

Democratic Policy Decisions with Decentralized Promises Contingent on Vote Outcome¹

Ali Lazrak² and Jianfeng Zhang³

First version March 1, 2023.

May 23, 2023

¹We thank the participants of the UBC reading group on political economy and finance in the summer 2022, the UBC VSE Micro lunch workshop, the USC colloquium, the Bachelier Finance congress, the Stockholm School of Economics conference in memory of Tomas Björk. We thank Chad Kendall and Dean Spencer for comments. Ali Lazrak gratefully acknowledge the support from The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Jianfeng Zhang gratefully acknowledge the support from NSF grants DMS-1908665 and DMS-2205972.

²University of British Columbia, email: ali.lazrak@sauder.ubc.ca

³University of Southern California, email: jianfenz@usc.edu

Abstract

We examine how decentralized and simultaneous utility transfer promises affect collective decision-making by voting. Committee members with varying levels of support and opposition to an efficient reform can make enforceable promises before voting. An equilibrium requires stability and minimal total promises. Equilibria exist and are indeterminate, but do share several key characteristics. Equilibria result in enacting the reform and necessitate transfer promises from high to low-intensity members. When reform supporters lack sufficient voting power, promises must reach across the aisle. When reform supporters have enough voting power to enact the reform, promises must preclude reform opponents to entice the least enthusiastic reform supporters to become reform opponents. In that case, equilibrium promises do not need to reach across the aisle unless the weakest reform supporters have homogeneous intensities. We also discuss a finite sequence of promises that achieve an equilibrium that minimizes the ranges of intensities.

1 Introduction

Vote trading is a controversial practice that can be viewed as undermining the principles of democracy and efficient capital markets. In the context of political elections, the act of voting is often regarded as a moral duty, and trading votes for money or favors may be seen as abhorrent. Similarly, voting rights in corporations are an important means for stakeholders to voice their opinions on decisions that affect their economic ownership. Decoupling voting rights from economic ownership may undermine the ideal of allocative efficiency in capital markets. Despite the negative connotations associated with vote trading, it is a widespread practice that can take various accepted or tolerated forms within legal and societal norms. For example, legislative logrolling is a common practice where politicians exchange their votes on particular issues in return for votes on other issues. In corporate votes, activist investors may borrow shares for a nominal fee and use them to vote in favor of their private agendas.¹

Although vote trading is a commonly used practice, its normative properties are not well understood. In a recent survey, Casella and Macé [2021] noticed, “Given the prominence of vote trading in all groups’ decision-making, it is very surprising how little we know and understand about it.” On one hand, vote trading enables voters to adjust the intensity of their preferences, which is not possible with a binary vote. Early literature (Buchanan and Tullock [1962] and Coleman [1966]) highlighted that this feature should, in principle, have a positive impact on efficiency. On the other hand, when certain subsets of voters trade votes, they create an externality on non-trading voters (Downs [1957]) which can harm efficiency by creating a conflict between private and collective interests.

In this paper, we evaluate one form of “vote trading”, where prior to casting their vote, voters make decentralized promises contingent on the voting outcome. Our model describes the process of liquidation voting in corporate bankruptcy proceedings where creditors and sometimes shareholders are asked to vote on a proposed plan of reorganization or liquidation against the alternative—resolving the issues in court. The wedge between the expected court rulings’ terms and the proposal’s represents

¹Hu and Black [2005] offer an overview of the “decoupling techniques” which are used in practice to unbundle the common shares’ economic interest from voting rights.

a promise of transfers between stakeholders, as we envision in our model. Our model also captures a common practice in legislative bodies, including the US Congress, where bills are often amended before they are voted on. The final bill bundles the initial bill and the amendments, which we view as promises between voters. The process of amending bills is meant to give voters who initially oppose the bill reasons to support and vote for it. For example, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (commonly known as Obamacare) was passed by the US Congress in 2010. During the legislative process, the bill was amended to gain enough support from both Democrats and Republicans to pass. Several concessions to moderate Democrats and Republicans were made, including removing a public option and scaling back the scope of the bill.

More specifically, we examine a model in which a committee decides with a vote on whether to accept a reform or retain the status quo. The alternative that generates majority support is adopted.² Committee members disagree on which alternative they prefer because they have heterogeneous intensities of preferences. We assume that the reform is socially optimal in that the sum of preference intensities for the reform relative to the status quo is positive. Before voting, however, members can freely make credible and enforceable promises contingent on the committee's decision. The promises are unconstrained and involve coalitions of any size ranging from a pair to the entire committee. They can represent favors (*e.g.* logrolling), legislative amendments, terms of liquidation, monetary payments, or any commitment to certain future actions that increase the promisees' utility. Voting occurs after the promises have been made. The promises alter the incentives to vote, but voters retain control of their voting rights and sincerely cast their votes to maximize self-interest.

In the absence of promises and when the committee decides by majority rule, the median voter theorem holds because heterogeneity is unidimensional and the decision is binary (Black [1958]). In that case, the political equilibrium aligns with the preferred policy of the median voter. The introduction of promises creates a multidimensional set of alternatives, which renders the median voter theorem invalid.

²In our model, we allow the committee to be ruled by a κ -majority rule where κ is any integer that is smaller than the committee size. Therefore the results of this paper hold for both the super-majority rules that require more than 50% voting share to adopt the reform and the sub-majority rules that require less than 50% voting share to adopt the reform.

The concept of equilibrium promises rests on a stability argument that prohibits the formation of *blocking coalitions*. For an equilibrium to exist, it is necessary that with the contingent promises in place, no blocking coalition can create additional promises among its members, overturn the committee decision, and achieve a better outcome for all coalition members compared to the outcome prior to the deviation. This condition ensures the stability of the equilibrium.

One additional important assumption we make is that the equilibrium promise profiles are minimal, meaning that the total transfer promised by all parties is kept as low as possible. By minimizing the transfer promises made, we reduce the various transaction costs associated with promises that are not explicitly modeled. These costs include the costs of enforceability, commitment, and elicitation of intensities. For example, in a political context, when a bill is being amended, it can become more complex and potentially deviate from its original purpose. In such cases, politicians may aim to minimize the scope and number of amendments made if they believe that their constituents or donors would not approve of too many changes. In addition, if promises take the form of future transfers, as in logrolling or in corporate liquidation, they may generate uncertain costs and benefits for both parties involved. Thus, minimizing promises can help reduce uncertainty and its associated costs. Finally, transfer promises may also be illegal in some settings, and minimizing their magnitude can minimize the risk of detection.³

Based on the assumptions of stability and minimality, we explore the equilibrium-voting outcome when promises are allowed before voting. The first insight from the model is that the equilibria exist and achieve the social optimum, meaning that the reform is enacted.⁴ Promises contingent on the vote outcome are thus effective in removing the classical voting inefficiencies provoked by the binary nature of the voting action.

³Our assumption of total transfer minimization parallels Maupertuis's *principle of least action* in Physics (Maupertuis [1748]). According to the principle of least action, the behavior of a physical system can be thought of as an attempt to minimize a quantity called action that measures the work to be done on the system. To the extent that promises represent costly actions for the promisers, minimizing the total promises transfer is tantamount to minimizing the actions deployed by the promisers to improve their self-interest from the vote.

⁴This result is implied by the stability of the equilibrium and would hold even if we do not assume that the total transfer is minimal.

The second insight is that equilibria are generally indeterminate: while reducing the size of the set of stable promise profiles, the minimal transfer assumption does not imply the uniqueness of the equilibrium. The indeterminacy results from both the identity of the promisers and promisees, and the amounts of transfers; being unidentified in equilibrium. However, the assumption of minimality implies that all equilibria do share common characteristics. Specifically, in every equilibrium, the distribution of *ex post* intensities resulting from the transfer promises is more egalitarian than the distribution of *ex ante* intensities. In fact, for all voting rules and all distributions of *ex ante* intensities, there is a critical committee member such that all the promisers (resp. promisees) have larger (resp. lower) *ex ante* intensities than that member.

To provide more detailed predictions on the equilibrium flow of transfer and identity of the promisers and promisees, more specific assumptions on the distribution of *ex ante* intensities are necessary.

When the coalition of reform supporters does not have enough voting power to enact the reform, the voting outcome without promises is inefficient. This is the case of *frustrated minorities* where the reform is defeated despite the presence of a minority of members who would experience a large increase in utility when the reform is enacted. In that case, the promisers are reform supporters and the recipients of the promises are reform opponents. Thus, all equilibrium promises share the common characteristic of being in “the reaching across the aisle” type.

In the alternative case where reform supporters have enough voting power to implement the reform, the voting outcome in the absence of promises is efficient. Interestingly, even in that case, promises may be required to achieve stability and minimality. Blocking coalitions can exist where opponents of the reform entice the supporters of the reform with the weakest intensity of preferences with promises contingent on defeating the reform. These promises can persuade weakly motivated supporters to become reform opponents. Once these promises are made, a new coalition is established by combining the opponents of the reform and the supporters who have been persuaded to switch stances. The new coalition becomes a blocking coalition if it has enough voting power to influence the committee to reject the reform, and if all of its members would strictly increase their utilities compared to the voting

outcome in the absence of promises.

The aggregate net gain produced by the blocking coalition is equal to the difference between the aggregate intensity for the status quo of those who oppose the reform and the aggregate intensity for the reform of the coalition of the weakest reform supporters who are numerous enough to form a majority when they join forces with the reform opponents. When the aggregate net gain is negative, reform opponents do not have the incentive to form a blocking coalition. In that case, the zero promises profile is the unique equilibrium. When the aggregate net gain is positive, the equilibrium requires that some promises need to be done to preempt the formation of the blocking coalitions. When the aggregate net gains are small relative to the aggregate surplus of intensity at the disposal of the strongest reform supporters, one round of promises is enough to achieve an equilibrium. In that case, the minimal total transfer is equal to the aggregate net gain that the blocking coalition can achieve out of equilibrium. When the aggregate net gains are large, promising the aggregate net gains can create new targets for enticement which in turn requires additional promises. In that case, the minimal total transfer is larger than the aggregate net gains and is given in closed form as a function of the distribution of *ex ante* intensities. Except in certain knife edge cases, we notice that indeterminacy is a prevalent feature of equilibrium promises.

When considering the equilibrium implications for the identity of promisers and promisees, we find that as a general rule, there always exist equilibria in which the identity of the promisers and promisees conforms to the “reaching across the aisle” type. Additionally, equilibria may also exist in which “circle the wagon” promises are made, with supporters of the reform making promises to other supporters of the reform who have weaker preferences for the reform. However, when the intensities of preferences are homogeneous among the weakest reform supporters, we show that all equilibrium promises are of the reaching across the aisle type.

Finally, we provide an algorithm that describes a sequence of promises from the member with the largest intensities to the members with the lowest intensities. We show that, for any distribution of *ex ante* intensities and majority threshold requirement, the algorithm converges after a finite number of steps to an equilibrium. Among all equilibria, the equilibrium distribution of *ex post* intensities achieved through the

sequence of promises induced by the algorithm has the lowest range.

Related literature. This paper makes a contribution by demonstrating the mathematical feasibility of evaluating promise-related practices in decentralized settings. Through our methodological step forward, we have provided new insights that intersect with three streams of literature.

Our finding that the reform is enacted in equilibrium provides compelling evidence that the practice of contingent promises based on vote outcomes can effectively address the problem of majority coercion. This result contributes to the broader literature on political failures, which aims to identify situations where the political equilibrium outcome can be Pareto-improved, with a focus on restoring efficiency. Scholars such as Becker [1958] and Wittman [1989] have extensively discussed institutional responses to political failures and compared them to standard economic failures. By demonstrating the efficacy of contingent promises in mitigating majority coercion, our study contributes to this literature by reporting a mechanism to improve the overall efficiency of direct democracy voting models. Our result on the effectiveness of promises is reminiscent of the Coase theorem operating in the political market.⁵ The corollary of our result is that efforts to design institutions that promote the practice of promises and decrease the transaction costs associated with them push decentralized decisions mediated by voting toward an efficient outcome.

Second, we contribute to the literature on vote trading. The literature on vote trading, has received relatively less attention in recent decades compared to the enthusiastic efforts made in the 1960s and 1970s. A pivotal argument in the development of this literature is that the voting externality could make trading votes undesirable (Riker and Brams [1973]). Despite the declining interest, recent work by Casella and Palfrey [2019] offered a more optimistic perspective on trading votes, in committee settings where members vote on multiple issues and sequentially trade votes on one issue against votes for other issues (logrolling).⁶ In our research, we

⁵Coase (1960) demonstrated that when property rights are enforced and negotiation/transfer costs are minimized, economic market failures can be mitigated.

⁶Philipson and Snyder [1996] also offers a more positive result on vote trading in the context of an organized centralized vote market where the vote buyers could be party leaders or committee chairs. See also Xefteris and Ziros [2017] for a similar message under different assumptions on the trading market.

extend this literature by examining a decentralized framework, similar to that of Casella and Palfrey [2019], but with a focus on trading through simultaneous promises. We also offer a more upbeat perspective on vote trading within a different context and highlight the potential benefits of permitting promises contingent on the vote outcome. We view this addition as important because many pre-vote interactions in corporate votes, referenda, or political elections can be thought of as promises contingent on the vote outcome, particularly in cases where the final proposal bundles the initial proposal with additional transfers. Such bundled proposals align well with our model, where the enforceability and credibility of promises are assumed to be given. In this context, the assumption of enforceability and credibility of promises becomes an assumption of the credibility of the institutions, which is more natural within democratic systems upholding the rule of law and fostering competition for political office and for corporate control.

Finally, we contribute to the literature on promises that include Myerson [1993], Groseclose and Snyder [1996], Dal Bo [2007], Dekel et al. [2008], Dekel et al. [2009], and more recently Chen and Zápál [2022]. The literature has largely concentrated on models with political representatives and revolves around leaders vying for votes by making pledges or campaign promises. Within this framework, much attention has been devoted to leaders' capacity to utilize budgetary resources to manipulate vote results and gain profits while in office. Through varying assumptions about the game structures, the studies have made significant advancements in this area with an emphasis on the sequencing of promises. Our study offers a different perspective by investigating the potential advantages of outcome-contingent promises in a decentralized setting. In our context, promises happen simultaneously within the committee (or the electorate) without a designated leader. Rather than examining this practice solely within the traditional political agency framework, we demonstrate how vote trading through promises can facilitate agreement and drive efficient outcomes in a direct democracy model. By exploring the potential benefits of vote-contingent promises in this distinct context, our research underscores the need for a broader examination of this practice.

Our approach also differs from previous studies on outcome-contingent promises by incorporating the principle of least action, which assumes minimal aggregate transfer

promises. This principle aligns with the standard economic theory of cost minimization since the utilitarian cost of reaching an efficient agreement is kept at its minimum level. The principle of least action is bundled with the principle of stability in our analysis, allowing us to make general predictions about the political equilibrium. Despite the inherent indeterminacy that can arise in decentralized decision-making settings where the median voter theorem is not applicable, our approach provides a framework for understanding and predicting the outcomes of such settings.

In Section 2 we describe the model, in Section 3 we define and characterize the stable promises, in Section 4 we define and establish the existence and indeterminacy of the political equilibrium and provide some of its general implications. We describe the equilibrium implications in Section 5, and we discuss across the aisle promises and an equilibrium selection based on an algorithm in Section 6. In Appendix A we give the proofs of all the results of the paper and in Appendix B we describe the selection algorithm and show its convergence to a unique equilibrium.

2 The model

Consider a committee $\mathbb{I} = \{1, \dots, I\}$ of I members faced with a vote on a reform. Based on the vote, the committee's decision is to adopt the reform "R" or to turn it down and support the status quo "S." Each voter i is characterized by a parameter u_i representing member i 's *intensity of preferences* for the reform relative to the status quo (or simply intensity). Normalizing the (cardinal) utility derived from the status quo for each voter to 0, the parameter u_i represents the utility experienced by voter i when the reform is adopted. A committee member with intensity $u_i \geq 0$ supports the reform while a member with intensity $u_i < 0$ favors the status quo.⁷ We order the committee members so that the intensities u_i are non-decreasing in i , that is,

$$u_1 \leq \dots \leq u_I \tag{1}$$

⁷Breaking the tie $u_i = 0$ by favoring the status quo instead of the reform or by randomizing the committee's choice between the two policies does not change the conclusions of our analysis.

and denote by \mathbf{u} the vector $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_I)$. Relative to the status quo, adopting reform is socially optimal,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i > 0. \quad (2)$$

The aggregate intensity $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i > 0$ represents the utilitarian welfare gain that the reform generates relative to the status quo. Condition (2) is not restrictive, because the alternative assumption $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i < 0$ would imply that the status quo is the efficient outcome and by symmetry all the results of the model would hold for the status quo alternative. We assume that there are $n \in \mathbb{I}$ reform opponents, denote the coalition of reform opponents (or status quo supporters) by \mathcal{C}^S and the coalition of reform supporters by \mathcal{C}^R :

$$\mathcal{C}^S := \{i : u_i < 0\} \equiv \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad \mathcal{C}^R := \{i : u_i \geq 0\} \equiv \{n+1, \dots, I\}. \quad (3)$$

The aggregate intensity of preferences of reform and status quo supporters, respectively, are denoted by

$$U_R := \sum_{\mathcal{C}^R} |u_i| \equiv \sum_{\mathcal{C}^R} u_i, \quad U_S := \sum_{\mathcal{C}^S} |u_i| \equiv \sum_{\mathcal{C}^S} (-u_i). \quad (4)$$

Notice that both U_R and U_S are non negative quantities and that $U_R - U_S = \sum_{\mathbb{I}} u_i > 0$.

Prior to voting, we consider a transferable utility framework where any committee member can make a utility transfer promise contingent on the committee decision to any other committee member(s). The transfer promises can take the form of money payments or favors as long as these transfers translate into utilities. The transferable utility assumption holds if utility is quasilinear in money and the transfers take the form of money payments.⁸

Contingent transfer promises are binding commitments. That is, any transfer promises contingent on a specific voting outcome *must* be honored by the promisers in favor of the recipients (“promisees”) if that outcome is realized. For instance, a transfer promise contingent on reform rejection has to be honored if the reform is rejected. Transfer promises alter the incentives to vote for the reform but voters

⁸See Bergstrom and Varian [1985] and Chiappori and Gugl [2020] for more general conditions on preferences and market environments allowing transferable utility representations.

retain their voting rights. As is standard in the literature, we assume that the transfer promises are credible and enforceable.⁹

Transfer promises are unconstrained in terms of both their cardinal impact on the utility and in terms of the identity of the promisers and the promisees. A promise profile contingent on adopting the reform is denoted by $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_I) \in \mathbb{R}^I$. When $r_i \geq 0$, committee member i is a net promisee and she gets a net utility increase of r_i when the reform is adopted by the committee. When $r_i \leq 0$, committee member i is a net promisor and her utility decreases by $|r_i|$ when the reform is adopted by the committee. Notice that the net promise r_i is the aggregation of all promises that have been made to member i by other committee members, net of the promises that have been initiated by member i to other committee members. For each committee member, the incentives to vote for the reform are entirely determined by the net aggregate flow of promises. Hence we can assume without loss of generality that the net aggregate flow of promises summarized by the profile \mathbf{r} , is the sole determinant of any committee member's voting decision. Because the utilities are transferred from the promisers to the promisees, any promises profile must satisfy the zero sum condition,

$$\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P} := \{\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_I) \in \mathbb{R}^I \mid \sum_{\mathbb{I}} x_i = 0\}. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, a payment promise profile contingent on the reform being defeated is denoted by $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_I) \in \mathcal{P}$ where s_i is the net utility increase of committee member i when the reform is defeated.

