

The Restored Social Compact

A Path to Legislative Development

A proposal for converting the Social Compact Score from concept into statutory language. This is a conceptual plan. The organizations mentioned illustrate an approach and a team that could, in the author's opinion, push the RSC forward. The legislation demands expertise across a broad spectrum – these organizations represent that. No one is remotely committed - yet. August 2026.

What This Requires

Turning a proposal into an actual piece of legislation is a monumental endeavor. Five distinct things need to happen, and no single organization supplies more than one or two of them.

1. Program design – pushing concepts and philosophical underpinnings into actionable, reality-based, evidenced-based frameworks.
2. Statutory translation — turning the framework's architecture into actual bill text, cross-referenced to the federal law it already relies on.
3. Cross-ideological credibility — validation from more than one political tradition, so the bill cannot be dismissed as a partisan entry before it is read.
4. Adversarial stress-testing — independent, technically grounded attempts to find where the framework's desired outcomes break, produce unintended consequences, or fall short of the RSC's underpinnings.
5. Legislative sponsorship and proximity — standing to actually convene the other parties, create action among diverse organizations and, eventually, carry a bill.

Legislative Sponsorship

The entry point is a single office — a senator or a representative — asked one direct question: as conceived, is this an effort you would support, would you help convene it? That office is not being asked to be the framework's permanent or sole political home. Its job is to open the door and provide political clout.

The goal past that first door is broader: a bipartisan sponsorship group, not a single-party one — realistically something like two members from each side willing to be associated with the formation of the RSC as a viable piece of legislation. A bill that already carries visible support from both parties is a different, more durable proposition than one that depends on a single office's continued interest. The bill is designed to accrete a broad coalition. That ideological diversity from a sponsorship perspective should be present from inception.

Statutory Translation and Cross-Ideological Credibility

The RSC's beneficiaries certainly do not constitute a single ideology. The concept is neither right nor left. Its formation must be foundationally cross-ideological. Two thinktanks with the capacity

and expertise to provide this credibility are The Center for American Progress and the Niskanen Center. CAP is left-leaning and labor-aligned; Niskanen is center-right and heterodox. Paired, they supply drafting competence from two institutional traditions simultaneously, which means technical accuracy and political credibility ride on the same partnership rather than being purchased separately. Neither organization drafts alone, and neither publishes a provision the other has not reviewed.

This pairing is not a novel request. The AEI-Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies and the AEI-Brookings Joint Election Reform Project are documented precedents of a right-leaning and a center-left think tank formally co-producing substantive policy work together. The genre already exists.

Adversarial Stress-Testing

Four universities are proposed for this function, each because of a specific and verifiable reason rather than general standing — and each filling a different part of the function, not four instances of the same one.

Johns Hopkins — institutional will

President Ron Daniels has already argued publicly, in his own published work, that universities have an obligation to engage directly in shaping democratic institutions. This is a university whose leadership has already staked out the position that this is the kind of work it should be doing, rather than one being asked to take on an unfamiliar role.

Stanford — subject-matter stress-testing

The Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research already publishes current research specifically on corporate tax policy and tax avoidance. The Corporate Governance Research Initiative, housed jointly across the Graduate School of Business and Stanford Law School, studies executive compensation, board accountability, and shareholder issues — territory that overlaps directly with the wage-compression pillar and the framework's own identified shareholder-objection risk. The Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality specifically develops evidence-based policy to address and prevent poverty and inequality. These centers already do the kind of work this project needs; none would be starting from scratch.

MIT — the mechanism's own home, and a second stress-test

MIT's role is unusual: it already owns part of the mechanism. The Living Wage Calculator that Pillar 2 codifies directly into statute is built and maintained by Amy Glasmeier's lab in MIT's School of Architecture and Planning. Bringing MIT in is not adding a fourth generic stress-tester — it is engaging the institution whose own tool the statute already depends on. Separately, MIT's Economics department launched the Stone Center on Inequality and Shaping the Future of Work in 2025, studying wage inequality and labor market dynamics with an explicit goal of policymaker engagement — a fresh, current instance of the same subject-matter stress-testing Stanford provides, aimed at a different pillar.

Georgetown Law — legislative proximity and influence

Georgetown Law's Federal Legislation Clinic drafts actual legislative text and works directly with congressional offices on behalf of its clients; two of its projects have already been enacted. Its Center on Congress and Democracy sits roughly two blocks from the Capitol, trains members of

Congress and their staff, and has a track record of convening across ideological lines. Georgetown's contribution is proximity and influence inside the legislative process itself — a different function from Stanford's or MIT's technical validation, and one that also carries real drafting capacity of its own.

Revenue-Complexity

The Federal tax revenue stream is not peripheral to the RSC. The goal is to create socially beneficial businesses, nevertheless balancing tax revenue against those benefits is a structural requirement. This balance must be acutely tuned across multiple tributaries so revenue flows predictably and adequately. Affecting this flow is the standard tax rate, the discount across the pillars, the anticipated number of beneficial businesses and their effective tax rate. And these are but a few considerations. The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget (CRFB) — staffed by former budget committee chairs and CBO, OMB, and Federal Reserve directors from both parties — is positioned to stress-test this revenue architecture with the credibility a purely ideological validator cannot offer.

Funding

The think tank and university partners are expected to absorb their own participation as mission-aligned work, using existing staff time and research capacity rather than requiring new money. Where outside funding becomes necessary, the strongest current match is the Hewlett Foundation's Economy and Society Initiative — a five-year, fifty-million-dollar program explicitly built to fund work aimed at replacing neoliberal economic orthodoxy, and a close substantive fit for this framework specifically.

Art Brazee

Aug. 2026

The Restored Social Compact (v2.1) · © 2026 Art Brazee · therestoredsocialcompact.com