faction from automatically capturing both seats.
- They maintain separate staff, budgets and records, but must jointly report areas of agreement and disagreement.
- Either may raise a constituent's case; neither may suppress the other's lawful inquiry.
- Major constituency recommendations show both positions and the underlying public evidence.
- A rotating local citizens' council questions both representatives and monitors follow-through.

Socioeconomic breadth

The originating proposal requires one representative from a working-class family so that both broad scales of society are present. The purpose - lived understanding of ordinary work, insecurity and dependence on public services - is important. The legal mechanism requires more work. 'Working class' is neither binary nor easily verified, and family origin can be intrusive, gamed or used to stereotype.

A pilot should test a transparent socioeconomic-experience criterion set by an independent electoral body and reviewed by a citizen panel. Relevant indicators might include sustained experience of hourly or manual work, low income, insecure employment, social housing, insecure renting, unemployment, caring, disability or reliance on public services. No single indicator should define a person's worth or political position.

Duality is a check, not a guarantee

Two representatives can collude. Paired representation therefore requires real-time disclosure of donations, gifts, assets, relevant debts, outside work and lobbying contacts; independent audit; protected whistleblowing; judicial accountability; and a lawful recall mechanism after independently established serious misconduct.

10. Administration, courts and restorative justice

The word administration expresses the intended relationship: public institutions hold responsibilities in trust and provide services on behalf of people. Renaming government is not enough. Authority changes only when decisions are attributable, reasons are public and remedies are accessible.

A ladder of resolution

1. Listening and explanation: a clear account, correction of misunderstanding and practical support.
2. Independent ombudsman: investigation and a remedy without requiring full litigation.
3. Mediation: voluntary assisted resolution where power imbalance can be managed safely.
4. Restorative process: acknowledgement of harm, affected voices, repair and prevention where participation is informed and voluntary.
5. Independent court or tribunal: binding determination of rights, facts and remedies.
6. Appeal and review: correction of legal or procedural error without making individual officials untouchable.

Procedural-justice research finds that people are more willing to accept legal authority when they experience voice, neutrality, respectful treatment and trustworthy motives, even when they do not receive their preferred outcome [16]. Restorative justice is not suitable for every case and must never coerce a victim into contact. A Campbell systematic review nevertheless found that face-to-face restorative conferences, when added to ordinary justice and used in suitable cases, reduced repeat offending on average and improved victim satisfaction [13].

Justice asks more than who to punish

What happened? Who was affected? What rights were engaged? What needs repair? What support or boundary is necessary now? What would prevent repetition? Understanding does not erase responsibility; it helps select a proportionate response.

Being tired, disabled, frightened or overwhelmed is not itself a crime. These conditions may explain conduct and should shape accessibility, support and remedy. They do not remove another person's right to safety. The system must be capable of holding care and boundaries at the same time.

11. Records, transparency and public memory

Records protect participants from institutional forgetting and from the rewriting of reasons after an outcome becomes controversial. They also create risk: excessive personal data can expose vulnerable people, chill speech or become a tool of retaliation. The design therefore separates public institutional memory from protected personal information.

Minimum session record

Record	What is captured	Protection
Attendance	Present, authorised absence, accessibility support, remote participation and role.	Do not publish medical detail or treat disability, caring or parental leave as misconduct.
Evidence register	Source, date, provenance, limitations and status: unknown, suspected, supported or confirmed.	Corrections remain linked to the earlier version rather than silently replacing history.
Interest register	Relevant financial, organisational, familial or campaigning interests.	Collect only what is material to the question.
Discussion record	Questions, proposals, material reasons, changes of position and unresolved concerns.	Do not create a verbatim surveillance transcript by default.
Decision record	Consent positions, blocks, delegated authority, measures, owners and review dates.	Sensitive individual positions may be protected where publication creates a credible risk.
Implementation log	Actions, expenditure, outcomes, deviations, complaints and corrections.	Public by default for institutional action; personal case data redacted.