When facing a vote on the reform with the outstanding promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$, each committee member casts her vote to maximize self-interest. When $u_i + r_i \geq s_i$, member i votes for the reform; Otherwise, she votes for the status quo. We assume thus all committee members vote *sincerely*. Sincere voting is a natural assumption in our framework since all voters have the same information and voting is costless.¹⁰

⁹The assumption would be natural in a repeated setting where group members have incentives to develop a reputation for not renegeing on promises.

¹⁰In our model, all model parameters are common knowledge and therefore there is no reason for voters to be strategic. Sincere voting is an undominated strategy in our context. When a committee member is pivotal, sincere voting is a dominating strategy because voting sincerely enacts her preferred policy. When a committee member is non-pivotal, sincere voting is an undominated

The committee is ruled by a κ -majority rule for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{I}$; the reform is adopted if and only if at least κ votes are in favor of the reform. Special cases of the κ -majority rule range from simple majority ($\kappa = \kappa_I$ where κ_I is the smallest integer larger than $I/2$), to unanimity where $\kappa = I$. When $\kappa_I < \kappa < I$, the κ -voting rule is a supermajority rule. The voting share threshold to adopt the status quo policy is given by $\widehat{\kappa}$ where

$$\widehat{\kappa} := I - \kappa + 1. \quad (6)$$

When $\widehat{\kappa}$ committee members vote for the status quo, then the committee adopts the status quo. Any κ -voting rule can alternatively be defined by two sets of *decisive coalitions*, \mathcal{D}^R and \mathcal{D}^S , that are sets of subsets of \mathbb{I} —that is, elements of $2^{\mathbb{I}}$. A coalition is decisive for adopting (resp. defeating) the reform if and only if the group adopts (resp. defeats) the reform when all members of that coalition vote for (resp. against) the reform. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{D}^R := \{\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{I} : |\mathcal{C}| \geq \kappa\}, \quad \mathcal{D}^S := \{\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{I} : |\mathcal{C}| \geq \widehat{\kappa}\}. \quad (7)$$

We denote by $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \{R, S\}$ the committee decision or voting outcome when facing the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) .

The utility vector derived by committee members from the voting outcome is denoted by $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} = (v_1^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}, v_2^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}, \dots, v_I^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}})$ and is given by

$$\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} := \begin{cases} \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r}, & \text{if } D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R; \\ \mathbf{s}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

or more succinctly, $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r})1_{\{D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})=R\}} + \mathbf{s}1_{\{D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})=S\}}$. In particular, the utility derived from the voting outcome in the absence of the promises—meaning $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$ where $\mathbf{0}$ is the zero vector of size I —is $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}} = \mathbf{u}1_{\{D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})=R\}}$.

3 Stable promises: Definition and characterization

We focus our attention on promises profiles that are stable in the sense that once in place, no coalition can arrange additional promises among its members that would

strategy because the vote of a non-pivotal member is irrelevant.

reverse the committee decision and yield a better outcome for all its members. If such coalitions exist, we qualify them as *blocking coalitions* and define them as follows.

Definition 1. [*Blocking coalitions*] Assume the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ is in place.

When $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$, a coalition \mathcal{C} blocks the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) if there exists an alternative promises profile contingent on adopting the status quo $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$ and satisfying $\mathcal{C} = \{i : s'_i \neq s_i\}$, such that a deviation from (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) to $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$ implies

1. a reversal of the committee decision: $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}') = S$ and,
2. individual benefits for all members of that coalition: $v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}'} > v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}$ holds for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$.

When $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$, a coalition \mathcal{C} blocks the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) if there exists an alternative promises profile contingent on adopting the reform $\mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{P}$ and satisfying $\mathcal{C} = \{i : r'_i \neq r_i\}$, such that a deviation from (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) to $(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s})$ implies

1. a reversal of the committee decision: $D(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}) = R$ and,
2. individual benefits for all members of that coalition: $v_i^{\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}} > v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}$ holds for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$.

To illustrate Definition 1, assume the contingent transfers $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ are promised and that the committee decision is $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$. When a blocking coalition \mathcal{C} exists, some of its members deviate from (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) by launching an additional round of promises contingent on rejecting the reform, targeting the remaining members of that coalition. These promises are designed to entice the promisees to cast pivotal votes against the reform and thereby reverse the committee decision. Denote these incremental promises by $\tilde{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathcal{P}$ and notice that $\mathcal{C} = \{i : \tilde{s}_i \neq 0\}$. Since these promises are internal to the coalition \mathcal{C} , we have $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \tilde{s}_i = 0$. The resulting *cumulative* promises profile contingent on the status quo is given by $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s} + \tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ and we have, $s'_i \neq s_i$ if and only if $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}') = S$. The condition $v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}'} > v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}$ holds for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and says that all members of the blocking coalition \mathcal{C} benefit from the deviation and that they will all vote against the reform since

$$s'_i \equiv v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}'} > v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} \equiv u_i + r_i.$$

Similarly, when $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$, a blocking coalition can deviate with incremental promises contingent on adopting the reform. We now utilize the concept of blocking coalitions to define stable promises.

Definition 2. [*Stable promises*] *The promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ is stable if and only if there exists no blocking coalition for (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) .*

Thus, a promise profile is stable if once it is in place, there is no incentive for any coalition to launch additional promises and reverse the group decision to get a strictly Pareto improving allocation (for the coalition). We denote the set of stable promises profiles by

$$\mathcal{S} := \{(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2 \mid (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \text{ is stable}\} \quad (9)$$

and provide a characterization of this set in the next proposition.

Proposition 1. [*Characterization of stable promises*] *The promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ is stable if and only if*

$$\sum_{\mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq \sum_{\mathcal{C}} s_i \text{ for all coalitions } \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, any stable promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{S}$ leads the committee to enact the reform, that is, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$.

Proposition 1 shows that the voting outcome associated with each stable promises profile is socially optimal since the committee adopts the reform. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the efficiency result shows that promises contingent on the committee decision are effective in removing any inefficiency that may be caused by voting externalities. To see this, assume that more than $\hat{\kappa} = I - \kappa + 1$ members vote against the reform in the absence of promises. The committee then rejects the reform and creates a frustrated losing coalition: the coalition supporting the reform has a larger aggregate intensity of preferences than the aggregate intensity for the status quo of the coalition of reform opponents and yet the committee rejects the reform because reform supporters do not have enough voting power. The inefficiency arises because binary voting does not allow the expression of intensity of preferences. Allowing promises with arbitrary transfers permits reform supporters to modulate their actions. They

get the chance to express their intensity of preferences not only by voting, but also by launching promises contingent on the reform in order to convert opponents to supporters.

Proposition 1 also shows that promises profiles enabling the reform are stable if and only if, when compared to the status quo alternative, the reform is socially optimal for any decisive coalitions that can induce the group to overturn the reform. As a result, stability is characterized by the system of linear inequalities (10), which define a convex polyhedron in non degenerate cases, and this allows us to carry out a fairly detailed analysis of stable promises.

To illustrate the usefulness of the characterization (10), assume that the zero (empty) promises profile ($\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$) leads to the committee to adopt the reform, $D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = R$. By inequality (2), the zero promises profile ($\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}$) satisfies the condition (10) for the grand coalition $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{I}$. However, for the promises profile ($\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}$) to be stable, we need to have $\sum_{\mathcal{C}} u_i > 0$ not only for the grand coalition but also for every decisive coalitions whose members can collectively defeat the reform—that is, for all coalitions of size weakly larger than $\hat{\kappa}$. Given the ordering of *ex ante* intensities (1), the promises profile ($\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}$) is stable if and only if $\sum_1^{\hat{\kappa}} u_i \geq 0$. The characterization in Proposition 1 offers therefore a practical tool to verify whether a promises profile is stable. We now discuss an example to illustrate further the result in Proposition 1.

Example 1. *Consider a committee with 3 members whose intensities are given by*

$$\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3) = (-4, 1, 5).$$

Assume the committee is ruled by the simple majority rule $\kappa = \hat{\kappa} = 2$ so that both \mathcal{D}^R and \mathcal{D}^S consist of coalitions that have a cardinality 2 or higher. The reform is socially optimal since $\sum_i u_i = 2 > 0$. In the absence of promises, the reform is adopted since both member 2 and 3 vote for it, and thus $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}} = (-4, 1, 5)$. By Proposition 1, the empty promise profile ($\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}$) is not stable because $u_1 + u_2 = -3 < 0$ and therefore the reform is not socially optimal for the decisive coalition $\{1, 2\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$. The coalition $\{1, 2\}$ is thus a blocking coalition for the no trading promises profile ($\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}$). Member 1 can promise to pay member 2 an amount $s_2 = 2$ if the reform is defeated. The resulting group decision after the promises ($\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s} = (-2, 2, 0)$) are in place is thus to defeat the reform because both member 1 and 2 vote for S . The

voting outcome is then $D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}) = S$ and the resulting intensity is $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}} = (-2, 2, 0)$. Because $v_1^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}} = -2 > -4 = v_1^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}}$ and, $v_2^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}} = 2 > 1 = v_2^{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}}$, the coalition $\{1, 2\}$ is a blocking coalition for the promise profile $(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$.

Consider now the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) := ((3, 0, -3), \mathbf{0})$ that enacts the reform and imply the ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}} = (-1, 1, 2)$. Since inequality (10) holds for the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0})$ for all coalitions of size 2 and above, the promises profile $(\mathbf{r} = (3, 0, -3), \mathbf{0})$ is stable. Following the same logic, one can check that there are multiple other stable promises profiles.

Example 1 illustrate that stable promises enacts the reform. The example also points to an indeterminacy of stable promises profiles. Precluding the formation of blocking coalitions still leaves multiple ways to structure the promises of transfers across committee members to achieve stability. In addition, the example illustrates another cause of multiplicity. The promises contingent on defeating the reform are not pinned down because they are never honoured. For example, we can associate the stable promises profile $((3, 0, -3), \mathbf{0})$ with an equivalence class of stable promises of the form $((3, 0 - 3) + \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s})$ for an arbitrary $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$. This is because the inequalities (10) hold for any pair of promises (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) if and only if it holds for the pair of promises $(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{0})$.

In the following proposition, we establish the existence, multiplicity, and efficiency of stable promises. Before stating the proposition, denote by \mathcal{S}_0 the set of stable promises that are contingent only on the reform being adopted

$$\mathcal{S}_0 := \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P} \mid (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Proposition 2. [*Existence and multiplicity of stable promises*] *The following hold:*

(i) *Stable promises contingent on adopting the reform exist and are indeterminate: the set \mathcal{S}_0 is non-empty and contains multiple elements.*

(ii) *The promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}$ is in the set \mathcal{S} if and only if $(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{0}) \in \mathcal{S}_0$, and hence*

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}) \mid \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0 \text{ and } \mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}\}. \quad (11)$$

Proposition 2 shows that there are multiple stable promises and that the multiplicity occurs even if they are restricted to the set \mathcal{S}_0 of promises that are contingent

only on reform adoption. The fact that the set of stable promises \mathcal{S}_0 contains multiple elements suggests that the requirement of stability does not identify how the promisers divide the net benefit that they can get together. The multiplicity of stable promises in the set \mathcal{S} is even more fundamental: the restriction of stability allows *any* promises contingent on the reform being adopted to be part of a stable promises profile from the set \mathcal{S} when the promises contingent on the status quo \mathbf{s} are chosen appropriately.¹¹

In the next section, we define the political equilibrium and establish existence and multiplicity.

4 Equilibrium promises: Existence and general properties

The political equilibrium is defined as the set of promises profiles that maintain stability while minimizing total transfer promises. This assumption of total transfer minimization captures the need to minimize unmodeled expenses associated with the commitments that actually make up the promises.

We define the total promises transfer for any promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} |r_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} |s_i|. \quad (12)$$

For any stable promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{E}$, we have $|r_i - s_i| \leq |r_i| + |s_i|$ and hence, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{0}} \leq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}}$. In order to minimize the total promises transfer (12) we can restrict our attention to the set \mathcal{S}_0 of equilibrium promises which only require transfers if the reform is adopted. To simplify the exposition, we make the following notation changes

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} := \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} |r_i|, \quad \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}} := \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}}. \quad (13)$$

and define equilibrium promise profiles as follows:

¹¹To see this, consider a stable profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0})$ and observe that the promises profile $(\mathbf{0}, -\mathbf{r})$ is also stable. Therefore, for any promises profile contingent on adopting the reform $\mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{P}$, the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r})$ is also stable.

Definition 3 (Equilibrium promises profiles). A promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ contingent on the reform is an equilibrium if (i) it is stable and, (ii) it minimizes the total promises transfer among all stable promises. The set of equilibrium promises is therefore given by

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0 \mid \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \inf_{\mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{S}_0} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}'}\}.$$

We have the following simple existence result.

Proposition 3 (Existence). The set of equilibrium promises \mathcal{E} is not empty.

Relative to stability, the equilibrium adds the restriction that stability is achieved in the “cheapest possible way”. The set of equilibrium promises \mathcal{E} is smaller than the set of stable promises \mathcal{S}_0 , but indeterminacy is not eliminated by the minimum total transfer restriction as the following example illustrates.

Example 2. Reconsider the committee with 3 members whose intensities are given by $\mathbf{u} = (-4, 1, 5)$ that we discussed in Example 1. Recall that the committee is ruled by a majority rule $\kappa = \widehat{\kappa} = 2$. Inequality (10) shows that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ is stable if and only if:

$$r_1 + r_2 \geq 3, \quad r_1 + r_3 \geq -1, \quad r_2 + r_3 \geq -6, \quad r_1 + r_2 + r_3 = 0.$$

Direct calculations show that $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P} \mid r_1 \leq 6, r_3 \leq -3, -r_2 = r_1 + r_3 \geq -1\}$. Therefore there are multiple stable promises and the set \mathcal{S}_0 a triangle in the plane (r_1, r_3) with vertices $(2, -3)$, $(6, -3)$ and $(6, -7)$. For any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$, we have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2}(|r_1| + |r_1 + r_3| + |r_3|) \geq |r_3| \geq 3$. On the other hand, any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ satisfies $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = 3$ if and only if $r_3 = -3$ and $2 \leq r_1 \leq 3$. That is, in the plane (r_1, r_3) , the set of equilibrium promises is a subset of \mathcal{S}_0 represented by the horizontal side of the triangle defined by the vertices $(2, -3)$ and $(3, -3)$. Therefore, multiple equilibrium promises generate the minimum total transfer $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = 3$. To summarize, the set of stable promises is a triangle and the set of equilibria is a subset of one of the edges of that triangle.

Example 2 illustrates that multiplicity of the stable promises persists even when we focus on the promises that minimize the total promises transfer (12). However, by focusing on these minimizing equilibria, we are able to identify some general properties of the structure of promises that will hold for all equilibria. In the next proposition, we give some general properties of equilibrium promises, which show that the

requirements of stability and transfer minimization push toward an equalization of intensities.

Proposition 4. [*Push toward equality*] For any equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there exists a committee member $k_* \in \mathcal{C}^R$ such that

$$-u_j \leq r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i, \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^r \leq v_j^r \quad \text{for all} \quad i < k_* \leq j \quad (14)$$

and the total promises transfer satisfies of the promises profile \mathbf{r}

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i < k_*} r_i = \sum_{j \geq k_*} (-r_j). \quad (15)$$

Proposition 4 shows that, in any equilibrium, the flow of promises should be initiated by reform supporters with an *ex ante* intensity that is larger than that of a critical reform supporter k_* . Moreover, the promisors are subject to an individual rationality constraint precluding them from promising more than the utility gained when the reform is adopted. Promise recipients have an *ex ante* intensity that is lower than that of the critical member k_* and can be reform opponents or reform supporters. As a result, equilibrium promises lead to an *ex post* distribution of utilities across committee members that is more egalitarian than the *ex ante* distribution of utilities. This happens because members with large *ex ante* intensity of preferences promise transfers to members with low intensity of preferences contingent of the reform being adopted. The specific location of the critical committee member k_* depends on the voting rule and the *ex ante* distribution of the intensity of preferences. However, the *ex post* intensities of the promisors are always larger than those of the promisees as inequalities (14) show.

Proposition 4 is however agnostic about the amount of transfer promises as well as the identity of promisees. In particular the promisees can be reform supporters or reform opponents. The amount of transfer promises depends on the *ex ante* distribution of the intensity of preferences and the majority threshold κ . In the next subsections, we make specific assumptions on the distribution of *ex ante* intensities and derive a more detailed description of the equilibrium transfer promises. In order to describe the promises profiles, we say that a promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ is of the *reaching across the aisle* type if all the recipients of the promises are reform opponents:

$$r_i > 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^S \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in \mathbb{I}.$$

Alternatively, when some recipients of promises are reform supporters and some others are reform opponents, we say that the promises profile \mathbf{r} has some *circle the wagon* transfers.

5 Equilibrium promises implications

In this section, we discuss some general properties of the set \mathcal{E} of equilibrium promises. We identify the magnitude and directions of the flow of promises that achieve stability with the lowest total transfers. In the first subsection, we study the case where reform supporters lacks the voting power to enact the reform without making promises. This situation is commonly referred to as “frustrated minorities” or alternatively as a “coercive majority”. In the second subsection, we study the case where reform supporters possess sufficient voting power to enact the reform even without resorting to promises.

5.1 Equilibrium when the coalition of reform opponents is decisive

We assume in this subsection that the reform does not have enough voting support in the absence of promises, $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$ with $2 \leq \kappa$.¹² Under this assumption, $D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = S$. When the committee decision is taken by simple majority rule, the assumption $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$ on the distribution of intensity of preferences creates a “tyranny of the majority” problem leading the committee to an inefficient outcome. In this case, the coalition \mathcal{C}^R is not decisive and, since $U_R > U_S$, we qualify it as *an intense κ -minority*. The next proposition provides some general properties of the transfers that need to be promised in any equilibrium when $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$.

Proposition 5. [*Equilibrium payment promises with an intense κ -minority*]

Consider a committee where the coalition supporting the reform is not decisive, $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$. A promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ is an equilibrium if and only if

1. *All reform supporters are promisors and the promises satisfy:*

¹²When $\kappa = 1$, the reform will always be enacted by voting as long as it has support from at least one member, which it does by assumption. We therefore excluded the case $\kappa = 1$ in this section.

- (a) *The individual rationality and non-positivity constraint $-u_i \leq r_i \leq 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^R$ and,*
- (b) *the aggregate promises transfer of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R is given by $\sum_{\mathcal{C}^R} r_i = -U_S$.*

2. *All promisees are reform opponents and the promises $(r_i)_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S}$ satisfy*

- (a) *When $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa - 1$, each member $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$ is promised the transfer $r_i = -u_i > 0$ just to make her indifferent between the reform and the status quo, $v_i^r = 0$.*
- (b) *When $|\mathcal{C}^R| = \kappa - 1$, the promises to the members of \mathcal{C}^S are non negative, $r_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and satisfy*

i. $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = U_S$

- ii. *The ex post intensities of members in \mathcal{C}^S cannot exceed those of members in \mathcal{C}^R : $v_i^r \leq v_j^r$ for any $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$.*

Moreover, The equilibrium promises profiles $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ are indeterminate but all have identical total transfer promises $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = U_S$.

