Part II. The Practice of Fulfillment

Future Molding Games

The three Future-Molding Games try, explicitly and measurably, to fulfill by their scoring scheme the three objectives of Washington 2000, namely: To increase the citizens':

1) Awareness of issues and options,
2) Voicing of views on them, and
3) Participating in decision-making on alternative options.

All this improves the democratic process of self-government and continually generates the planning in Washington 2000, or any other current planning for the future quality of life.

THE THREE FUTURE-MOLDING GAMES deal with: Goal-Setting (Series I), Program Setting (Series II) and Evaluations Setting (Series III).

EACH SERIES HAS FIVE STAGES and as many Rounds as the players may wish to pursue in an evening. Somewhat like bridge, the players are seated in foursomes at a table with pencils, response cards, and an instruction sheet. They discuss their goals and alternative means thereto, within some agreed on field, population and period. For example, the 5 stages of Goal-Setting for Washington State in the three decades ahead, include:

Stage 1. <u>Listing Goals</u> - Each player nominates on a card his first, second and third choices.

Stage 2. <u>Ranking Goals</u> - Each player records his priorities among the nominated goals.

Stage 3. <u>"Targeting" Goals</u> - For each goal, in turn, each player chooses his preferred amount (on a standardizing 10-point scale, for the period at issue).

Stage 4. <u>Pricing Goals</u> - Each player records his "give/get" ratio for the averaged target in (terms of) (1) tax dollars, (2) time, or (3) a (specified) sacrifice he will give to get his target achieved.

Stage 5. <u>"Consensing' Goals</u> - On each targeted goal, players in pairs note their disagreement, if any, between their two targets (roughly scaled into 10 degrees). They then seek to reduce this initial "gap" by discussion and a joint vote on a compromise target. Each player then declares his terminal target and computes any self-declared shift of opinion caused by the intervening <u>discussion-with-intent-to-agree</u>. Any reduction shown in the terminal gap between partner's targets compared with their initial gap, measures here the percent of gain in consensus. This is averaged over all pairs for the group's score at Stage 5.

At each Stage the score of the team (of 4) may reach 100% according as they cooperate fully. Then competition between teams can become to excel as cooperators in building a community with high consensus on goals and means thereto as developed from this Future-Molding Game.

This consensus-forming game (called "consensing") becomes a highly scientific controlled experiment if played with control teams matched to the experimental teams. When two different issues-and-goals, A and B, are discussed by any two teams, P and Q, in a fourfold experimental design:

	A	B
P	PA	PB
Q	QA	QB

they can simultaneously serve as experimental team (on one issue) and control team (on the other issue). Each pair (or 2-person team) thus complements the other pair in this highly efficient design for controlled experiments. It isolates and tests the effectiveness of any causal factor or manipulatable treatment, such as here: Discussion-With-Intent-to-Agree, in producing increased consensus. Any foursome of persons at a table can thus be a replicated and controlled experiment on changing people's opinions thru discussion when coupled with another causal factor like their Intent-to-Agree. (The causal factor is manipulated by inserting it or not inserting it, (in Experimental versus the Control team in each foursome).)

Our experimentation to date* has identified twenty-four causal factors which seem isolatable and testable by these consensus-forming experiments. These "Consensing" games offer rich opportunities for Ph.D. theses in the field of "symbolic interaction" within Sociology. Thus far our experiments have found, on a dozen issues and very diverse groups, that the factor of Discussion-with-Intent-to-Agree produces on the average some 25% of the maximum possible gain in consensus here.

This consensing Stage of the Future-Molding Game (FMG) seems a very promising technique to explore in Washington 2000 when seeking to 'make citizens more aware, vocal and participating.

The whole Future-Molding Game can be played with equal fruitfulness by any set of interested citizens, or any Task Force of Experts, or Caucus of Legislators, or any Executive Department, as it seems a highly universal and systematic way of making decisions in a self-governing democracy.

This social invention, called the "Future-Molding Game" (=FMG) is a particular and minute case of the author's combinatoric Actants Model for the cosmos via his Transact Model. The FMG is a particular combining and permuting of dimensional transact factors (i.e., Acts of People in Time), to maximize the valued end-state, V, called "increased consensus on goals," so APT=V, dimensionally

Further detailing of Rules or description *of variant* Rounds for the FMG will be found on Instruction Sheets, or left to the players to invent and agree on, as they experiment with these new technics of group self-improvement.

*See Dodd and Christopher, "Three Causes of Achieved Consensus in Two-Person Groups," International Review of Modern Sociology (in Vol. II, No. 2, September, 1972).

See also "Pathways" to Self-Government--a World Game, EpiDoc 225; and "FMG Testing Fulfillment," EpiDoc 290.