Reconciling two accounts

The recorders compare independent notes after the session. Agreed material becomes the draft record. Unresolved differences are marked as such and referred to participants. Participants may correct inaccurate attribution but may not erase legitimate criticism or dissent. The table approves the final record before it becomes authoritative.

Attendance without cruelty

Public representatives should have transparent attendance and activity records, but one headline percentage is misleading. Records should distinguish chamber and committee attendance, constituency work, other public duties, medical or disability leave, parental and caring leave, declared abstention and unexplained absence. Transparency should reveal neglect, not punish ordinary human limits.

12. Human rights, accessibility and absent voices

Concordance cannot include literally every affected person in every room. Legitimacy therefore depends on representative selection, open routes for evidence, supported participation, rights review and explicit consideration of those who are absent.

- Children and future generations, who cannot vote on consequences they will inherit.
- People unable to attend because of disability, work, poverty, caring, language, distance or fear.
- Minorities too small to appear reliably in a random sample.
- People affected outside the council's geography.
- Non-human life and ecological systems without a direct speaking voice.

Each table should assign a rights-and-absence review before concordance. The review does not invent what absent people believe. It identifies foreseeable impacts, missing evidence and routes for direct input. Decisions with substantial external or intergenerational effects move to a wider nested table.

13. Failure modes and protective responses

A social technology should be designed for difficult days, not only cooperative ones. The table below treats failure modes as engineering requirements rather than proof that participation is impossible.

Failure mode	Risk	Protective response
Exhaustion masquerading as agreement	A dissenter gives up so the meeting can end.	Time limits, breaks, adjournment and a private coercion check before recording acceptance.
One-person permanent veto	Necessary action is blocked without an addressable reason.	Require a stated harm, principle or evidence gap; use independent facilitation, additional evidence and review of bad-faith conduct.
Hidden hierarchy	Confident insiders dominate a nominally leaderless group.	Explicit rotating roles, equal information, visible speaking-time records and recallable authority [14].
Expert capture	Technical language makes citizens dependent on one institution.	Competing expertise, plain-language briefs, declared uncertainty and participant-selected questions.
Organised capture	Well-resourced interests fill open seats and submissions.	Civic lottery, material-interest declarations, accessibility support and independent integrity oversight.
False or manipulated evidence	A proposal is built on fabricated claims.	Provenance register, independent verification, three-state uncertainty and correction without humiliation.
Pair collusion	Two facilitators, recorders or representatives protect each other.	Rotation, independent audit, citizen review, conflict disclosure and lawful external appeal.
Emergency abuse	Temporary authority becomes permanent control.	Narrow statutory trigger, written reasons, automatic expiry, independent review and retrospective public examination.
Privacy harm	Participation exposes vulnerable people.	Data minimisation, consent, redaction, protected sessions and separate public/personal records.
No implementation	Participation becomes theatre and deepens cynicism.	A binding response duty, named owner, budget, timetable, implementation log and public explanation [3].

Jo Freeman's warning about the 'tyranny of structurelessness' is central here: removing formal leadership can conceal informal elites rather than remove power. Concordance Administration therefore names, limits, rotates and records authority [14].

14. Pilot programme and evaluation

The proposal should not begin with national replacement. It should begin with a lawful, independently evaluated pilot on a bounded local question where several options are genuinely available.

Suggested pilot

Phase	Activity	Exit condition
0. Independent design	Citizen, legal, accessibility, safeguarding, data-protection and research review.	Public protocol and ethics statement.
1. Recruitment	Civic lottery plus targeted inclusion of affected people; expenses and accessibility funded.	Composition report and gap analysis.
2. Learning	Balanced briefs, open evidence register and questions to multiple experts.	Participants report sufficient understanding to deliberate.
3. Deliberation	Four-person stewardship, independent records and concordance process.	Proposal, dissent record or documented deadlock.
4. Reversible test	Small, time-limited implementation with safety limits and control comparison where possible.	Minimum evidence period completed without rights or safety breach.
5. Review	Participant, public and independent evaluation; publish positive, negative and null results.	Decision to adopt, redesign, repeat or stop.