Proposition 5 shows that equilibrium promises profile satisfy $\sum_{\mathcal{C}^R} r_i = -U_S = -\sum_{\mathcal{C}^S} r_i$. This implies in equilibrium, members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R supporting the reform collectively compensate members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S for the aggregate disutility that they experience when the reform is adopted. In other terms, all equilibria consist of promises profiles of the reaching across the aisle type. The critical member k_* from Proposition 4 is given by $k_* = n + 1$, so that the κ -minority reform supporters are promisers and reform opponents are promisees. The equilibrium leaves multiple ways for the members of the minority coalition \mathcal{C}^R to divide the gains that they collectively obtain by enticing the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S to vote for the reform. Whether there is an additional indeterminacy of the promises transfers to the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S depends on the size of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R .

If the coalition \mathcal{C}^R is short at least 2 members of being decisive ($|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa - 1$), then the distribution of equilibrium promises among promisees is unique. After receiving the promises, all members of \mathcal{C}^S are indifferent between voting for or against the

reform. In that case, the promises to the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S are identical for all equilibria and are determined by the *ex ante* intensity of preferences, $r_i = -u_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$. Recalling our tie breaking assumption the committee members vote for the reform when indifferent between the alternative R and S , notice that when $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa - 1$, there is a unanimous vote for the reform after the equilibrium promises have been made.

When the coalition \mathcal{C}^R is just one member short of being decisive ($|\mathcal{C}^R| = \kappa - 1$), the promises to the members of \mathcal{C}^S are indeterminate. In that case, multiple distributions of promises across the members of the receiving coalition \mathcal{C}^S can form an equilibrium provided that they satisfy the requirement 2.b.ii of Proposition 5. The requirement restricts the promises directed to each member of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S to be non-negative and to produce *ex post* intensities of preferences that maintain the ordering across the coalitions of promisers and promisees of the *ex ante* intensity of preferences. Changing the ordering of interim intensities across the coalition \mathcal{C}^R and \mathcal{C}^S will create incentives to engage in additional rounds of promises and contradict the stability requirement of the equilibrium. When $|\mathcal{C}^R| = \kappa - 1$, the committee adopts the reform after the promises are made but the vote for the reform may not be unanimous.

We now discuss an example to illustrate the results of Proposition 5.

Example 3. Consider a committee with 5 members ruled by a simple majority rule, $\kappa = 3$. The intensities are given by

$$\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5) = (-2, -1, -1, 8, 10).$$

The coalition supporting the reform is $\mathcal{C}^R = \{4, 5\}$ and has an aggregate intensity $U^R = 18$. The coalition supporting the status quo is $\mathcal{C}^S = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and has an aggregate intensity $U^S = 4$. The minority coalition $\mathcal{C}^R = \{4, 5\}$ is one member short of being decisive. Without promises, the reform is defeated, $D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = S$ and each member of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R is dissatisfied with the committee choice. By Proposition 5, in any equilibrium, members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R promise the aggregate transfer $U^S = 4$ contingent on reform adoption to the members of coalition \mathcal{C}^S . Promises r_4 and r_5 satisfy the individual rationality and non-positivity constraints $-8 \leq r_4 \leq 0$, $-10 \leq r_5 \leq 0$ and the promises satisfy no dissipation constraint $r_4 + r_5 = -4$. Following condition 2.b.ii from Proposition 5 the promises r_1, r_2 and r_3 must satisfy the

non-negativity constraint $0 \leq \min\{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ and the ordering of ex post intensities constraint $\max\{-2 + r_1, -1 + r_2, -1 + r_3\} \leq \min\{8 + r_4, 10 + r_5\}$. For example the equilibrium promises profiles $\mathbf{r}_1 = (2, 1, 1, 0, -4)$ and $\mathbf{r}_2 = (0, 0, 4, -2, -2)$ produce the respective ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_1} = (0, 0, 0, 8, 6)$, $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_2} = (-2, -1, 3, 6, 8)$. Under the promises profile \mathbf{r}_1 , there is a unanimous vote for the reform. Under the equilibrium promises profile \mathbf{r}_2 , there is majority support for the reform but members 1 and 2 vote against it.

The promises profile $\mathbf{r}_3 = (0, 0, 4, -4, 0)$ produces the ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_3} = (-2, -1, 3, 2, 10)$ and leads the committee to adopt the reform. The promises profile \mathbf{r}_3 is not an equilibrium, however, because the utility of member 3, $v_3^{\mathbf{r}_3} = 3$ is larger than that of member 4, $v_4^{\mathbf{r}_3} = 2$. The promises profile \mathbf{r}_3 is not stable because the coalition $\{1, 2, 4\}$ has an aggregate intensity of $-2 + (-1) + 2 = -1 < 0$ and can thus form a blocking coalition to profile \mathbf{r}_3 . This is because member 4 promises a transfer of 4 and ended up with an ex post intensity of 2. This low level of intensity renders him an affordable target of enticement from members 1 and 2 who will form a blocking coalition by promising member 4 a transfer of up to $s_4 = 3$ if the reform is rejected.

In the next subsection, we study the equilibrium that emerges when the committee would adopt the reform in the absence of promises.

5.2 Committee with a decisive coalition of reform supporters

In this subsection, we assume that the reform has enough support, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ so that the group adopts the reform, $D(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}) = R$. Recalling definitions (3), notice that $n \leq I - \kappa \equiv \hat{\kappa} - 1$ and that $u_i < 0 \leq u_j$, for $i \leq n < j$. In the absence of promises, members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R are numerous enough to lead the group to their preferred policy R . Members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S can however promise transfers contingent on defeating the reform to some members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R to increase the support for their preferred policy S and lead the committee to defeat the reform. The members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^R who are more susceptible to being enticed to vote for the status quo are those with the lowest *ex ante* intensity of preferences for the reform. Their votes for the status quo become pivotal if a blocking coalition exists. We denote the

coalition of these members by

$$\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R := \{n + 1, \dots, \widehat{\kappa}\}.$$

Notice that the members of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ are the cheapest to entice into voting for S and, since $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{1, \dots, \widehat{\kappa}\}$, members of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ are numerous enough to form a decisive coalition for the status quo with \mathcal{C}^S . Recall that $0 \leq u_i$ for all $i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and denote by

$$\underline{U}^R := \sum_{\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i \equiv \sum_{i=n+1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i$$

the aggregate intensity of preferences for the reform of the coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$.

For the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S , the incentive to entice members of the coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to vote for the alternative S arises only when there are gains from trade. Specifically, by switching from the decision R to the decision S , members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S gain the aggregate amount U^S . To entice members of the coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to vote for S , members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S incur the aggregate cost \underline{U}^R . Therefore we define the aggregate gains from trade of the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S as

$$G^S := U^S - \underline{U}^R = - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i \equiv - \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i. \quad (16)$$

5.2.1 Equilibrium when there are no gains from trade: $G^S \leq 0$

The following results identify the unique equilibrium promises profile when there are no gains from trade.

Proposition 6. *[No promises equilibrium in the absence of gains from trade] Consider a committee with more reform supporters than the κ -majority requirement, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$. Assume the gain from trade defined in equation (16) is non positive, $G^S \leq 0$. Then $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ is the unique equilibrium, that is, $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.*

When the gain from trade G^S is negative, the members of the coalition supporting the alternative S have a smaller aggregate intensity of preferences than the required cost to change the group decision from R to S . That cost is given by \underline{U}^R and represents the aggregate intensity of preferences of the least intense reform supporters who can form, with the reform opponents, the smallest decisive coalition for the status quo.

Proposition 6 shows that when the gain from trade G^S is non positive, the coalition \mathcal{C}^S has no incentive to entice committee members supporting the reform to vote against it. Therefore no blocking coalition for the zero promises profile exists. As a result, there will be no need for the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to preempt attempts to form blocking coalitions and the resulting equilibrium is a no promise equilibrium.

5.2.2 Equilibria when there are gains from trade and preemption is affordable

We now consider the case where the gain from trade G^S is positive with $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$. We also assume without loss of generality that $2 \leq \kappa$. If $\kappa = 1$, then $\hat{\kappa} = \mathbb{I}$ so $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \mathcal{C}^R$ and, given condition (2), we have $G^S = -\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i < 0$ which contradicts the assumption that $G^S > 0$.

When the gains from trade are positive, blocking coalitions for the zero promises profile exist. The members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ have then to promise transfers to members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to preempt attempts to form blocking coalitions. We first discuss an example to illustrate the equilibrium promises intuitively, before giving a proposition that covers more general situations.

Example 4. Consider a committee with $I = 4$ members, and $\kappa = 3$, and $\mathbf{u} = (-5, 1, 3, 10)$. In this case $\mathcal{C}^S = \{1\}$, $\mathcal{C}^R = \{2, 3, 4\}$, $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{2\}$, $\mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{3, 4\}$, and $G^S = 4$.

The intuition suggests that, in equilibrium, the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{3, 4\}$ should promise a total of $G^S = 4$ to the coalition $\{1, 2\}$. The aggregate intensity of the coalition $\{3, 4\}$ is $3 + 10 = 13$ and therefore it can afford to promise a transfer of 4 without violating the ordering condition for ex post intensities and creating incentives for new rounds of promises.

Consistent with the case of an intense minority covered in Section 5.1, the equilibria are not unique. For example, all the following promises are equilibria: $\mathbf{r}_1 = (2, 2, 0, -4)$, $\mathbf{r}_2 = (3, 1, -1, -3)$, $\mathbf{r}_3 = (4, 0, -1, -3)$, and $\mathbf{r}_4 = (4, 0, -2, -2)$. They produce the respective ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_1} = (-3, 3, 3, 6)$, $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_2} = (-2, 2, 2, 7)$, $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_3} = (-1, 1, 2, 7)$ and, $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_4} = (-1, 1, 1, 8)$. However, the promises profile $\mathbf{r}_5 = (2, 2, -1, -3)$ achieves the minimum total transfer promises $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}_5} = 4$ but is not an equilibrium. This is because the resulting ex post

intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_5} = (-3, 3, 2, 7)$ violate the ordering condition $v_2^{\mathbf{r}_5} > v_3^{\mathbf{r}_5}$. Because $v_1^{\mathbf{r}_5} + v_3^{\mathbf{r}_5} = -1 < 0$, Proposition 1 shows that the promises profile \mathbf{r}_5 is not stable. This happens because, after \mathbf{r}_5 is in place, member 3 becomes a new target for enticement by member 1. The coalition $\{1, 3\}$ becomes a blocking coalition and hence the promise \mathbf{r}_5 is unstable and therefore it is not an equilibrium.

In the following proposition, we show that the intuition in Example 4 holds more generally and provide conditions under which the coalition of promisors can afford to preempt new rounds of promises and achieve stability. Before stating the results in a proposition, recall $|\mathcal{C}^S| = n$ and denote by \bar{U}^R the aggregate intensity of preferences of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ defined by

$$\bar{U}^R := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_j \equiv \sum_{j=\hat{\kappa}+1}^I u_j. \quad (17)$$

Moreover, for each $i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ define the aggregate surplus of intensity of preferences of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ relative to member i by

$$\Delta U_i := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [u_j - u_i] \equiv \sum_{j=\hat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_j - u_i]. \quad (18)$$

The variable ΔU_i represents the maximum aggregate transfer that members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ can promise while keeping their *ex post* intensities above that of member i . When $\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$ is larger than G^S , the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ can afford to promise a total transfer of G^S while maintaining their *ex post* intensities above that of all the members of the coalition of promisees $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. In this case, members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ can be compensated for the forgone gain realized by forming a blocking coalition, *i.e.* G^S , without creating new targets for enticement against the reform.

The following proposition establishes that when $G^S \leq \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$, all equilibria involve a total transfer promises of G^S from the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. Importantly, in all equilibria, the *ex post* individual intensities remain larger for all members of $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ than that of any member of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. Before stating the proposition, we recall that $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{1, \dots, \hat{\kappa}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{\hat{\kappa} + 1, \dots, I\}$.

Proposition 7. [*Equilibrium promises with first order preemption.*] Consider a committee in which the support for the reform is larger than the κ -majority requirement, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ with $2 \leq \kappa$. Assume the gain from trade defined in equation (16) satisfies $0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$. Equilibrium promises profiles $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ are indeterminate and any promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ is an equilibrium if and only if

1. Members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ are promisors subject to individual rationality constraints while members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ are promisees:

$$-u_j \leq r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i, \quad \forall i \leq \widehat{\kappa} < j. \quad (19)$$

2. The *ex post* intensities of members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ cannot exceed those of members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \forall i \leq \widehat{\kappa} < j. \quad (20)$$

3. The total promises transfer induced by \mathbf{r} is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = G^S = \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} r_i = - \sum_{j=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I r_j. \quad (21)$$

Proposition 7 shows that, under the assumption $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ and $0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$, all equilibria require members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to promise a total transfer of G^S to the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. The objective of this transfer is to preempt members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S from enticing members of the coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to cast pivotal votes against the reform. Proposition 7 also shows that multiplicity occurs for two reasons. First, the members of the promisors coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ can divide the cost of preemption in different ways among themselves. Multiplicity also occurs because the transfer promises to the coalition of promisees $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ can be distributed in different ways. However, the distributions of promises are constrained by inequality (20) to generate *ex post* intensities of preferences that are lower for the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ than for the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$.

This represents a binding political constraint. To see the nature of the political constraint, consider a slight variation of Example 4, where a committee with $I = 4$ members has simple majority rule, $\kappa = 3$, and where the *ex ante* intensities are

given by $\mathbf{u} = (-5, 1, 3, 3)$. Proposition 7 applies to this example with $\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} \equiv \Delta U_2 = G^S = 4$ and in any equilibrium, the coalition $\{3, 4\}$ must promise a transfer of 4 to the coalition $\{1, 2\}$. In equilibrium however, the coalition of promisers $\{3, 4\}$ cannot transfer anything to the weak reform supporter member 2 without reversing the order of *ex post* intensities. This means that all equilibrium promises profiles are of the reaching across the aisle type.

Similarly, consider a different variation of Example 4 where a committee with $I = 4$ members, a $\kappa = 3$ voting rule, and *ex ante* intensities $\mathbf{u} = (-5, 1, 1, 10)$. In this case $\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} \equiv \Delta U_2 = 9 > G^S = 4$ and Proposition 7 shows that to preserve the order of *ex post* intensities between member 2 and member 3, it is impossible to make any promise to member 2. In fact there is a unique reaching across the aisle type promises profile whereby member 4 promises a transfer of 4 utils to member 1.

By contrast, when $G^S < \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$ and when the *ex ante* intensities of the weakest members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ are distant from those of the strongest members of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^{R13}$, the equilibrium promises profiles may have some circle the wagon promises. This case is illustrated by Example 4. In the last section of the paper, Proposition 9 generalizes the intuition based on the above variations of Example 4 by providing a necessary and sufficient condition under which all equilibria are of the reaching across the aisle type.

5.2.3 Equilibria with higher order preemption

We now consider the case where $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ with $\kappa \geq 2$ and with $0 \leq \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} < G^S$. When $\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} < G^S$, members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ cannot promise the aggregate transfer G^S while maintaining *ex post* intensities above the intensities of all members in $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. In that case, when the members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ collectively promise G^S , the *ex post* intensities of some of them are reduced enough that they become targets for new rounds of enticements.

A *Higher order* blocking coalition may then emerge after the first round of promises with total payments G^S : members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S together with some reform supporters from the coalition \mathcal{C}^R with the lowest post-promises intensities may form a decisive coalition defeating the reform. To preempt such attempts, the members of

¹³That is, $u_{\hat{\kappa}+1} - u_{\hat{\kappa}}$ is large.

the coalition \mathcal{C}^R who are ranked below $\widehat{\kappa}$ in the distribution of post-promises intensities will have to issue a new round of promises. These new promises may create opportunities for new blocking coalitions to form which will require additional rounds of promises. These additional rounds of promises to prevent the formation of higher order blocking coalitions imply that the total transfer is larger than G^S . In fact while the promises transfer G^S prevents the formation of first order blocking coalitions, it actually creates the opportunity for higher order blocking coalitions to form. The precise characterization of the equilibrium will be reported in Proposition 8 below, and we first provide some insight on the equilibrium promises structure through a numerical example.

Example 5. Consider a committee with $I = 7$ members, and a majority requirement of $\kappa = 3$ (only 3 of 7 members are required to implement the reform). We have $\widehat{\kappa} = 5$ and assume that the ex ante intensities are $\mathbf{u} = (u_1 = -14, u_2 = -8, u_3 = 2, u_4 = 4, u_5 = 6, u_6 = 8, u_7 = 8)$. In this case $\mathcal{C}^S = \{1, 2\}$, $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{3, 4, 5\}$, $\mathcal{C}^R/\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{6, 7\}$, and $G^S = 10$, $\Delta U_5 = 4$.

Let us assume that members the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{6, 7\}$ promise a transfer of 10 to the coalition $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. After the promises are issued, either member 6 or 7 will have an ex post intensity that is lower than $u_5 = 6$. Indeed, if for example we set

$$\mathbf{r} = (6, 4, 0, 0, 0, -5, -5), \quad \text{then} \quad \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}} = (-8, -4, 2, 4, 6, 3, 3). \quad (22)$$

Then $v_6^{\mathbf{r}} < v_5^{\mathbf{r}}$ and the coalition $\{1, 2, 3, 6, 7\}$ forms a blocking coalition for the promises profile \mathbf{r} . Therefore the promises profile \mathbf{r} defined in (22) is not an equilibrium and additional promises need to be made to reach an equilibrium. This shows intuitively that the total promises need to be larger than $G^S = 10$ to reach an equilibrium.

Who will promise these additional transfers? We see from the ex post intensities given in (22) that, member 5 becomes the member with the largest intensity $v_5^{\mathbf{r}} = 6$ even though she does not belong to the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R/\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. Thus member 5 will initiate the second round of promises. We thus see that each round of promises may necessitate a new round of promises that add to the existing ones. As we will establish in Proposition 8, any equilibrium promises profile aggregates a finite number of promises' rounds and can indeed be reached through an algorithm of sequential promises. We

now show how an equilibrium for this example can be constructed through an algorithm that includes three steps:

Step 1. The coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ promises a total of $\Delta U_5 = 4$ to the coalition \mathcal{C}^S , aligning their ex post intensities with member 5, $u_5 = 6$. This uniquely implies $r_6 = r_7 = -2$. We also need to insure that ex post intensities of $\mathcal{C}^S = \{1, 2\}$ do not exceed $u_5 = 6$. The algorithm allows multiple choices for r_1 and r_2 but for illustration we choose

$$\mathbf{r} = (3, 1, 0, 0, 0, -2, -2), \quad \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}} = (-11, -7, 2, 4, 6, 6, 6). \quad (23)$$

Notice also that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = 4 < G^S$ and the transfer promises are not sufficient to preclude the formation of blocking coalitions. Indeed, an inspection of the ex post intensities given in (23) shows that the promises profile \mathbf{r} is not an equilibrium because the coalition $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ is a blocking coalition for \mathbf{r} .

Step 2. Members of the coalition $\{5, 6, 7\}$ promise the members of \mathcal{C}^S an amount that reduces the formers' ex post intensities to $u_4 = 4$. Thus $r_5 = r_6 = r_7 = -2$. The algorithm also caps the ex post intensities of $\mathcal{C}^S = \{1, 2\}$ at $u_4 = 4$. Again there are multiple possible choices and for illustration, we choose

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{r}} &= (6, 0, 0, 0, -2, -2, -2), \quad \text{which means } \mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}} = (9, 1, 0, 0, -2, -4, -4), \\ \text{and thus } \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}} &= (\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}})^{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = (-5, -7, 2, 4, 4, 4, 4). \end{aligned}$$

We remark that, although the total transfer $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = 10 = G^S$, the "effective" transfer from $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to \mathcal{C}^S is only $\Delta U_4 = 4 + 4 = 8$, which is still less than $G^S = 10$. Indeed, the promises profile $\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is not an equilibrium because the coalition $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ is a blocking coalition.

Step 3. If we continue to reduce the intensities of the members of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ to $u_3 = 2$, each member of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ needs to transfer 2 more units of utility. The "effective" transfer from $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ to \mathcal{C}^S will be $\Delta U_3 = 6 + 6 = 12 > G^S = 10$. That transfer will be more than is necessary to meet the minimum total transfer. This means we need to reduce the common transfer so that the effective transfer originating from the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ is just equal to 10. Let's assume that, after the promises profile $\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ is in place, each member of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ makes a promise of $x > 0$ to the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S . Then the aggregate

cumulative transfer from the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ is $8 + 2x$. Equalizing that effective transfer to 10 gives $x = 1$. Note that the resulting ex post intensities of the promisers $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ are all equal to 3 and that they are larger than $u_3 = 2$. The distribution of these promises among the members of coalition \mathcal{C}^S is indeterminate except for the fact that the ex post intensities must not exceed $u_3 = 2$. We can choose, for example,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{r}} &= (2, 2, 0, -1, -1, -1, -1), \quad \text{or say } \hat{\mathbf{r}} := \mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}} + \bar{\mathbf{r}} = (11, 3, 0, -1, -3, -5, -5), \\ \text{and thus } \mathbf{v}^{\hat{\mathbf{r}}} &= (\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}})^{\bar{\mathbf{r}}} = (-3, -5, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

This is an equilibrium, with total transfer $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mathbf{r}}} = 14 > G^S = 10$. By Proposition 8 below we see that 14 is indeed the minimum total transfer. Of the 14 unit of utility transferred, 10 units pay members to avoid forming first order blocking coalitions and 4 units sway members to forswear higher order blocking coalitions. So, this algorithm achieves the intended result of determining an equilibrium. The algorithm leaves a degree of freedom on how to allocate the promises among the coalition of promisees which reflects the indeterminacy of the equilibrium set. However, the algorithm determines uniquely the allocation of promises among promisers. To see this let us make some additional observations.

First, note that in Step 3 of the algorithm, members of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ issue equal incremental promises. If they do not promise an equal amount, then some members will become more vulnerable to enticement, and consequently further promises will be required in order to reach an equilibrium. While at the end of this process an equilibrium will be reached, that equilibrium will not realize the minimum total transfer. To see this, assume, instead of (24), that the incremental promises in Step 3 are not equalized among the members of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{r}}' &= (2, 2, 0, 0, -2, -1, -1), \quad \text{or say } \hat{\mathbf{r}}' := \mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}} + \bar{\mathbf{r}}' = (11, 3, 0, 0, -4, -5, -5), \\ \text{and thus } \mathbf{v}^{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'} &= (\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r} + \tilde{\mathbf{r}}})^{\bar{\mathbf{r}}'} = (-3, -5, 2, 4, 2, 3, 3). \end{aligned}$$

This is not an equilibrium because $\{1, 2, 3, 5, 6\}$ is a blocking coalition. However, $\mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mathbf{r}}'} = 14$ and the new round of promises to preclude the formation of this new blocking coalition will inflate the total promise and contradict the minimum total promises constraint. The constraint of equal payments among promisers uniquely determines promisers' individual (net) transfer. This result is proven in Proposition 8.

Second, the allocation of total transfers among promisees is not unique. In our numerical example, members of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$ promise a total transfer of

14 to the member of the coalition $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The coalition $\{1, 2, 3\}$ can distribute the total transfer of 14 in an arbitrary way among the members of the coalition $\{1, 2, 3\}$, as long as their ex post intensities do not exceed 3, which is the ex post intensity of the members of the coalition $\{4, 5, 6, 7\}$. For example, the promise profile $\mathbf{r}_1 = (10, 4, 0, -1, -3, -5, -5)$ is an equilibrium and produces the ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_1} = (-4, -4, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3)$. Similarly, the promises profile $\mathbf{r}_2 = (9, 4, 1, -1, -3, -5, -5)$ is an equilibrium and produces the ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}_2} = (-5, -4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3)$. In particular, profile \mathbf{r}_2 exhibits a circle the wagon transfer since member 3 is a promises recipient even though she is a reform supporter ($u_3 = 2 > 0$). \square

We now present the general characterization of equilibrium promises profiles for the case $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} < G^S$, and assume again that $\kappa \geq 2$ without loss of generality. Before stating the proposition, define the intensity

$$u_* := \frac{1}{\kappa - 1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}} u_j > 0. \quad (25)$$

Proposition 8. [Equilibrium with higher order preemption Alternative] Consider a committee in which support for the reform is in excess of κ -majority requirement, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ with $\kappa \geq 2$. Assume the gain from trade defined in equation (16) is not affordable to promise, i.e., $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} < G^S$. There exists a unique $k_* \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ defined by

$$u_{k_*-1} \leq u_* < u_{k_*}. \quad (26)$$

The promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ is an equilibrium if and only if

1. Members of the coalition $\{k_*, \dots, I\}$ are promisers subject to individual rationality constraints

$$-u_j \leq r_j = -u_j + u_* < 0 \quad \text{for all } j \geq k_* \quad (27)$$

and experience equal ex post intensities

$$v_j^{\mathbf{r}} = u_* > 0 \quad \text{for all } j \geq k_*. \quad (28)$$

2. Members of the coalition $\{1, \dots, k_* - 1\}$ are promisees, and their ex post intensities cannot exceed those of promisers

$$r_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \equiv u_*, \quad \text{for all } i < k_* \leq j. \quad (29)$$

Moreover, equilibrium promises profiles are indeterminate and they all generate the common total promises transfer

$$\mathcal{T}_r = \mathcal{T}_* \text{ where } \mathcal{T}_* := \sum_{j \geq k_*} [u_j - u_*] > G^S. \quad (30)$$

Proposition 8 shows that in all equilibria, members of the promisers coalition promise a transfer that is affine in their *ex ante* intensities as described in equation (27). This implies that members with larger intensities promise a larger transfer and this results in an equalized distribution of *ex post* intensities among the coalition of promisers. Therefore, in all equilibria the distribution of promised transfers among promisers is unique. This uniqueness is novel and contrasts with the cases covered in Proposition 5 and Proposition 7 where the distribution of transfer promises among promisers was indeterminate. The intuition of this uniqueness is that if the promisers have unequal *intensities*, some of them will become subject to enticement to cast their vote against the reform and this in turn contradicts the stability requirement as additional promises are required to preclude the enticement. On the other hand, the multiplicity associated with the transfer distribution among promisees remains valid as in the cases covered in Proposition 7.

Proposition 8 also shows that the total transfer is larger than the gain from trade G^S as we illustrated in the example. More specifically, a direct calculation shows that the aggregate promises from the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_j = \sum_{j=\hat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_j - u_*] = G^S.$$

This shows that members of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ will promise an aggregate transfer of G^S . An aggregate transfer of G^S will be sufficient to achieve an equilibrium when the gain from trade is affordable. However, this is not the case since $\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} < G^S$ and as a result, some members of $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ will have lower *ex post* intensities than some members of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and hence become targets for enticement. To preempt this, additional transfer promises are needed from the members of the coalition $\{k_*, \dots, \hat{\kappa}\} \subseteq \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ with *interim* intensities that are larger than those of the members of $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. The aggregation of these promises are given by $\sum_{j=k_*}^{\hat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] > 0$, which results in a total transfer $\mathcal{T}_* > G^S$.

6 Additional equilibrium implications and implementation

In this section, we first provide necessary and sufficient conditions under which the equilibrium promises are of the reaching across the aisle type. Second, we propose an equilibrium selection based on an a finite sequence of transfers from the strongest supporters of the reform to the weakest.

Being pragmatic and recognizing the diverse needs of individuals, Tenmay16 is also actively engaged in the retail of supplements and medications through its branch, Finlandia. We acknowledge that despite the profound impact of food on health, there are instances where individuals may require additional support beyond nutrition alone. Inclusivity is a core value for us, and we aim to cater to all segments of the population by offering a comprehensive range of healthcare options.

6.1 Reaching across the aisle equilibria

The following proposition generalizes the discussions on whether the equilibrium rules out circling the wagon transfers where some promises recipients are reform supporters.

Proposition 9. [*Reaching across the aisle equilibria.*] *Consider a committee with a κ -majority voting rule. When $k \geq 2$, the equilibrium promises are of the reaching across the aisle type if and only if one of the following conditions hold:*

1. *Reform supporter lack voting power to enact the reform, $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$, as in Proposition 5.*
2. *Reform supporters have enough voting power, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$, and $G^S \leq \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$ as in Proposition 7, and the two following conditions are satisfied*
 - (a) *The weakest reform supporters $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{n + 1, \dots, \hat{\kappa}\}$ have equal ex ante intensities:*

$$u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{\hat{\kappa}}.$$

- (b) *Either $G^S = \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$, or $G^S < \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}$ and the reform supporter $\hat{\kappa} + 1$ has an ex ante intensity that is equal to that of the members $\{n + 1, \dots, \hat{\kappa}\}$:*

$$G^S = \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} \quad \text{or}; \quad G^S < \Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{\hat{\kappa}} = u_{\hat{\kappa}+1}.$$

3. Reform supporters have enough voting power, $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$, and $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} < G^S$ as in Proposition 8, and

$$u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{k^*-1} = u_*.$$

Proposition 9 shows that in the case of a frustrated κ -minority covered in Proposition 5, promises recipients are reform opponents in all equilibria. Despite their multiplicity, equilibrium promises share the common feature of being of the reaching across the aisle type. By contrast, in the cases covered in Proposition 7 and Proposition 8 where there are enough supporters to enact the reform to begin with ($|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$), we show in Proposition 9 that for equilibrium promises to always be of the reaching across the aisle type additional restrictions are required. To rule out circle the wagon type transfers, we broadly need a stale distribution of intensities among a specific subset of reform supporters with weakest intensities, ranked $\kappa - 1$ and higher. In words, the proposition shows that when the weakest reform supporters derive uniform utility from the reform, then equilibrium requires that all promises recipients are reform opponents.

6.2 An equilibrium selection algorithm

In this section we propose an algorithm describing how to select a sequence of incremental promises that reach an equilibrium after a finite number of steps. Unlike the algorithm from Example 5, the algorithm described in this section dictates in each step how to proceed for the next step and does not leave room for multiple choices. Importantly, the algorithm achieves an equilibrium for all distributions of *ex ante* intensities; this covers all cases that we have discussed in this paper. A social planner who mandate this algorithm would achieve an equilibrium in a finite number of steps.

The algorithm operates based on a guiding principle where, at each step, committee member(s) with the highest intensities are allowed to promise a transfer to committee member(s) with the lowest intensities. In each step, a fixed amount is transferred to ensure that the post-promise intensities of either the promiser or the promisees align with the next lowest or highest intensity committee member, respectively. This iterative process continues until the gains from trade (G^S) of the resulting post-promise intensities are effectively nullified. Proposition 10 of Appendix B shows that the algorithm converges after a finite number of steps to a unique equilibrium.

The algorithm is founded on an egalitarian principle, as it ensures that utility transfers occur from members with higher intensities to those with lower intensities, while maintaining the ordering of the interim intensities. It is not surprising, then, that Proposition 10 in Appendix B demonstrates that among all equilibria, the equilibrium resulting from the algorithm has the lowest range of *ex post* intensities. Essentially, the algorithm serves as an equilibrium selection mechanism, accompanied by a dynamic implementation involving transfers between members in the upper and lower tails of the intensity distribution. It is worth noting that alternative algorithms based on different principles could select different types of equilibria. For a more formal description of the algorithm and its convergence proof, we refer the reader to Appendix B. In next example, we illustrate the algorithm in the context of a numerical example.

Example 6. Recall the committee of Example 5 where $I = 7$, $\kappa = 3$, $I - \kappa + 1 = 5$, and

$$\mathbf{u} = (-14, -8, 2, 4, 6, 8, 8).$$

Note that in this case $\sum_{i=1}^5 u_i < 0$, so $\mathbf{r} = 0$ is unstable (see Proposition 1). For the first step, the promise $\mathbf{r}^1 = (4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 2, 2)$ are implemented which results in the intensities $\mathbf{v}^1 = (-10, -8, 2, 4, 6, 6, 6)$.

We notice that $\sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^1 < 0$ and thus the promise \mathbf{r}^1 is unstable. In the second step, the incremental promises $\mathbf{r}^2 = (2, 0, 0, 0, -2/3, -2/3, -2/3)$ is implemented which results in the intensities $\mathbf{v}^2 = (-8, -8, 2, 4, 16/3, 16/3, 16/3)$

We notice again that $\sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^2 < 0$, and hence the promises profile $\mathbf{r}^1 + \mathbf{r}^2$ is also unstable. In the third step, the incremental promises $\mathbf{r}^3 = (2, 2, 0, 0, -4/3, -4/3, -4/3)$ is implemented which results in the intensities $\mathbf{v}^3 = (-6, -6, 2, 4, 4, 4, 4)$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^3 < 0$, the promises profile $\mathbf{r}^1 + \mathbf{r}^2 + \mathbf{r}^3$ is unstable. If in the fourth step, we set the incremental promises profile $\mathbf{r}^4 = (4, 4, 0, -2, -2, -2, -2)$, the resulting intensities would be $\mathbf{v}^4 = (-2, -2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$. We see that $\sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^4 > 0$, so the

promises profile $\sum_{i=1}^4 \mathbf{r}^i$ is stable. However, we can achieve stability with a lower total

transfer. Assume that instead of promising a total transfer of 8, the total incremental transfer is $X^* < 8$ so that produced the ex post intensity profile \mathbf{v}^* is just equal to 0. We shall have

$$\mathbf{v}^4 = \left(-6 + \frac{X^*}{2}, -6 + \frac{X^*}{2}, 2, 4 - \frac{X^*}{4}, 4 - \frac{X^*}{4}, 4 - \frac{X^*}{4}, 4 - \frac{X^*}{4}\right)$$

. We then set X^* just large enough to attain stability, that is,

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^* = -2 + \frac{X^*}{2} \Rightarrow X^* = 4.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{v}^* = (-4, -4, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3).$$

This is one of the equilibria constructed in Example 5. □

7 Conclusion

Our study focuses on a binary voting model, where committee members can make outcome-contingent promises before casting their votes. We define the political equilibrium using the classical notion of stability, combined with the assumption of total transfer promises minimization. Our findings show that equilibria exist, always lead to reform enactment and are indeterminate. The intensity of promises flows from supporters with the strongest intensities to those with weaker intensities. In committees with a frustrated coalition of reform supporters, promises flow across the aisle from reform supporters to reform opponents. In cases where reform supporters hold enough voting power to enact the reform, promises may be necessary to prevent weaker opponents from voting against it. However, these promises need not necessarily cross the aisle unless the weakest reform supporters have homogeneous preferences.

It is important to acknowledge that the theoretical framework presented in this paper focuses on a specific type of political failure, namely the problem of majority coercion. Other forms of political failures, such as the tragedy of the commons (Olson [1965]) voter ignorance (Downs [1957]) and rent-seeking (Tullock [1967]) are also significant and warrant further investigation. Therefore, there is still much work to be done in developing a comprehensive evaluation of promise practices, particularly

in environments where informational issues play a crucial role. It is also worth noting that we do not explicitly model the game leading to an equilibrium. What we can say is that once a stable equilibrium of promise profiles is reached, it remains in place, whereas other profiles do not exhibit the same level of stability. In practice, promises often take the form of amendments to legislative bills, involving multiple rounds of negotiation. Thus, it would be valuable to model a dynamic game of sequential decentralized promises, aiming to generate equilibria based on the farsighted core. With that broader perspective, our model can be thought of as a last step of a dynamic game. This extension would align with existing literature on promises with political representation, providing novel understanding of the sequencing of promises in decentralized settings.

8 Appendix A: Proofs

Preamble: Our proofs often rely on a contradiction approach, where we construct modified promise profiles that contradict our assumptions. Notably, we do not rely on external tools and instead, we utilize basic logical arguments and work directly with the mathematical objects, starting from first principles. To assist the reader, we provide a summarized table of notation for easy reference.

Table 1: Summary of the notations

Notations	Definition
I	Number of committee members
$\mathbb{I} = \{1, \dots, I\}$	Set of committee members
$n \leq I$	Number of reform opponents
$\kappa \leq I$	Voting share threshold to enact the reform
$\widehat{\kappa} = I - \kappa + 1$	Voting share threshold to defeat the reform
$\mathcal{C}^R = \{i : u_i \geq 0\} \equiv \{n+1, \dots, I\}$	Coalition of reform supporters
$\mathcal{C}^S = \{i : u_i < 0\} \equiv \{1, \dots, n\}$	Coalition of reform opponents
\mathcal{D}^R resp. \mathcal{D}^S	The set of decisive coalitions enacting the reform resp. the status quo
$U_R = \sum_{i=n+1}^I u_i$	Aggregate intensity for the reform
$U_S = \sum_{i=1}^n (-u_i)$	Aggregate intensity for the status quo
$\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_I)$	Vector of <i>ex ante</i> intensities
$\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_I)$	Promises profile contingent on enacting the reform
$\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_I)$	Promises profile contingent on defeating the reform
$D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \{R, S\}$	Committee decision once the promises (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) are in place
$\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r})\mathbb{1}_{\{D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})=R\}} + \mathbf{s}\mathbb{1}_{\{D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})=S\}}$	Profile of <i>ex post</i> intensities implied the promise profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})
$\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}} = (\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r})\mathbb{1}_{\{D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})=R\}}$	Profile of <i>ex post</i> intensities implied the promise profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0})$
\mathcal{S}_0 resp. \mathcal{E}	Set of stable promises resp. set of equilibrium promises with $\mathbf{s} = 0$
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^I r_i $	Total transfer promises associated with the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0})$
$\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{n+1, \dots, \widehat{\kappa}\}$	Coalition of weakest reform supporters
$\underline{U}^R = \sum_{\mathcal{C}^R} u_i$	Aggregate <i>ex ante</i> intensity of the coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$
$G^S = U_S - \underline{U}^R$	Aggregate gain from trade of the members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S
$\overline{U}^R = \sum_{\mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i$	Aggregate <i>ex ante</i> intensity of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$
$\Delta U_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [u_j - u_i]$	Aggregate surplus of intensity of the coalition $\mathcal{C}^R / \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ relative to member $i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$
$u_* = \frac{1}{\kappa-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}} u_j$	Scaled average <i>ex ante</i> intensity
$u_{k_*-1} \leq u_* < u_{k_*}$	Definition of κ^* , the critical promiser

Proof of Proposition 1:

First we verify the “only if” direction of the proposition (\Rightarrow) by proving that if $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{S}$, then inequalities (10) hold.

Assume that $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{S}$.