Measures that matter

- Participation: demographic and socioeconomic representativeness, attendance and reasons for attrition.
- Fairness: speaking-time distribution, interruption, accessibility, perceived respect and freedom to disagree.
- Learning: factual knowledge, uncertainty recognition and ability to describe opposing reasons fairly.
- Decision quality: feasibility, rights compliance, evidence use, unresolved risk and external review.
- Concordance integrity: consent profile, changes over time, coercion indicators and quality of recorded blocks.
- Implementation: completion, cost, timeliness, service outcomes and unintended consequences.
- Trust and conflict: institutional trust, affective polarisation, complaint rates and willingness to participate again.
- Correction: whether negative evidence leads to timely redesign rather than institutional defence.

Success is not unanimous praise. A pilot succeeds scientifically if it reveals where the design works, where it fails and what must change. Null and adverse findings belong in the public record.

15. Open research questions

- Which decisions genuinely require concordance, and which can be delegated under an earlier concordant mandate?
- How should a block be reviewed without transforming review into majority rule by another name?
- How long can deliberation continue before delay itself causes harm?
- What lawful emergency trigger permits temporary action, and who conducts the immediate review?
- How can socioeconomic breadth be guaranteed without intrusive class certification or stereotypes?
- Which electoral method best prevents one faction from capturing both constituency seats?
- How are people outside the geography, future generations and ecological effects represented without fabricated consent?
- When should records be public, anonymised, sealed or destroyed?
- How can small councils resist coordinated disinformation without creating an authority that decides permitted opinion?
- How should the model interact with existing parliaments, local authorities, unions, professional bodies and courts?
- Can concordance operate at national scale directly, or only through nested and federated councils?
- What evidence would justify abandoning or substantially redesigning the model?

An invitation, not a demand

Researchers, administrators, community organisers, judges, workers, disabled people, sceptics and critics are invited to test these questions. The model becomes stronger when people can show where it is wrong.

Conclusion

Concordance Administration begins from a modest recognition: no individual, party, class, profession or technology can perceive every consequence alone. Human beings are powerful and vulnerable, capable of care and of harm, especially when fear, status and unchecked authority narrow what we can hear.

The response is not to search for a perfect ruler. It is to arrange roles, records, rights and feedback so that power remains visible and correction remains possible. Relevant councils bring problems to the people who live with them. Paired facilitators protect speaking space. Independent recorders preserve more than one perception. Concordance turns objections into design requirements. Courts and ombudsmen provide remedy. Reversible pilots let reality answer our confidence.

The model will not eliminate conflict. Nor should it erase genuine moral disagreement. Its aim is to prevent disagreement from becoming a machinery of domination and to make public decisions worthy of voluntary cooperation.

The Concordance proposition

Why crawl through systems organised around control when people can build shared lift? We can learn to fly together - not by breaking difference, but by arranging it into care, evidence, accountability and freedom.

This paper is therefore given as a beginning. Take it, question it, improve it and return what you learn so the next version belongs to a wider human conversation.

Appendix A. Compact session template

Field	Entry
Public question	A neutral question describing the problem and the decisions genuinely available.
Jurisdiction	Why this is the relevant table; linked tables and external effects.
Participants	Civic sample, affected people, administrators, experts, facilitators and recorders.
Access	Adjustments, interpretation, remote access, caring support, transport and remuneration.
Evidence state	Known / supported / suspected / unknown, with sources and limitations.
Interests	Material conflicts and institutional affiliations.
Options	Existing options, combined options and newly designed alternatives.
Concerns	Affected group, feared consequence, evidence/value and response.
Decision	Consent / acceptance / stand aside / block, reasons and coercion check.
Mandate	Action, owner, budget, boundaries, safety limits and expiry.
Review	Measures, data owner, public report date and correction route.