We first prove that $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$ by contradiction. Suppose that $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$. In that case, the grand coalition \mathbb{I} itself is a blocking coalition for the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) . The committee members can initiate the alternative promises contingent on adopting the reform

$$r'_i := s_i - u_i + \frac{1}{I} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}} u_j.$$

Since $\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $\sum_{\mathbb{I}} r'_i = 0$ and thus $\mathbf{r}' \in \mathcal{P}$. When voting under the alternative promises profile $(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s})$, member i compares the utility if the reform is adopted, $u_i + r'_i = s_i + \frac{1}{I} \sum_{\mathbb{I}} u_j$ with the utility when the reform is rejected s_i . By assumption, $\sum_{\mathbb{I}} u_j > 0$, and hence committee members unanimously vote for the reform, leading the committee to adopt the reform, $D(\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}) = R$. Committee member i then gets the utility $v_i^{\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}} = s_i + \frac{1}{I} \sum_{\mathbb{I}} u_j$. Because we assumed $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$, we have $v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} = s_i$. Thus $v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} < v_i^{\mathbf{r}', \mathbf{s}}$ for any committee member $i \in \mathbb{I}$. We conclude that if $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$, then the promise profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is not stable because the grand coalition \mathbb{I} can block it. Hence, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$.

Second, we prove the inequalities (10). We proceed by contradiction and assume that there exists a coalition $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ such that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) < \sum_{\mathcal{C}} s_i \quad (31)$$

Define $\tilde{u}_i := u_i + r_i - s_i$, and consider the partition of $\mathcal{C} = \underline{\mathcal{C}} \cup \overline{\mathcal{C}}$ where $\overline{\mathcal{C}} := \{i \in \mathcal{C} : \tilde{u}_i \geq 0\}$ and, $\underline{\mathcal{C}} := \{i \in \mathcal{C} : \tilde{u}_i < 0\}$. Inequality (31) implies $\underline{\mathcal{C}} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, if $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \emptyset$ then $\underline{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ and therefore $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$ since all members of the decisive coalition $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ vote for the status quo. This is a contradiction since we know from the first step of this proof that $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$ and therefore, $\overline{\mathcal{C}} \neq \emptyset$.

Denote, for any $\varepsilon \geq 0$,

$$\alpha_\varepsilon := \frac{\sum_{i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} (\tilde{u}_i + \varepsilon)}{\sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}} |\tilde{u}_i|} > 0.$$

Note that (31) implies $\sum_{i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} \tilde{u}_i < \sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}} |\tilde{u}_i|$, so that $\alpha_0 < 1$, and thus we may choose $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough such that $0 < \alpha_\varepsilon < 1$.

If the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is in place, members of the coalition \mathcal{C} can propose

additional internal promises $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}$ contingent on the status quo and defined by

$$\tilde{s}_i := \begin{cases} u_i + r_i + \varepsilon - s_i, & \text{if } i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}; \\ -\alpha_\varepsilon |\tilde{u}_i|, & \text{if } i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}; \\ 0, & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{C}; \end{cases}$$

which in turn produces the cumulative promises profile \mathbf{s}' contingent on the status quo,

$$s'_i := \begin{cases} u_i + r_i + \varepsilon, & \text{if } i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}; \\ s_i - \alpha_\varepsilon |\tilde{u}_i|, & \text{if } i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}; \\ s_i, & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

Notice that $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$ because,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} s'_i &= \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + r_i + \varepsilon] + \sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}} s_i - \alpha_\varepsilon \sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}} |\tilde{u}_i| + \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} s_i \\ &= \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} [s_i + \tilde{u}_i + \varepsilon] + \sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}} s_i - \sum_{i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}} (\tilde{u}_i + \varepsilon) + \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} s_i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} s_i = 0. \end{aligned}$$

When facing the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$, the voting decision of the members of the coalition \mathcal{C} is determined by the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } i \in \overline{\mathcal{C}}: \quad & s'_i = u_i + r_i + \varepsilon > u_i + r_i; \\ \text{for } i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}: \quad & s'_i = s_i - \alpha_\varepsilon |\tilde{u}_i| > s_i - |\tilde{u}_i| = s_i + \tilde{u}_i = u_i + r_i; \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\tilde{u}_i < 0$ for all $i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\alpha_\varepsilon < 1$ in the second inequality. Hence, all members of \mathcal{C} vote for the status quo. Because the coalition \mathcal{C} is decisive for the status quo alternative, the collected support for the alternative S from all members of \mathcal{C} sways the committee decision in favor of the status quo, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}') = S$. Moreover, all members of the coalition \mathcal{C} strictly improve their utilities with the new promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$ relative to the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) : Any member i of the coalition \mathcal{C} derives the utility $u_i + r_i$ when facing the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) , and the utility $s'_i > u_i + r_i$ when they face the promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$. To sum up, members of the coalition \mathcal{C} propose the alternative promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$ and each one of them achieves a strictly higher utility with the new promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}')$ relative to (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) . From Definition 2, we deduce that the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is not stable. We conclude from the contradiction that inequalities (10) hold.

Now we proceed in the “if” direction (\Leftarrow). Given a promises profile $(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathcal{P}^2$ satisfying inequality (10) for any coalition $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, we want to show that it is stable.

First observe that if inequalities (10) hold, then $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$. This is because if $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = S$, then there must exist a coalition $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ whose members vote unanimously for the status quo. This cannot be true because when $\sum_{\mathcal{C}}(u_i + r_i) \geq \sum_{\mathcal{C}} s_i$, we cannot have $u_i + r_i < s_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$.

To prove that (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is stable, proceed again by contradiction and assume that (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is not stable. By Definition 2 and the fact that $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) = R$, there must exist a coalition \mathcal{C} and an alternative promises profile $\mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{C} = \{i : s'_i \neq s_i\}$, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}') = S$ and, $v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}'} = s'_i > v_i^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}} = u_i + r_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}' \in \mathcal{P}$, by the zero sum property we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} s_i = - \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} s_i = - \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} s'_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} s'_i. \quad (33)$$

Consider now the coalition $\mathcal{B} := \{i : s'_i > u_i + r_i\} \supset \mathcal{C}$ and observe that it is a decisive coalition for the status quo alternative, that is, $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{D}^S$. This is because only the members of \mathcal{B} vote for the status quo and the status quo is adopted by the committee, $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}') = S$. Thus, it must be that the coalition \mathcal{B} has enough voting power to defeat the reform: $|\mathcal{B}| \geq \hat{\kappa}$. We now establish that the coalition \mathcal{B} violates the inequality (10). Using equality (33) and $\mathcal{C} = \{i : s'_i \neq s_i\}$ we observe that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} s_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} s_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{C}} s_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} s'_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{C}} s'_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} s'_i > \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} (u_i + r_i).$$

To sum up we have $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} s_i > \sum_{i \in \mathcal{B}} (u_i + r_i)$ and therefore, inequality (10) is contradicted. Consequently, the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) is stable. \square

Proof of Proposition 2:

(i) Since any promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ satisfies $D(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}) = R$, the set of utility outcomes associated with stable promises from the set \mathcal{S}_0 is given by

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{0}} \mid \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0\} = \mathcal{S}_0 + \mathbf{u} \equiv \{\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r} \mid \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0\}.$$

Since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, by Proposition 1 we see that

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left\{ \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^I : \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} z_i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} z_i \geq 0 \text{ for all coalitions } \mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S \right\}.$$

The above set \mathcal{Z} is non empty; it includes, for example, the vector $(\alpha_1 \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i, \dots, \alpha_I \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i)$, where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \alpha_i = 1$. We note that the set \mathcal{Z} depends only on the aggregate intensity $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i$ and not on the distribution of intensities. The set of stable promises \mathcal{S}_0 can be defined as a translation of the set \mathcal{Z}

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = \mathcal{Z} - \mathbf{u} = \{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P} \mid \exists \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ such that } \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{u}\}.$$

(ii) If the inequalities (10) hold for the promises profile (\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s}) , then they also hold for the payment promises profile $(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{s}, \mathbf{0})$. Therefore, all equilibria can be categorized by equivalence classes where each element of an equivalence class is congruent to the same element of the set of equilibria with transfers that are only promised conditional on the reform being adopted. This is formally described in equation (11). \square

Proof of Proposition 3:

Note that \mathcal{S}_0 is nonempty. Let $\mathbf{r}_n \in \mathcal{S}_0$ be a minimizing sequence: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}_n} = \inf_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}_n} \leq \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}_1} < \infty$ for all $n \geq 1$, then $\{\mathbf{r}_n\}_{n \geq 1} \subset \mathbb{R}^I$ is bounded. By the local compactness of \mathbb{R}^I , there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{r}_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 1}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{r}_{n_k} = \mathbf{r}^*$ for some $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathbb{R}^I$. Since $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} r_{n_k, i} = 0$ for all k , then clearly $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} r_i^* = 0$, that is, $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{P}$. Moreover, by Proposition 1 (with $\mathbf{s} = 0$) we see that \mathbf{r}_{n_k} satisfies (10) for each k . Then by sending $k \rightarrow \infty$ we see that \mathbf{r}^* also satisfies (10), and thus $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Finally, observe that $\mathcal{T} : \mathcal{S}_0 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is continuous and hence $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}_{n_k}} = \inf_{\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}}$. This implies that $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4:

The proof relies on the following three lemmas.

Lemma 1. *For any equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there exists no pair of members (i, j) such that*

$$r_i < 0 < r_j \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^{\mathbf{r}} < v_j^{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (34)$$

Proof. Assume by contradiction that (34) holds true. For some $\varepsilon > 0$ small, set

$$\tilde{r}_i = r_i + \varepsilon \leq 0, \quad \tilde{r}_j = r_j - \varepsilon \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{r}_k = r_k \text{ for all } k \neq i, j. \quad (35)$$

Notice that $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{P}$ because the promises of member i are reduced by ε and the promises recipients also see a reduction in their transfer by the same amount ε . Next, for any $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}_0$, using inequality (10) with $\mathbf{s} = 0$ and the definition of $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ gives

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} v_k^{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0, & \text{if } i, j \in \mathcal{C} \text{ or } i, j \notin \mathcal{C}; \\ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} v_k^{\mathbf{r}} + \varepsilon \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} v_k^{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C}, j \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

For the last case that $j \in \mathcal{C}, i \notin \mathcal{C}$, by setting $\varepsilon < v_j^{\mathbf{r}} - v_i^{\mathbf{r}}$, we have $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} < v_j^{\mathbf{r}} - \varepsilon = u_j + \tilde{r}_j$. Then, since $(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}$ is also in \mathcal{D}^S , we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) \geq \sum_{k \in (\mathcal{C} \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}} v_k^{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0, \quad \text{if } j \in \mathcal{C}, i \notin \mathcal{C}. \quad (37)$$

Combining (36) and (37) and recalling that \mathcal{C} is an arbitrary coalition from the set \mathcal{D}^S , by Proposition 1 again (with $\mathbf{s} = 0$) we see that $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{S}_0$.

Note further that

$$|\tilde{r}_i| = -\tilde{r}_i = -r_i - \varepsilon = |r_i| - \varepsilon, \quad |\tilde{r}_j| = \tilde{r}_j = r_j - \varepsilon = |r_j| - \varepsilon, \quad |\tilde{r}_k| = |r_k|, \quad k \neq i, j.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^I |\tilde{r}_k| = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{k \neq i, j} |r_k| + |r_i| - \varepsilon + |r_j| - \varepsilon \right] = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} - \varepsilon < \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}}.$$

This contradicts the minimum total promises transfer property, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. \square

Lemma 2. *For any equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, there exists no committee member i such that*

$$r_i < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_i^{\mathbf{r}} < 0. \quad (38)$$

Proof. Assume by contradiction that (38) holds true. Since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, there exists $j \neq i$ such that $r_j > 0$. Then by Lemma 1 we have $v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_i^{\mathbf{r}} < 0$. Define the promises profile $\tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ by (35) again. Note that $v_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = v_i^{\mathbf{r}} + \varepsilon$, $v_j^{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = v_j^{\mathbf{r}} - \varepsilon$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we have $v_j^{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} < v_i^{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} \leq 0$.

Following the same reasoning as in Lemma 1, we prove now that the inequality $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) \geq 0$ must hold for every coalition $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$. First observe that by

Proposition 1 we have $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} v_k^{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0$ and hence, there exists $m \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $v_m^{\mathbf{r}} \geq 0$. Notice that, since $v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_i^{\mathbf{r}} < 0$, we have $m \neq i, j$.

When $i, j \in \mathcal{C}$, or $i, j \notin \mathcal{C}$, or $i \in \mathcal{C}, j \notin \mathcal{C}$, (36) remains true and hence $\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) \geq 0$.

In the case $j \in \mathcal{C}, i \notin \mathcal{C}$, since $u_m + \tilde{r}_m = u_m + r_m \geq 0 \geq u_i + \tilde{r}_i$ and $(\mathcal{C} \setminus \{m\}) \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, we have

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) \geq \sum_{k \in (\mathcal{C} \setminus \{m\}) \cup \{i\}} (u_k + \tilde{r}_k) = \sum_{k \in (\mathcal{C} \setminus \{m\}) \cup \{i\}} (u_k + r_k) \geq 0.$$

This, together with (36) and Proposition 1, implies $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Then, following the same argument on the total transfer used in the last step of the proof of Lemma 1, we derive the desired contradiction. \square

Lemma 3. *For any equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, define the committee members*

$$\underline{k}_* = \max\{i | r_i > 0\}, \quad \bar{k}_* = \min\{i | r_i < 0\}. \quad (39)$$

Then

$$\underline{k}_* < \bar{k}_*, \quad \text{and} \quad r_k = 0 \quad \text{for all } \underline{k}_* < k < \bar{k}_*. \quad (40)$$

Committee member \bar{k}_ is a reform supporter— $\bar{k}_* \in \mathcal{C}^R$, all committee members $j \geq \bar{k}_*$ are promisors subject to an individual rationality constraint, and all committee members $i \leq \underline{k}_*$ are promisees*

$$r_i \geq 0, \text{ for all } i \leq \underline{k}_*; \quad \text{and} \quad -u_j \leq r_j \leq 0, \text{ for all } j \geq \bar{k}_*. \quad (41)$$

The ex post intensities $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{r}} \equiv \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{r}$ are ranked across the coalition of promisors and the coalition of promisees, that is,

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \quad \text{for all } i \leq \underline{k}_* < \bar{k}_* \leq j. \quad (42)$$

Proof. First, since $r_{\bar{k}_*} < 0$, by Lemma 2 we have $u_{\bar{k}_*} + r_{\bar{k}_*} \geq 0$, which implies $u_{\bar{k}_*} > 0$. That is, $\bar{k}_* \in \mathcal{C}^R$.

Next, since $r_{\underline{k}_*} < 0 < r_{\underline{k}_*}$, by Lemma 1 we have $u_{\underline{k}_*} + r_{\underline{k}_*} \leq u_{\overline{k}_*} + r_{\overline{k}_*}$, and thus $u_{\underline{k}_*} < u_{\overline{k}_*}$. Then by (1) we obtain $\underline{k}_* < \overline{k}_*$. The inequality $\underline{k}_* < \overline{k}_*$ and the definitions (39) imply that $r_k = 0$ for all $\underline{k}_* < k < \overline{k}_*$, and this proves the statement in (40).

We now prove the statements in (41). First, to prove the left inequality (41), assume by contradiction that $r_i < 0$ for some $i \leq \underline{k}_*$. Since $r_{\underline{k}_*} > 0$, we must have $i < \underline{k}_*$. By (1), we have $v_i^r < u_i \leq u_{\underline{k}_*} < v_{\underline{k}_*}^r$. This contradicts Lemma 1, and thus $r_i \geq 0$ for all $i \leq \underline{k}_*$. Similarly, to prove the right inequality in (41), assume there exists $j \geq \overline{k}_*$ such that $r_j > 0$. Then we would have $r_{\overline{k}_*} < 0 < r_j$ and $v_{\overline{k}_*}^r < u_{\overline{k}_*} \leq u_j < v_j^r$. This contradicts Lemma 1, and thus $r_j \leq 0$ for all $j \geq \overline{k}_*$. Moreover, if $r_j < -u_j$ for some $j \geq \overline{k}_*$, then $v_j^r = u_j + r_j < 0$. Since $\overline{k}_* \in \mathcal{C}^R$, then $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$ and thus $r_j < -u_j \leq 0$. To sum up, $r_j < 0$ and $v_j^r < 0$. This contradicts Lemma 2, so $r_j \geq -u_j$ for all $j \geq \overline{k}_*$, and thus (41) holds true.

We now prove inequalities (42). Assume by contradiction that $v_i^r > v_j^r$ for some $i \leq \underline{k}_* < \overline{k}_* \leq j$. By (41) we have $r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i$. If $r_j < 0 < r_i$, we obtain the contradiction with Lemma 1. If $r_j = 0 < r_i$, we have $r_{\overline{k}_*} < 0 < r_i$, and by (1) we have $v_{\overline{k}_*}^r < u_{\overline{k}_*} \leq u_j = v_j^r < v_i^r$, contradicting Lemma 1. Similarly, $r_j < 0 = r_i$, we have $r_j < 0 < r_{\underline{k}_*}$, and by (1) we have $v_{\underline{k}_*}^r > u_{\underline{k}_*} \geq u_i = v_i^r > v_j^r$, also contradicting Lemma 1. In the last case that $r_i = 0 = r_j$, we have $r_{\overline{k}_*} < 0 < r_{\underline{k}_*}$, and by (1), $v_{\overline{k}_*}^r < u_{\overline{k}_*} \leq u_j = v_j^r < v_i^r = u_i \leq u_{\underline{k}_*} < v_{\underline{k}_*}^r$. This again contradicts Lemma 1. In sum, we obtain a contradiction with Lemma 1 in all the sub-cases, and thus (42) holds true. \square

We now prove Proposition 4. We first prove the statements in (14). Define $a := \min_{\overline{k}_* \leq j \leq I} v_j^r$. By (40) we have $v_k^r = u_k$ for $\underline{k}_* < k < \overline{k}_*$. If $a \geq v_{\overline{k}_*-1}^r$, then set $k_* = \overline{k}_*$. By (1) we have $a \geq v_{\overline{k}_*-1}^r \geq v_k^r$ for all $\underline{k}_* < k < \overline{k}_*$, and by (42) we have $a \geq v_i^r$ for all $i \leq \underline{k}_*$. Moreover, by (40) and (42) we see that $r_i \geq 0 \geq r_j$ for all $i < k_* \leq j$. So $k_* = \overline{k}_*$ satisfies all the requirements in inequalities (14). We now assume $a < v_{\overline{k}_*-1}^r$. Since $a \geq v_{\underline{k}_*}^r$ by (42), we may set $k_* = \inf\{k > \underline{k}_* : v_k^r > a\}$. Then $\underline{k}_* < k_* \leq \overline{k}_*$, and by (1) we see that $v_k^r \leq a$ for all $\underline{k}_* < k < k_*$, and $v_k^r \geq v_{k_*}^r > a$ for all $k_* \leq k < \overline{k}_*$. Recall again (42), then $v_i^r \leq a \leq v_j^r$ for all $i < k_* \leq j$, and by (40) and (41), we have $r_i \geq 0 \geq r_j$ for all $i < k_* \leq j$. This completes the proof of (14). Moreover, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\sum_{i < k_*} r_i = \sum_{j \geq k_*} (-r_j)$, and thus obtains (15). \square

Proof of Proposition 5:

We start by giving a lemma that will be useful in subsequent proofs.

Lemma 4. *For any promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, the following holds:*

- (i) *For any coalition $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{I}$, we have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} \geq \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i \right|$.*
- (ii) *Consider a coalition $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{I}$ such that $|\mathcal{C}| = \widehat{\kappa}$, $u_i + r_i \leq u_j + r_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $j \notin \mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ if and only if $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$.*

Proof. (i) Since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} |r_i| + \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} |r_i| \right] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i \right| + \left| \sum_{i \notin \mathcal{C}} r_i \right| \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i \right| + \left| - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i \right| \right] = \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} r_i \right|.$$

(ii) Note that $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ because the reform is defeated if all members of \mathcal{C} vote against it. If $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$, by Proposition 1 (and recalling $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}$), since $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, we have $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$.

We now assume $0 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i)$ for \mathcal{C} satisfying the conditions in part (ii) of Lemma 4 and prove that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. This in particular implies that

$$\min_{j \notin \mathcal{C}} (u_j + r_j) \geq \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0. \quad (43)$$

For any decisive coalition $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, consider the partition of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ defined by $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2 \cup \mathcal{C}_3$. Members of the coalition \mathcal{C}_1 belong both to \mathcal{C} and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, that is, $\mathcal{C}_1 := \mathcal{C} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. The coalition \mathcal{C}_2 is a subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \mathcal{C}$ such that when merged with the coalition \mathcal{C}_1 , it forms a coalition with cardinality $\widehat{\kappa}$, that is, $|\mathcal{C}_1| + |\mathcal{C}_2| = \widehat{\kappa}$. Finally the coalition \mathcal{C}_3 formed by the residual members of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ who do not belong to \mathcal{C}_1 or \mathcal{C}_2 , that is, $\mathcal{C}_3 := \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \setminus (\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2)$. Note that $u_i + r_i \leq u_j + r_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1$ and $j \in \mathcal{C}_2$ and that, $|\mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1| = |\mathcal{C}_2|$. Thus the inequality (43) implies

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_2} (u_j + r_j) \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1} (u_i + r_i). \quad (44)$$

Since $\mathcal{C}_3 \cap \mathcal{C} = \emptyset$, we have $u_k + r_k \geq \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{C}_3$, and hence

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_3} (u_k + r_k) \geq 0. \quad (45)$$

Using (44) and (45) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} (u_i + r_i) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_1} (u_i + r_i) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_2} (u_j + r_j) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}_3} (u_k + r_k) \\
&\geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_1} (u_i + r_i) + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \mathcal{C}_1} (u_i + r_i) + 0 \\
&= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now it follows from Proposition 1 again that $r \in \mathcal{S}_0$. \square

We now prove Proposition 5. We first show that $\mathcal{T}_r \geq U_S$ for any stable promises profile $r \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Indeed, since $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$, we have $\mathcal{C}^S \in \mathcal{D}^S$ so Proposition 1 implies then that $\sum_{\mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} |r_i| \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (-u_i) = U_S. \quad (46)$$

Then it follows from Lemma 4 (i) that

$$\mathcal{T}_r \geq \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i \right| \geq U_S, \text{ for all } r \in \mathcal{S}_0. \quad (47)$$

Step 1: We start by considering the case where $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa - 1$, and cover first the "if" direction (\Leftarrow), then the "only if" direction (\Rightarrow).

If a promises profile r satisfies conditions 1 and 2.a from Proposition 5, then it can be directly checked that $r \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{T}_r = U_S$. Moreover, by construction we see that $u_i + r_i = 0$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and $u_j + r_j \geq 0$ for $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$. Therefore $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$ for all coalitions $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ and hence, by Proposition 1 the promises profile r is stable, that is $r \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Since $\mathcal{T}_r = U_S$, inequality (47) shows that the promises profile r achieves the minimum total promises transfer and thus $r \in \mathcal{E}$.¹⁴

We now prove the only if part. That is, we assume $r \in \mathcal{E}$ and prove that conditions 1 and 2.a from Proposition 5 hold. Note that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} |r_i| \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} (-r_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i \geq U_S, \quad (49)$$

¹⁴In particular, we note that the following promises profile r satisfies 1 and 2.a from Proposition 5, and hence is an equilibrium with minimum total promises transfer:

$$r_i := -u_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^S; \quad r_j := -\frac{U^S}{U^R} u_j, \quad j \in \mathcal{C}^R. \quad (48)$$

and combining (46) with (49) gives

$$\mathcal{T}_r = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} |r_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} |r_i| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} (-r_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (r_i) \geq U_S. \quad (50)$$

Since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ has minimum total promises transfer, we must have $\mathcal{T}_r = U_S$. Therefore, inequalities (50) become equalities, that is,

$$U_S = \mathcal{T}_r = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} |r_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} |r_i| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} (-r_i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (r_i) = U_S.$$

This in turn implies that inequalities (46) and (49) are also equalities:

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} |r_i| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = U_S, \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} |r_i| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} (-r_i) = U_S.$$

Then

$$|r_i| = r_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^S; \quad |r_i| = -r_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^R; \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^R} |r_i| = U_S,$$

and thus

$$r_i \geq 0 \geq r_j, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}^S, j \in \mathcal{C}^R, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = U_S = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R} (-r_j). \quad (51)$$

Moreover, the equality $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = U_S$ implies that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) = 0$.

Since $|\mathcal{C}^S| > \hat{\kappa}$, then for any $i_0 \in \mathcal{C}^S$, $\mathcal{C}^S \setminus \{i_0\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, thus by Proposition 1 we have $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \setminus \{i_0\}} (u_i + r_i) \geq 0$. This, together with $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) = 0$, implies that $u_{i_0} + r_{i_0} \leq 0$, for all $i_0 \in \mathcal{C}^S$. Combining this with the equality $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) = 0$, we must have $u_i + r_i = 0$ or $r_i = -u_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$.

Finally, for each $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$, since $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, then by Proposition 1 we have $0 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \{j\}} (u_i + r_i) = u_j + r_j$. That is, $r_j \geq -u_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$. To summarize, we have proven that: in addition to the relations (51), $r_i = -u_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and $-u_j \leq r_j \leq 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$. Thus conditions 1 and 2.a from Proposition 5 hold. This concludes the proof for the case $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa - 1$.

Step 2: We now consider the case $|\mathcal{C}^R| = \kappa - 1$. Notice that in this case, $|\mathcal{C}^S| = \hat{\kappa}$. First, if \mathbf{r} satisfies conditions 1 and 2.b of Proposition 5, then it can be checked as in Step 1 that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{T}_r = U_S$, $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) = 0$, and $r_j \geq -u_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$. Moreover, by condition 2.b of Proposition 5 and property (ii) of Lemma 4, we see that

$r \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Since $\mathcal{T}_r = U_S$, the promises profile \mathbf{r} minimizes the total promises transfer and hence $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$.¹⁵

We now prove the only if part. We assume $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ and show that conditions 1 and 2.b of Proposition 5 hold true. By the same arguments in Step 1 of this proof, we see that (51) still holds true. Moreover, for any $i_0 \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and $j_0 \in \mathcal{C}^R$, note that $(\mathcal{C}^S \setminus \{i_0\}) \cup \{j_0\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, then by Proposition 1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \sum_{i \in (\mathcal{C}^S \setminus \{i_0\}) \cup \{j_0\}} (u_i + r_i) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) - (u_{i_0} + r_{i_0}) + (u_{j_0} + r_{j_0}) \\ &= (u_{j_0} + r_{j_0}) - (u_{i_0} + r_{i_0}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $u_{i_0} + r_{i_0} \leq u_{j_0} + r_{j_0}$ for all $i_0 \in \mathcal{C}^S$ and $j_0 \in \mathcal{C}^R$ and hence, condition 2.b.ii of Proposition 5 is satisfied. The remaining properties of condition 2.b from Proposition 5 are implied by (51). Similarly with the exception of the inequality $-u_j \leq r_j$ for $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$, all other properties in Condition 1 from Proposition 5 are implied by (51). To prove this last property, note that if $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (u_i + r_i) = 0$, then there exists $i_0 \in \mathcal{C}^S$ such that $u_{i_0} + r_{i_0} \geq 0$. Condition 2.b.ii from Proposition 5 implies that $u_j + r_j \geq u_{i_0} + r_{i_0} \geq 0$ for any $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$, and thus $r_j \geq -u_j$, for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^R$. \square

Proof of Proposition 6:

Note that in this case $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i = -G^S \geq 0$. It can be verified that the conditions in Lemma 4 (ii) for $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \dots, \widehat{\kappa}\}$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ hold. Then $\mathbf{0} \in \mathcal{S}_0$, and this stable promises profile is both unique and has zero total transfers. Hence $\mathcal{E} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 7:

The proof proceeds in four steps. In the first step, we show that $\mathcal{T}_r \geq G^S$. In the second step, we prove the "if" part of Proposition 7. In the third step, we give an example of across the aisle equilibrium promise that satisfies $\mathcal{T}_r = G^S$. The example is used in the fourth and last step where we prove the "only if" part of Proposition 7.

¹⁵In particular, we note that the promises profile \mathbf{r} constructed in (48) satisfies conditions 1 and 2.b of of Proposition 5 and hence is in \mathcal{E} . In contrast to the case where $|\mathcal{C}^S| < \kappa - 1$ where all members of the coalition \mathcal{C}^S were *ex post* indifferent between R and S after receiving the equilibrium promises, we note that in the case $|\mathcal{C}^R| = \kappa - 1$ it is possible that $u_i + r_i > 0$ for some $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$.

Step 1. We first show that $\mathcal{T}_r \geq G^S$ for any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Since $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R \in \mathcal{D}^S$, by Proposition 1 and (16) we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [u_i + r_i] = -G^S + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i. \quad (52)$$

Then by Lemma 4 (i) we have $\mathcal{T}_r \geq |\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i| \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i \geq G^S$.

Step 2. We next prove the if part: assume conditions (19), (20) and (21) hold and prove that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfy (19), note that $r_k \geq -u_k$ or $u_k + r_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, and by the calculation in (52) we see that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} v_i^r \geq 0$. These observations together with condition (20) show that all conditions required in Lemma 4 (ii) are fulfilled and therefore, we have $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Condition (21) and Step 1 of this proof show that in addition to being stable, the promises profile \mathbf{r} achieves the minimal total promises transfer $\mathcal{T}_r = G^S$ and thus $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$.

Step 3. In this step we construct an equilibrium $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. Consider the following across the aisle promises profile \mathbf{r} :

$$r_i := -\frac{G^S}{U^S} u_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^S; \quad r_j := 0, \quad j \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R; \quad r_k := -\frac{G^S}{\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}} [u_k - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}], \quad k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R. \quad (53)$$

We can show directly that it satisfies conditions (19), (20) and, (21).¹⁶ Moreover, using the result in Step 2 of this proof shows that the promises profile \mathbf{r} is an equilibrium.

¹⁶To see this, first observe that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ since, using equalities (4) and (18), it can be checked that $\sum_{\mathbb{I}} r_i = 0$.

Noticing that $u_{\widehat{\kappa}} \geq 0$, $G^S \leq U^S$, and $G^S \leq \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$, we have for any $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$, $j \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, and $k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$,

$$r_i \geq 0, \quad r_j = 0, \quad r_k \leq 0; \quad r_k \geq -\frac{G_s}{U_{\widehat{\kappa}}} u_k \geq -u_k$$

and therefore \mathbf{r} satisfies condition (19). Moreover we have,

$$\begin{aligned} v_i^r &= [1 - \frac{G^S}{U^S}] u_i < 0 \leq u_{\widehat{\kappa}}, \quad v_j^r = u_j \leq u_{\widehat{\kappa}}, \\ v_k^r &= u_k - \frac{G_s}{\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}} [u_k - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}] \geq u_k - [u_k - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}] = u_{\widehat{\kappa}}; \end{aligned}$$

and thus condition (20) is satisfied. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i &= \frac{G^S}{U^S} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} [-u_i] = G^S, \\ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_k &= -\frac{G_s}{\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [u_k - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}] = -\frac{G_s}{\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}} \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} = -G^S; \end{aligned}$$

and hence condition (21) is satisfied. To sum up the promises profile \mathbf{r} satisfy conditions (19), (20) and, (21), and therefore it is an equilibrium.

Step 4. We now prove the only if part. Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ and prove that \mathbf{r} satisfies conditions (19), (20) and, (21). Applying Step 1 of this proof shows that since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$, we have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} \geq G^S$. Recall (52) and note that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_i| \geq \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i \geq G^S; \quad (54)$$

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_k| \geq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (-r_k) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i \geq G^S. \quad (55)$$

Combining (54) and (55) gives

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_k| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (-r_k) \geq G^S. \quad (56)$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} \geq G^S$ for any stable promise profile, and since the equilibrium promise profile defined in (53) achieves the total promises transfer G^S , it must be that $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = G^S$ for any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. When $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = G^S$, inequalities (56) become equalities:

$$G^S = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_k| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (-r_k) = G^S.$$

This in turn implies inequalities (54) and (55) are also equalities:

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_i| = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i = G^S, \quad \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} |r_j| = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (-r_j) = G^S.$$

Then, similarly to the approach used to prove (51), we deduce that $|r_i| = r_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and $|r_j| = -r_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$. Hence

$$r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R, j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R.$$

Recalling that $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{1, \dots, \hat{\kappa}\}$ and $\mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R = \{\hat{\kappa} + 1, \dots, I\}$, we see that the last equation is equivalent to

$$r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i, \quad \forall i \leq \hat{\kappa} < j.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{\kappa}} r_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (-r_j) \equiv \sum_{j=\hat{\kappa}+1}^I (-r_j) = G^S.$$

Using (16), observe further that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (u_i + r_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} u_i + \sum_{i \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_i = -U^S + \underline{U}^R + G^S = 0.$$

To verify the individual rationality constraint $-u_j \leq r_j$ for any $j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, observe that $(\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R) \cup \{j\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$, then by Proposition 1 we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{i \in (\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R) \cup \{j\}} (u_i + r_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (u_i + r_i) + (u_j + r_j) = u_j + r_j,$$

which implies $r_j \geq -u_j$. So far, we have shown that the payment promises profile \mathbf{r} satisfies (19) and (21).

All that's left to prove is that (20) also holds. For any $j \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and $k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, noting that $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R \cup \{k\} \setminus \{j\} \in \mathcal{D}^S$ because $|(\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R \cup \{k\}) \setminus \{j\}| = \widehat{\kappa}$, then by (10) from Proposition (1) we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{i \in (\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R \cup \{k\}) \setminus \{j\}} (u_i + r_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} (u_i + r_i) + (u_k + r_k) - (u_j + r_j) = v_k^{\mathbf{r}} - v_j^{\mathbf{r}}.$$

Thus $v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_k^{\mathbf{r}}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and $k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ and the promises profile \mathbf{r} satisfies (20). \square

Proof of Proposition 8:

We start the proof with two preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 5. *Consider a committee rule by κ -majority rule satisfying $|\kappa| \geq 2$ and such that $G^S > \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$. The following statements hold:*

(i) *We have*

$$u_* < u_{\widehat{\kappa}}, \tag{57}$$

where we recall that u_* is defined by $u_* = \frac{1}{\kappa-1} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}} u_j$.

(ii) *There exists a unique group member $k_* \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, i.e. $n < \kappa_* \leq \widehat{\kappa}$, and inequalities (26) hold, that is, $u_{k_*-1} \leq u_* < u_{k_*}$.*

(iii) *The constant \mathcal{T}_* defined in (30) satisfies the inequality*

$$\mathcal{T}_* > G^S. \tag{58}$$

Proof. To prove that (i) holds, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
G^S &= U^S - \underline{U}^R = -\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i = -\sum_{i=1}^I u_i + \sum_{i=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I u_i \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^I u_i + \sum_{i=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_i - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}] + (I - \widehat{\kappa})u_{\widehat{\kappa}} \\
&= -\sum_{i=1}^I u_i + \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} + (\kappa - 1)u_{\widehat{\kappa}},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the definition of $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$ in (18) and the relation $\widehat{\kappa} = I - \kappa + 1$. Using the definition of u_* given in (25) yields

$$G^S - \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} = (\kappa - 1)u_{\widehat{\kappa}} - \sum_{i=1}^I u_i = (\kappa - 1)[u_{\widehat{\kappa}} - u_*]. \quad (59)$$

Since $G^S > \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$, this establishes inequality (57) in part (i) of Lemma 5.

From the reasoning just used to prove the first part of the lemma and assumption $G^S > \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$, we have $u_n < 0 < u_* < u_{\widehat{\kappa}}$. Then by the ordering condition (1) there exists a unique $k_* \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, *i.e.* $n < k_* \leq \widehat{\kappa}$, such that the inequalities (26) hold¹⁷. This proves part (ii) of Lemma 5.

To prove part (iii) of Lemma 5, observe that the total promises transfer \mathcal{T}_* defined in (30) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T}_* &\equiv \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] + \sum_{j=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_j - u_*] \\
&= \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] + \sum_{j=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_j - u_{\widehat{\kappa}}] + \sum_{j=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I [u_{\widehat{\kappa}} - u_*] \\
&= \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] + \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} + (\kappa - 1)[u_{\widehat{\kappa}} - u_*] \\
&= \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] + G^S > G^S
\end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

where we used equation (59) in the fourth equality of the above sequence of equalities. This establishes inequality (58) in part (iii) of Lemma 5. \square

¹⁷For example, pick $k_* = \min k$ such that $u_k > u_*$.

Lemma 6. Consider the across the aisle promises profile \mathbf{r} defined by

$$r_i := -\frac{\mathcal{T}_*}{U^S}u_i, \quad \forall i \leq n; \quad r_k := 0, \quad \forall n < k < k_*; \quad r_j := -[u_j - u_*], \quad \forall j \geq k_* \quad (61)$$

where we recall that k_* is defined in part (ii) of Lemma 5. Then the promises profile \mathbf{r} is zero sum, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ and satisfies the conditions (27)-(30) of Proposition 8. Moreover, the promise profile \mathbf{r} defined in (61) is stable.

Proof. First, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ since

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} r_i = \frac{\mathcal{T}_*}{U^S} \sum_{i=1}^n (-u_i) - \sum_{j=k_*}^I [u_j - u_*] = \mathcal{T}_* - \mathcal{T}_* = 0.$$

Second, the statements in (27), (28) and (30) can be directly checked from the definition of the promises profile \mathbf{r} given in (61).

Finally, to prove (29), we need first to prove the preliminary result that $0 < \mathcal{T}_* < U^S$. Using (60), observe that

$$U^S - \mathcal{T}_* = U^S - \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] - G^S.$$

Using the definition of G^S given in (16) yields

$$U^S - \mathcal{T}_* = \underline{U}^R - \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} [u_j - u_*] = \underline{U}^R - \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_j + (\widehat{\kappa} - k_* + 1)u_*. \quad (62)$$

Since $k_* \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$, we have $n < k_* \leq \widehat{\kappa}$ and hence $\underline{U}^R - \sum_{j=k_*}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_j \geq 0$. Moreover, $n < k_* \leq \widehat{\kappa}$ also implies that $(\widehat{\kappa} - k_* + 1)u_* > 0$. Thus using (62) gives $0 < \mathcal{T}_* < U^S$.

Now we are prepared to prove (29). For $i \leq n$, $n < k < k_*$, and $j \geq k_*$, we have

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} = u_i + r_i = [1 - \frac{\mathcal{T}_*}{U^S}]u_i \leq 0; \quad v_k^{\mathbf{r}} = u_k + r_k = u_k \geq 0; \quad v_j^{\mathbf{r}} = u_j + r_j = u_* > 0$$

where the left inequality is implied by $0 < \mathcal{T}_* < U^S$. Thus we see that the condition (29) is satisfied for the promises profile \mathbf{r} defined in (61).

Finally, to show that \mathbf{r} is stable, set $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R$ in Lemma 4 (ii) so that $|\mathcal{C}| = \widehat{\kappa}$. Using condition (29) and observing that $u_j + r_j = u_*$ for all $j \geq k_*$ shows that we have $u_i + r_i \leq u_j + r_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $j \notin \mathcal{C}$.