Appendix B. Record status vocabulary

Status	Meaning
UNKNOWN	The record does not yet establish whether the claim is true or false.
SUSPECTED	There is a reason to investigate, but available evidence is insufficient.
SUPPORTED	Relevant evidence increases confidence, while material uncertainty remains.
CONFIRMED	The claim meets the defined verification standard and is linked to supporting evidence.
DISPUTED	Materially different interpretations or evidence remain in the record.
CORRECTED	A later finding changes an earlier record; both versions and the reason for correction remain traceable.

These labels describe the state of the record, not the worth or honesty of the person who contributed the claim.

Appendix C. Minimum public accountability record

- Named responsible office and officeholder.
- Legal authority and scope of delegated power.
- Evidence, interests and material alternatives considered.
- Concordance record and preserved dissent.
- Public expenditure and relevant contracts.
- Implementation milestones, deviations and complaints.
- Rights, equality, accessibility and privacy review.
- Review date, expiry date and route to independent challenge.

References

- [1] **OECD, Government at a Glance 2025.** Citizen participation and deliberation; 716 tracked processes through 2023. [Source](#)
- [2] **OECD, Innovative Citizen Participation and New Democratic Institutions.** Catching the Deliberative Wave. OECD Publishing, 2020. DOI: 10.1787/339306da-en. [Source](#)
- [3] **OECD Guidelines for Citizen Participation Processes.** OECD Publishing, 2022. DOI: 10.1787/f765caf6-en. [Source](#)
- [4] **Ostrom, E..** Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. Nobel Prize Lecture, 8 December 2009. [Source](#)
- [5] **The Belfast / Good Friday Agreement.** Northern Ireland Office, 10 April 1998. [Source](#)
- [6] **UNESCO Memory of the World.** Archives of CODESA 1991-1992 and the Multi-Party Negotiating Process 1993. [Source](#)
- [7] **Onondaga Nation.** Clan Mothers: selection, guidance and removal of council spokesmen. [Source](#)
- [8] **OECD Observatory of Public Sector Innovation.** The Irish Citizens' Assembly case study. [Source](#)
- [9] **Goncalves, S..** The Effects of Participatory Budgeting on Municipal Expenditures and Infant Mortality in Brazil. World Development 53 (2014), 94-110. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.009. [Source](#)
- [10] **Jin, J. et al..** The relationship between social exclusion and aggression: A meta-analysis. Acta Psychologica Sinica 55(12), 2023. DOI: 10.3724/SP.J.1041.2023.01979. [Source](#)
- [11] **Caluwaerts, D. and Bernaerts, K..** Deliberation and polarization: a multi-disciplinary review. Frontiers in Political Science 5, 2023. DOI: 10.3389/fpos.2023.1127372. [Source](#)
- [12] **Hogg, M.A., Meehan, C. and Farquharson, J..** The solace of radicalism: self-uncertainty and group identification in the face of threat. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 46(6), 2010, 1061-1066. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.005. [Source](#)
- [13] **Strang, H. et al..** Restorative Justice Conferencing using face-to-face meetings: effects on recidivism and victim satisfaction. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2013. [Source](#)
- [14] **Freeman, J..** The Tyranny of Structurelessness. Original essay on hidden power in nominally leaderless groups. [Source](#)
- [15] **Stanford Deliberative Democracy Lab.** What is Deliberative Polling? Representative sampling, balanced materials and facilitated discussion. [Source](#)
- [16] **Tyler, T.R..** Why People Obey the Law, 2nd ed. Princeton University Press, 2006. [Source](#)

[17] **OECD**. Ostbelgien model: permanent Citizens' Council, rotating membership and parliamentary response. [Source](#)

[18] **United Nations**. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted 10 December 1948. [Source](#)

[19] **Creative Commons**. Attribution 4.0 International licence. [Source](#)

Research and drafting note

This Version 1 paper combines cited public evidence with original institutional design proposals. The two-facilitator/two-recorder model, paired constituency representation and the precise concordance protocol are hypotheses proposed for evaluation, not findings already validated by the cited studies.

Errors and omissions should be reported to The Green Tank so that corrections can be logged transparently in later versions.