Moreover, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, by (57) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [-u_j + u_*] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i - (\kappa - 1)u_* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by applying Lemma 4 (ii) we see that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. \square

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 8 and we proceed in two steps. In the first step, we prove the only if part and in the second step, we prove the if part.

Step 1. In this step, we prove the only if part: we fix an equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$, and show that \mathbf{r} satisfies conditions (27)-(30) of Proposition 8. Notice that Proposition 3 shows that the set \mathcal{E} is not empty and thus it is possible to select a promises profile from \mathcal{E} as we just did.

Recall Lemma 3 and let $\tilde{k}_* \in \mathcal{C}^R$ satisfy

$$\underline{k}_* \equiv \max\{i : r_i > 0\} < \tilde{k}_* \leq \min\{i : r_i < 0\} \equiv \bar{k}_*, \quad (63)$$

and the requirements (14) (In this proof, we reserve the notation k_* for the requirement (26) instead of the requirements (14)), that is, $-u_j \leq r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i$ and $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}}$ for all $i < \tilde{k}_* \leq j$. Moreover, we assume \tilde{k}_* is the largest one satisfying the requirements, and thus

$$\text{either } r_{\tilde{k}_*} < 0, \quad \text{or } v_{\tilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} > \min_{j > \tilde{k}_*} v_j^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad (64)$$

because otherwise $\tilde{k}_* + 1$ would also satisfies the desired requirements¹⁸.

Step 1.1. We first show that $\tilde{k}_* \leq k_*$. Since $k_* \leq \hat{\kappa}$, this implies $\tilde{k}_* \leq \hat{\kappa}$. Assume by contradiction that $\tilde{k}_* > k_*$. Then by (14) we have

$$u_j + r_j \geq u_{k_*} + r_{k_*} \geq u_{k_*}, \quad \text{for all } j \geq \tilde{k}_*.$$

Moreover, in the case that $\tilde{k}_* > \hat{\kappa}$, by (1) we also have,

$$u_j + r_j \geq u_j \geq u_{k_*}, \quad \text{for all } \hat{\kappa} \leq j < \tilde{k}_*;$$

¹⁸To see this, assume the opposite of statement (64) holds, that is, $r_{\tilde{k}_*} \geq 0$ and $v_{\tilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} \leq \min_{j > \tilde{k}_*} v_j^{\mathbf{r}}$. Condition (14) implies that $r_{\tilde{k}_*} \leq 0$ and hence assuming $r_{\tilde{k}_*} \geq 0$ implies that $r_{\tilde{k}_*} = 0$. Thus we have $\underline{k}_* < \tilde{k}_* + 1 \leq \bar{k}_*$ and, $-u_j \leq r_j \leq 0 \leq r_i$ for all $i < \tilde{k}_* + 1 \leq j$. Finally the assumption $v_{\tilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} \leq \min_{j > \tilde{k}_*} v_j^{\mathbf{r}}$ implies $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}}$ for all $i < \tilde{k}_* + 1 \leq j$. Hence $\tilde{k}_* + 1$ also satisfies the requirements (63) and (14).

So in all the cases we have $u_j + r_j \geq u_{k_*}$ for all $j \geq \widehat{\kappa}$. This in turn implies,

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_j \geq \sum_{j > \widehat{\kappa}} [u_{k_*} - u_j] = -\Delta U_{k_*} > -G^S.$$

Thus, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} [u_i + r_i] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R} r_j < -G^S + G^S = 0.$$

This contradicts the inequality (10) which is required here because $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}^S \cup \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R \in \mathcal{D}^S$.

Step 1.2. In this step, we prove that the *ex post* intensities of the members $j = \widetilde{k}_*, \dots, I$ are equal:

$$v_{\widetilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} = \dots = v_I^{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (65)$$

Consider for notational convenience, the order statistics of $\{v_j^{\mathbf{r}}\}_{\widetilde{k}_* \leq j \leq I}$:

$$v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} \leq \dots \leq v_{l_I}^{\mathbf{r}},$$

where $\{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}, \dots, l_I\}$ is a permutation of $\{\widetilde{k}_*, \dots, I\}$.

To simplify the exposition, we proceed in two substeps. First, we show that $v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = \dots = v_{l_{\widetilde{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}$. Second, we show that the equality $v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = \dots = v_I^{\mathbf{r}}$ is also true.

Step 1.2.1. In this sub-step we show that

$$v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = v_{l_{\widetilde{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}} \quad \text{and hence} \quad v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = \dots = v_{l_{\widetilde{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (66)$$

We emphasize that we are considering the term $l_{\widetilde{\kappa}+1}$, rather than $l_{\widehat{\kappa}}$.

Assume by contradiction that

$$v_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} < v_{l_{\widetilde{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}. \quad (67)$$

We claim that

$$r_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}} < 0. \quad (68)$$

Indeed, recall (64). In the case $r_{\widetilde{k}_*} < 0$, by the definition of order statistics and the ordering (1) we have

$$u_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}} + r_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}} \leq u_{\widetilde{k}_*} + r_{\widetilde{k}_*} < u_{\widetilde{k}_*} \leq u_{l_{\widetilde{k}_*}},$$

which implies (68). In the case that $r_{\tilde{k}_*} = 0$ and $v_{\tilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} > \min_{j > \tilde{k}_*} v_j^{\mathbf{r}}$, by (1) again we have

$$u_{\tilde{k}_*} = v_{\tilde{k}_*}^{\mathbf{r}} > \min_{j \geq \tilde{k}_*} v_j^{\mathbf{r}} = v_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = u_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} + r_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} \geq u_{\tilde{k}_*} + r_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}},$$

implying (68) again.

Clearly $r_i > 0$ for some $i < \tilde{k}_*$, and assume without loss of generality that $r_1 > 0$. We now modify \mathbf{r} as follows: for some $\varepsilon > 0$ small,

$$\tilde{r}_1 = r_1 - \varepsilon > 0, \quad \tilde{r}_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} = r_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} + \varepsilon < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{r}_i = r_i \quad \text{for all } i \neq 1, l_{\tilde{k}_*}.$$

Set $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{1, \dots, \tilde{k}_* - 1\} \cup \{l_{\tilde{k}_*}, \dots, l_{\hat{\kappa}}\}$ so that $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}| = \hat{\kappa}$. Note that, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 + \tilde{r}_1 &< u_1 + r_1 \leq v_{l_{\hat{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}; & u_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} + \tilde{r}_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} &= v_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} + \varepsilon < v_{l_{\hat{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}; \\ u_i + \tilde{r}_i &= u_i + r_i \leq v_{l_{\hat{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \setminus \{1, l_{\tilde{k}_*}\}; & u_j + \tilde{r}_j &= u_j + r_j \geq v_{l_{\hat{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad j \notin \tilde{\mathcal{C}}. \end{aligned}$$

So $u_i + \tilde{r}_i \leq v_{l_{\hat{\kappa}+1}}^{\mathbf{r}} \leq u_j + \tilde{r}_j$ for all $i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and $j \notin \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$. Note further that, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{S}_0$,

$$\sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + \tilde{r}_i] = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + r_i] + [(\tilde{r}_1 - r_1) + (\tilde{r}_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} - r_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}})] = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + r_i] \geq 0.$$

Then by Lemma 4 (ii) we have $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. However, as in the last part of the proof for Lemma 1, we have $\mathcal{T}_{\tilde{\mathbf{r}}} = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} - \varepsilon < \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}}$. This contradicts the assumption that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ has the minimum total promises transfer. Therefore, (66) holds true.

Step 1.2.2. Now we proceed to prove (65). Assume by contradiction that, for the order statistics in the previous step,

$$v_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}}^{\mathbf{r}} = \dots = v_{l_{k_2}}^{\mathbf{r}} < v_{l_{k_2+1}}^{\mathbf{r}} \leq \dots \leq v_{l_I}^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \text{for some } \hat{\kappa} + 1 \leq k_2 < I.$$

First, by (68) we also have

$$r_{l_j} < 0, \quad \text{for all } j = \tilde{k}_*, \dots, k_2. \quad (69)$$

Again assume $r_1 > 0$. We then modify \mathbf{r} as follows: for $\varepsilon > 0$ small,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{r}_1 &= r_1 - [\hat{\kappa} - \tilde{k}_* + 1]\varepsilon > 0, & \hat{r}_{l_j} &= r_{l_j} + \varepsilon < 0, \quad j = \tilde{k}_*, \dots, k_2; \\ \hat{r}_{l_{k_2+1}} &= r_{l_{k_2+1}} - [k_2 - \hat{\kappa}]\varepsilon < 0; & \hat{r}_i &= r_i \quad \text{for all other } i. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{P}$:

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} \hat{r}_i = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} r_i - [\hat{\kappa} - \tilde{k}_* + 1]\varepsilon + \sum_{j=\tilde{k}_*}^{k_2} \varepsilon - [k_2 - \hat{\kappa}]\varepsilon = 0$$

Similarly to Step 1.2.1, we see that, for all $i < \tilde{k}_*$ and $j > k_2 + 1$,

$$u_i + \hat{r}_i \leq u_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} + \hat{r}_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} = \cdots = u_{l_{k_2}} + \hat{r}_{l_{k_2}} < u_{l_{k_2+1}} + \hat{r}_{l_{k_2+1}} < u_j + \hat{r}_j,$$

where the second inequality holds for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Now for the same $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} = \{1, \dots, \tilde{k}_* - 1\} \cup \{l_{\tilde{k}_*}, \dots, l_{\hat{\kappa}}\}$ with $|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}| = \hat{\kappa}$ as in Step 1.2.1, we have $u_i + \hat{r}_i \leq u_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} + \hat{r}_{l_{\tilde{k}_*}} \leq u_j + \hat{r}_j$ for all $i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ and $j \notin \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$, and

$$\sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + \hat{r}_i] = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + r_i] - [\hat{\kappa} - \tilde{k}_* + 1]\varepsilon + \sum_{j=\tilde{k}_*}^{\hat{\kappa}} \varepsilon = \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}} [u_i + r_i] \geq 0.$$

Then by Lemma 4 (ii) we see that $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Moreover, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{\hat{\mathbf{r}}} - \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left[|\hat{r}_1| - |r_1| + \sum_{j=\tilde{k}_*}^{k_2} [|\hat{r}_{l_j}| - |r_{l_j}|] + |\hat{r}_{l_{k_2+1}}| - |r_{l_{k_2+1}}| \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[-[\hat{\kappa} - \tilde{k}_* + 1]\varepsilon + \sum_{j=\tilde{k}_*}^{k_2} (-\varepsilon) + [k_2 - \hat{\kappa}]\varepsilon \right] \\ &= -[\hat{\kappa} - \tilde{k}_* + 1]\varepsilon < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to $\tilde{k}_* \leq \hat{\kappa}$ from Step 1.1. This contradicts the assumption that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ has the minimum total promises transfer. Therefore, (65) holds true.

Step 1.3. We now collect all the results from the intermediate steps to show that \mathbf{r} satisfies conditions (27)-(30) of Proposition 8.

Let y_* denote the common value in (65). Then $r_j = y_* - u_j \leq 0$ for all $j \geq \tilde{k}_*$. On one hand, since $\tilde{k}_* \leq k_* \leq \hat{\kappa}$ by Step 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{i \leq \hat{\kappa}} [u_i + r_i] = \sum_{i \leq \hat{\kappa}} u_i - \sum_{j > \hat{\kappa}} r_j = \sum_{i \leq \hat{\kappa}} u_i - \sum_{j > \hat{\kappa}} [y_* - u_j] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i - (\hat{\kappa} - 1)y_* = (\hat{\kappa} - 1)(u_* - y_*). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $y_* \leq u_*$. On the other hand, by (15),

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{j \geq \tilde{k}_*} (-r_j) \geq \sum_{j \geq k_*} (-r_j) = \sum_{j \geq k_*} [u_j - y_*] \geq \sum_{j \geq k_*} [u_j - u_*] = \mathcal{T}_*. \quad (70)$$

Since \mathbf{r} minimizes the total promises transfer and we already constructed a stable promises profile in Lemma 6 with total promises transfer \mathcal{T}_* , then we must have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathcal{T}_*$, and thus all the inequalities in (70) are equalities. In particular, the second inequality in (70) implies that $u_* = y_*$. Moreover, by (64) and (65) we have $r_{\tilde{k}_*} < 0$, so that the first inequality in (70) implies that $\tilde{k}_* = k_*$. Now it can be directly checked that the conditions (27)-(30) of Proposition 8 hold. This concludes the proof of the only if part of Proposition 8.

Step 2. In this step we show the if part: we fix $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ that satisfies conditions (27)-(29) of Proposition 8 and show that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ and that (30) holds.

To show that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$, set $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}^S \cup \mathcal{C}^R$ in Lemma 4 (ii) so that $|\mathcal{C}| = \hat{\kappa}$. Using condition (29) and observing that $u_j + r_j = u_*$ for all $j \geq k_*$ (condition (28)) shows that we have $u_i + r_i \leq u_j + r_j$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and $j \notin \mathcal{C}$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $r_j = -u_j + u_*$ for $j \geq \kappa_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}} (u_i + r_i) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \mathcal{C}^R} u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \mathcal{C}^R} r_j = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S \cup \mathcal{C}^R} u_i - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \mathcal{C}^R} [-u_j + u_*] \\ &= \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} u_i - (\kappa - 1)u_* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then by applying Lemma 4 (ii) we see that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{j \geq k_*} (-r_j) = \sum_{j \geq k_*} [u_j - u_*] = \mathcal{T}_*.$$

By Proposition 3 there exists $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$. By Step 1 (the only if direction), the promises profile \mathbf{r}^* satisfies conditions (27)-(30), in particular, $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \mathcal{T}_*$, thus \mathcal{T}_* is the minimum total promises transfer for all $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Finally, if $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}_0$ satisfies (27)-(29), we have $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathcal{T}_*$, so \mathbf{r} matches the minimum total promises transfer, and thus $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 9

When $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$ is clear from Proposition 5 that all promises recipients are reform supporters and thus statement 1 in Proposition 9 holds.

We now prove statement 2.. We first show that properties 2.a. and 2.b collectively imply that any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ belongs to the reaching across the aisle type.

Consider now the first subcase where $u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{\hat{k}}$ and $G^S = \Delta U_{\hat{k}}$. Note that

$$u_j + r_j = v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \geq v_{\hat{k}}^{\mathbf{r}} \geq u_{\hat{k}}, \quad \forall j > \hat{k}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{j>\hat{k}} (-r_j) \leq \sum_{j>\hat{k}} (u_j - u_{\hat{k}}) = \Delta U_{\hat{k}} = G^S.$$

Since $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$, then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = G^S$ (Proposition (7) condition 3), and thus equality holds above. This implies that $-r_j = u_j - u_{\hat{k}}$ and thus $v_j^{\mathbf{r}} = u_{\hat{k}}$ for all $j > \hat{k}$. Note further that $u_i \leq v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} = u_{\hat{k}}$ for all $n < i \leq \hat{k} < j$. By the assumption in of this subcase, we see that $r_i = 0$ for $i = n + 1, \dots, \hat{k}$. That is, \mathbf{r} is of the reaching across the aisle type promise.

Consider the second subcase where $u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{\hat{k}} = u_{\hat{k}+1}$. By Proposition 7 Part 1, we have $r_i \geq 0$ for $n + 1 \leq i \leq \hat{k}$ and $r_{\hat{k}+1} \leq 0$. Then $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \geq u_i = u_{\hat{k}+1} \geq v_{\hat{k}+1}^{\mathbf{r}}$. By Proposition 7 Part 2, we have $v_{\hat{k}+1}^{\mathbf{r}} \geq v_i^{\mathbf{r}}$ and thus we must have $v_{\hat{k}+1}^{\mathbf{r}} = v_i^{\mathbf{r}}$. Thus $r_i = 0$ for $n + 1 \leq i \leq \hat{k}$. This implies that \mathbf{r} is of the reaching across the aisle type promise.

We next prove the only if part of statement 2 in Proposition 5. To do so, we assume that either statement 2.a or statement 2.b is false, and construct an equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ where some promises recipients are reform supporters. Note that, when either statement 2.a or statement 2.b is false, together with (1) and the assumption that $0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\hat{k}}$, one of the following two statements must be true:

$$u_{n+1} < u_{\hat{k}} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\hat{k}}; \quad (71)$$

$$u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{\hat{k}} < u_{\hat{k}+1} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < G^S < \Delta U_{\hat{k}}. \quad (72)$$

Now let $0 < \varepsilon < G^S$ and we modify the equilibrium promises profile in (53) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &:= -\frac{G^S - \varepsilon}{U^S} u_i, \quad i \in \mathcal{C}^S; \quad r_{n+1} := \varepsilon; \\ r_j &:= 0, \quad n + 1 < j \leq \hat{k}; \quad r_k := -\frac{G^S}{\Delta U_{\hat{k}}} [u_k - u_{\hat{k}}], \quad k \in \mathcal{C}^R \setminus \underline{\mathcal{C}}^R. \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

It can be directly checked that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ and satisfies conditions (19) and (21) from Proposition 7, so to establish that \mathbf{r} is an equilibrium, we only need to show (20) holds.

In the sub-case (71), assume further that $\varepsilon < u_{\hat{\kappa}} - u_{n+1}$. Then one can check that

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq 0 \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq u_{\hat{\kappa}} \leq v_k^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \text{for all } i \leq n < j \leq \hat{\kappa} < k.$$

In the sub-case (72), assume further that $\varepsilon < [1 - \frac{G^S}{\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}}] [u_{\hat{\kappa}+1} - u_{\hat{\kappa}}]$. Then using $u_{n+1} = u_{\hat{\kappa}}$ one can see

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq 0 \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq u_{\hat{\kappa}} + \varepsilon \leq u_{\hat{\kappa}} + [1 - \frac{G^S}{\Delta U_{\hat{\kappa}}}] [u_{\hat{\kappa}+1} - u_{\hat{\kappa}}] \leq v_k^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \text{for all } i \leq n < j \leq \hat{\kappa} < k.$$

To sum up, in all subcases, the promises profile \mathbf{r} defined in (73) also satisfies the condition (20) of Proposition 7 when ε is small enough, and as a result, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. We conclude then by observing that since $r_{n+1} > 0$ the reform supporter $n+1$ is a promise recipient and therefore the equilibrium \mathbf{r} has some circle the wagon transfers.

We now prove statement 3 in Proposition 9.

We first show the if part. Fix an arbitrary $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$. By Proposition 8, we have $r_i \geq 0$ and $u_i \leq v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq u_*$ for $n+1 \leq i \leq \hat{\kappa}$. However, since we assume $u_{n+1} = \dots = u_{k_*-1} = u_*$ here, we must have $r_i = 0$ for $n+1 \leq i \leq \hat{\kappa}$. Since $r_j = -(u_j - u_*) \geq 0$ for $j \geq k_*$, we see that the promises profile \mathbf{r} is of the reaching across the aisle type.

We now prove the only if part using the contrapositive. Equivalently, recalling (1), we assume $u_{n+1} < u_*$ and we shall construct an $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ which has some circle the wagon type transfers. Let $0 < \varepsilon < \mathcal{T}_*$ and we modify the promises profile described in (61) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &:= -\frac{\mathcal{T}_* - \varepsilon}{US} u_i, \quad i \leq n; & r_{n+1} &:= \varepsilon; \\ r_k &:= 0, \quad n+1 < k < k_*; & r_j &:= -[u_k - u_*], \quad j \geq k_*. \end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Assume further that $\varepsilon < u_* - u_{n+1}$, then one can check that

$$v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq 0 \leq v_j^{\mathbf{r}} \leq u_* = v_k^{\mathbf{r}}, \quad \text{for all } i \leq n < j \leq \hat{\kappa} < k.$$

It can be checked that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$ and satisfies all the other requirements in Proposition 8. We conclude by observing that $r_{n+1} > 0$ and therefore the equilibrium promises profile $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ constructed in (74) has some circle the wagon transfers. \square

Proof of Lemma 7 from Appendix B:

(i) By (79), we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}} r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} r_i + \sum_{i=k_1+1}^{k_2} r_i + \sum_{i=k_2+1}^I r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} \frac{X}{k_1} + \sum_{i=k_1+1}^{k_2} 0 + \sum_{i=k_2+1}^I \left(-\frac{X}{I-k_2}\right) = X - X = 0.$$

That is, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{P}$.

(ii) Recall $u_1 = u_{k_1}$. Since $X \leq k_1(u_{k_1+1} - u_{k_1})$, we have

$$v_{k_1} = u_{k_1} + \frac{X}{k_1} \leq u_{k_1} + (u_{k_1+1} - u_{k_1}) = u_{k_1+1} = v_{k_1+1}. \quad (75)$$

Similarly, recalling $u_I = u_{k_2+1}$, since $X \leq (I - k_2)(u_{k_2+1} - u_{k_2})$, then

$$v_{k_2+1} = u_{k_2+1} - \frac{X}{I - k_2} \geq u_{k_2+1} - (u_{k_2+1} - u_{k_2}) = u_{k_2} = v_{k_2}. \quad (76)$$

Now since $v_i = u_i$ for $k_1 < i \leq k_2$, by (1) we have $v_{k_1+1} \leq \dots \leq v_{k_2}$. Then we obtain

$$v_1 = \dots = v_{k_1} \leq v_{k_1+1} \leq \dots \leq v_{k_2} \leq v_{k_2+1} = \dots = v_I. \quad (77)$$

(iii) Inequalities (77) imply $k_1(\mathbf{u}) = k_1 \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}) \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}) \leq k_2 = k_2(\mathbf{u})$. \square

Proof of Proposition 10 from Appendix B:

In the case $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{k}} u_i \geq 0$ (there are no blocking coalitions), the algorithm stops at Step 0. All the statements are obvious.

Henceforth we assume $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{k}} u_i < 0$ in this proof. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^I u_i > 0$, then we must have $u_1 < 0 < u_I$ and thus $k_1(\mathbf{u})$ and $k_2(\mathbf{u})$ are well defined.

For all l in Step 1 such that $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{k}} v_i^l < 0$, by Lemma 7 (iii) we see that $k_1(\mathbf{v}^l)$ is weakly increasing in l and $k_2(\mathbf{v}^l)$ is weakly decreasing in l . Moreover, by (79) we have

$$v_i^{l+1} > v_i^l, \quad i \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_k^{l+1} = v_k^l, \quad k_1(\mathbf{v}^l) < k \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_j^{l+1} < v_j^l, \quad j > k_2(\mathbf{v}^l).$$

Then, since $\mathbf{v}^0 = \mathbf{u}$, by induction on l we see that

$$v_i^{l+1} > u_i, \quad i \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_k^{l+1} = u_k, \quad k_1(\mathbf{v}^l) < k \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_j^{l+1} < u_j, \quad j > k_2(\mathbf{v}^l).$$

In particular, for the l in Step 2, we have $k_1(\mathbf{v}^l) \leq k_1^* \leq k_2^* \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}^l)$, and

$$v_i^* > u_i, \quad i \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_k^* = u_k, \quad k_1(\mathbf{v}^l) < k \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad v_j^* < u_j, \quad j > k_2(\mathbf{v}^l).$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} r_i &> 0, \quad i \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad r_i = 0, \quad k_1(\mathbf{v}^l) < i \leq k_1^*; \quad r_k = 0, \quad k_1^* < k \leq k_2^*; \\ r_j &= 0, \quad k_2^* < j \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}^l); \quad r_j < 0, \quad j > k_2(\mathbf{v}^l). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (iii), and by the definition of k_1^*, k_2^* in (78), we have $v_1^* = \dots = v_{k_1^*}^*$, and $v_{k_2^*+1}^* = \dots = v_I^*$. Note further that $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0 < \sum_{i=1}^I v_i^*$ and by Lemma 7 \mathbf{v}^* is ordered, so we must have $\mathbf{v}_1^* \leq 0 < v_I^*$. This completes the proof for (i) and (ii).

Moreover, again since $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0$ and \mathbf{v}^* is ordered, by setting $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \dots, \widehat{\kappa}\}$ in Lemma 4 (ii) we see that $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{S}_0$. Let $\underline{k}_*, \bar{k}_*$ follow the definition in (39) from Lemma 3, using \mathbf{r}^* . By (i)-(iii) it is clear that

$$\underline{k}_* \leq k_1^* \leq k_2^* < \bar{k}_* \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{k}_* \leq n \leq k_2^*.$$

We next prove $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$ and (iv) in three cases.

Case 1: $|\mathcal{C}^R| < \kappa$ and thus $n = I - |\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \widehat{\kappa}$. By (i) it is clear that $u_i \geq v_i^* > 0$ for $i > k_2^*$, then $n \leq k_2^*$ and by (ii) and (iii) we have $v_i^* \leq 0$ for all $i \leq n$. On the other hand, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0$ and $\widehat{\kappa} \leq n$, then we must have $v_i^* = 0$ for all $i \leq \widehat{\kappa}$. Since \mathbf{v}^* is ordered, we actually have $v_i^* = 0$ and thus $r_i > 0$ for all $i \leq n$. Then $n \leq \underline{k}_*$ and in fact they are equal. Then

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \sum_{i=1}^{\underline{k}_*} r_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i^* = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (-u_i) = U_S.$$

Now by Proposition 5 we see that $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$.

Moreover, let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ be an arbitrary equilibrium. By Proposition 5 Part 1 we see that

$$\sum_{i > k_2^*} (u_i - v_i^*) = U_S = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i > n} (-r_i) \geq \sum_{i > k_2^*} (u_i - v_i^{\mathbf{r}}).$$

Here we used the fact that $k_2^* \geq n$. This clearly implies that $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \geq v_I^*$, and if equality holds, we must have $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} = v_I^*$ for all $i > k_2^*$ and $r_i = 0$ for all $n < i \leq k_2^*$.

Similarly, by Proposition 5 Part 2, in both cases we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (v_i^* - u_i) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i^* = U_S = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} r_i = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}^S} (v_i^{\mathbf{r}} - u_i).$$

Then clearly $\min_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r \leq v_1^*$, and if equality holds, we must have $v_i^r = v_1^*$ for all $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$. The same logic applies to maximum of $v_i^r - u_i$, directly implying $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r - \min_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r \geq v_1^* - v_1^*$. Now if the two sides are actually equal, then $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r = v_1^*$ and $\min_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r = v_1^*$, thus $v_i^r = v_1^*$ for $i \in \mathcal{C}^S$, $r_i = 0$ for $n < i \leq k_2^*$, and $v_i^r = v_1^*$ for $i > k_2^*$. This exactly means $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}^*$. So (iv) holds in this case.

Case 2: $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ and $k_2^* \geq \widehat{\kappa}$. This implies that $\underline{k}_* \leq n < \widehat{\kappa} \leq k_2^*$. Note that $r_i = 0$ for $\underline{k}_* < i \leq k_2^*$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0$, then

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \sum_{i=1}^{\underline{k}_*} r_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} r_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} (v_i^* - u_i) = - \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i = G^S.$$

Note that by Proposition 7 we see that the minimum total promises transfer is G^S in the case $0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$, and by Proposition 8 it is larger than G^S in the case $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} < G^S$. So we must be in the case $0 < G^S \leq \Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}}$ and $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$.

Moreover, let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ be an arbitrary equilibrium. By Proposition 7 Part 1 we see that

$$\sum_{i > k_2^*} (u_i - v_i^*) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = G^S = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i > \widehat{\kappa}} (-r_i) \geq \sum_{i > k_2^*} (-r_i) = \sum_{i > k_2^*} (u_i - v_i^r).$$

This clearly implies that $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r \geq v_1^*$, and if equality holds, we must have $v_i^r = v_1^*$ for all $i > k_2^*$ and $r_i = 0$ for all $\widehat{\kappa} < i \leq k_2^*$. Similarly, By Proposition 7 Part 2 we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} (v_1^* - u_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} r_i^* = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = G^S = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} r_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} (v_i^r - u_i).$$

Then clearly $\min_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^r \leq v_1^*$, and if equality holds, we must have $v_i^r = v_1^*$ for all $i \leq k_1^*$ and $r_i = 0$ for all $k_1^* < i \leq \widehat{\kappa}$. (iv) holds in this case by subtracting the minimum inequality from the maximum.

Case 3: $|\mathcal{C}^R| \geq \kappa$ and $k_2^* < \widehat{\kappa}$. By the analysis in *Case 2*, we must have $\Delta U_{\widehat{\kappa}} < G^S$, and thus we are in the situation of Proposition 8. Note that, since $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0$,

$$\sum_{i > k_2^*} (u_i - v_i^*) = \sum_{i > k_2^*} (-r_i^*) = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \sum_{i \leq k_2^*} r_i^* = \sum_{i \leq k_2^*} (v_i^* - u_i) = - \sum_{i=k_2^*+1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* - \sum_{i \leq k_2^*} u_i.$$

This implies that, recalling (57),

$$\sum_{i=1}^I u_i = \sum_{i=\widehat{\kappa}+1}^I v_i^* = (\kappa - 1)v_I^*, \quad \text{and thus} \quad v_I^* = \frac{1}{\kappa - 1} \sum_{i=1}^I u_i = u_*.$$

This implies immediately that $k_2^* = k_*$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \mathcal{T}_*$, where k_* and \mathcal{T}_* are as in Proposition 8. Therefore, $\mathbf{r}^* \in \mathcal{E}$.

Moreover, let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ be an arbitrary equilibrium. By Proposition 8 Part 1 we see that $\max_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^{\mathbf{r}} = u_* = v_I^*$. On the other hand, recalling again that $k_* = k_2^* \geq k_1^*$, by Proposition 8 Part 2 we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} (v_1^* - u_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} r_i^* = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}^*} = \mathcal{T}_* = \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{r}} = \sum_{i=1}^{k_*} r_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1^*} (v_i^{\mathbf{r}} - u_i).$$

Then clearly $\min_{i \in \mathbb{I}} v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_1^*$, and if equality holds, we must have $v_i^{\mathbf{r}} = v_1^*$ for all $i \leq k_1^*$ and $r_i = 0$ for all $k_1^* < i \leq k_2^*$. Putting the maximum and minimum together shows that (iv) holds in this case as well. \square

9 Appendix B: Description of the algorithm of Section

To describe the algorithm, we introduce an operator Φ as follows. Given an intensity profile \mathbf{u} satisfying (1), with $u_1 < u_I$, let $k_1(\mathbf{u}) \leq k_2(\mathbf{u})$ be such that, abbreviating as k_1, k_2 for notational simplicity,

$$u_1 = \cdots = u_{k_1} < u_{k_1+1}, \quad u_{k_2} < u_{k_2+1} = \cdots = u_I. \quad (78)$$

We then define, for any $X > 0$,

$$\Phi(\mathbf{u}, X) := \mathbf{v}, \quad \text{where} \quad (79)$$

$$v_1 = \cdots = v_{k_1} := u_1 + \frac{X}{k_1}, \quad v_i = u_i, \quad k_1 < i \leq k_2, \quad v_{k_2+1} = \cdots = v_I := u_I - \frac{X}{I - k_2}.$$

The following can be proved:

Lemma 7. *Denote $\mathbf{v} := \Phi(\mathbf{u}, X)$.*

- (i) *For any $X > 0$, $\mathbf{r} := \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{P}$.*
- (ii) *Assume $X \leq \min(k_1(u_{k_1+1} - u_{k_1}), (I - k_2)(u_{k_2+1} - u_{k_2}))$, then $v_1 \leq \cdots \leq v_I$.*
- (iii) *For the X in (ii), if $v_1 < v_I$, then $k_1(\mathbf{u}) \leq k_1(\mathbf{v}) \leq k_2(\mathbf{v}) \leq k_2(\mathbf{u})$.*

We now present the algorithm more formally:

Step 0 (Initialization). If $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i \geq 0$, \mathbf{u} is already stable, so $\mathbf{r} = (0, \dots, 0)$ is

the unique equilibrium. We now assume $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} u_i < 0$, and set $\mathbf{v}^0 := \mathbf{u}$.

Step 1. Given \mathbf{v}^l satisfying $v_1^l \leq \dots \leq v_I^l$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^l < 0$, we define \mathbf{v}^{l+1} recursively

as follows until $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^{l+1} \geq 0$: denoting $k_1 := k_1(\mathbf{v}^l)$, $k_2 := k_2(\mathbf{v}^l)$ as in (78),

$$\mathbf{v}^{l+1} := \Phi(\mathbf{v}^l, X_{l+1}) \quad \text{where} \quad X_{l+1} := \min(k_1(v_{k_1+1}^l - v_{k_1}^l), (I - k_2)(v_{k_2+1}^l - v_{k_2}^l)),$$

We remark that by Lemma 7 (ii) \mathbf{v}^{l+1} remains ordered.

Step 2. We now assume $\sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^l < 0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^{l+1}$ for some l . Then we set

$$\mathbf{v}^* := \Phi(\mathbf{v}^l, X^*) \quad \text{where} \quad 0 < X^* \leq X_{l+1} \text{ is determined by } \sum_{i=1}^{\widehat{\kappa}} v_i^* = 0,$$

and stop the algorithm.

We note that, in each recursion of Step 1, we will have either $v_{k_1+1}^{l+1} = v_{k_1}^{l+1}$ or $v_{k_2+1}^{l+1} = v_{k_2}^{l+1}$, namely \mathbf{v}^{l+1} will have at least one more tied component than \mathbf{v}^l , so Step 1 will stop after finitely many recursions. Moreover, clearly $\Phi(\mathbf{v}^l, X)$ is continuous and strictly monotone in X , so the transfer X^* in Step 2 is unique. The following proposition shows that the above algorithm implements an equilibrium.

Proposition 10. *The promises profile $\mathbf{r}^* := \mathbf{v}^* - \mathbf{u}$ produced after a finite number of steps from the above algorithm is an equilibrium and $v_1^* \leq \dots \leq v_I^*$ with $v^* \equiv v^{\mathbf{r}^*}$. Moreover, denoting by $k_1^* = k_1(\mathbf{v}^*)$ and $k_2^* = k_2(\mathbf{v}^*)$. the committee members defined as in (78), the following properties hold true:*

(i) *Members of the coalition of promisers $\{k_2^* + 1, \dots, I\}$, make individual promises $r_i \leq 0$ and get equalized ex post intensities $v_i^* = \bar{v} > 0$, for all $i > k_2^*$.*

(ii) *Members of the the coalition of promisees $\{1, \dots, k_1^*\}$, receive individual transfers $r_i \geq 0$ and get equalized ex post intensities $v_i^* = \underline{v} \leq 0$, for all $i \leq k_1^*$.*

(iii) *Members of the coalition $\{k_1^* + 1, \dots, k_2^*\}$ make no promises, that is, $r_i = 0$ and $v_i^* = u_i$ for all $k_1^* + 1 \leq i \leq k_2^*$.*

(iv) Among all equilibria, the promise profile \mathbf{r}^* produced by the algorithm generates the ex post intensity \mathbf{v}^* with the smallest range. That is, for any $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{E}$ such that $\mathbf{r} \neq \mathbf{r}^*$, we have

$$\min_i v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \leq v_1^*, \quad \max_i v_i^{\mathbf{r}} \geq v_I^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \max_i v_i^{\mathbf{r}} - \min_i v_i^{\mathbf{r}} > v_I^* - v_1^*.$$

Proposition 10 shows that the algorithm that we describe in this section converges after a finite number of steps to a unique equilibrium. The algorithm has an egalitarian underpinning: in each step, the utility transfers flow from the members with the highest intensities to the members with the lowest intensities while preserving the ordering of the *interim* intensities. Perhaps not surprisingly, property (iv) of Proposition 10 shows that the resulting equilibrium is the one with lowest range. The algorithm is in fact an equilibrium selection that comes with a dynamic implementation based on transfers between members of the two tails of the distribution of intensities. There may be other algorithms based on other principles that will select other types of equilibria.

References

- Gary S Becker. Competition and democracy. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 1: 105–109, 1958.
- Theodore C Bergstrom and Hal R Varian. When do market games have transferable utility? *Journal of Economic Theory*, 35(2):222–233, 1985.
- Duncan Black. *The Theory of Committees and Elections.*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press, 1958.
- J.M. Buchanan and G. Tullock. *The Calculus of Consent, Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy.* University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Alessandra Casella and Antonin Macé. Does vote trading improve welfare? *Annual Review of Economics*, 13:57–86, 2021.
- Alessandra Casella and Thomas Palfrey. Trading votes for votes. a dynamic theory. *Econometrica*, 87(2):631–652, 2019.
- Ying Chen and Jan Zápál. Sequential vote buying. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 205: 105529, 2022.
- Pierre-André Chiappori and Elisabeth Gugl. Transferable utility and demand functions. *Theoretical Economics*, 15(4):1307–1333, 2020.
- James S Coleman. The possibility of a social welfare function. *The American Economic Review*, 56(5):1105–1122, 1966.
- Ernesto Dal Bo. Bribing voters. *American Journal of Political Science*, 51(4):789–803, 2007.
- Eddie Dekel, Matthew O Jackson, and Asher Wolinsky. Vote buying: General elections. *Journal of Political Economy*, 116(2):351–380, 2008.
- Eddie Dekel, Matthew O. Jackson, and Asher Wolinsky. Vote buying: Legislatures and lobbying. *Quarterly journal of political science*, 4(2):103–128, 2009.
- Anthony Downs. An economic theory of political action in a democracy. *Journal of political economy*, 65(2):135–150, 1957.

- Tim Groseclose and James M Snyder. Buying supermajorities. *American Political Science Review*, 90(2):303–315, 1996.
- Henry TC Hu and Bernard Black. The new vote buying: Empty voting and hidden (morphable) ownership. *S. Cal. L. Rev.*, 79(4):811–908, 2005.
- Maupertuis. *Accord de différentes loix de la nature qui avoient jusqu'ici paru incompatibles*. Institut de France, 1748.
- Roger B Myerson. Incentives to cultivate favored minorities under alternative electoral systems. *American Political Science Review*, 87(4):856–869, 1993.
- Mancur Olson. *Logic of collective action; public goods and the theory of groups*. 1965.
- Tomas J Philipson and James M Snyder. Equilibrium and efficiency in an organized vote market. *Public Choice*, 89(3-4):245–265, 1996.
- William H Riker and Steven J Brams. The paradox of vote trading. *American Political Science Review*, 67(4):1235–1247, 1973.
- Gordon Tullock. The welfare costs of tariffs, monopolies, and theft. *Economic inquiry*, 5(3):224–232, 1967.
- Donald Wittman. Why democracies produce efficient results. *Journal of Political economy*, 97(6):1395–1424, 1989.
- Dimitrios Xefteris and Nicholas Ziros. Strategic vote trading in power sharing systems. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 9(2):76–94, 2017.