

CENTER FOR BALLOT FREEDOM

Fusion Voting: A common sense solution to America's polarization problem

The American two-party political system is broken. We're in a "[two-party doom loop](#)" in which Republicans and Democrats each see the other as mortal enemies, not merely political opponents. This leads them to focus on winning power at all costs, not on solving the nation's problems. Bad-faith actors also exploit this partisan division, challenging democratic norms, spreading disinformation, and aggressively and even violently ignoring the rule of law. We have a system that rewards extremism and radicalization.

The majority of voters, however, reject extremism, are [increasingly frustrated](#) with the two major parties, and are eager for more choices. Yet citizens are forced to sort themselves into just one of two warring camps every time they vote. In a country of 330 million people, it's unrealistic to expect everyone to fit into two boxes. New parties would expand and enrich our political landscape, but without rules changes that remove the unconstitutional constraints placed on them by major parties, the new parties – which provide more choices for voters and lead to more cross-partisan cooperation on policy solutions – simply cannot thrive. Fusion voting is the missing link.

What is fusion voting?

Fusion voting, once used in every state in the nation, is a practice in which a candidate can appear on the ballot as the nominee of more than one party. This easy-to-understand sample ballot shows how a new party "fuses" with a major party in support of the same candidate:

Ballot Instructions:

1. Please vote for your preferred candidate under the party label you wish to support.
2. Please note that votes count the same regardless of which party label the vote is cast under.

A sample ballot with three rows. Each row has a horizontal line above it. The first row is for 'MARY BRISTOW Party A' with a blue-to-red gradient bar above the name and a blue circle with a white arrow pointing to it. The second row is for 'DAVID WILKS Party B' with a blue circle and white arrow. The third row is for 'MARY BRISTOW Fusion Party' with a blue circle and white arrow.

Candidates nominated by major parties "A" and "B" are listed on the first two lines. On the third line, Bristow is listed for a second time, as the nominee for a new party (here, the "Fusion Party"). In a close race, the votes on the Fusion Party line could make the difference between a win and a loss for Bristow. Under fusion voting, new parties can become meaningful players, as candidates and major parties look to appeal to new party voters and hope to secure new party endorsements in the future.

Reinstating fusion voting is a common sense solution to counter the extremism and polarization ingrained in our political system. Fusion voting benefits:

- **Voters:** Fusion voting gives voters the ability to vote for a major party candidate on a party line that best matches their values. The voter neither "wastes" their vote on a new party candidate who has no chance of winning, nor "spoils" the election by unintentionally helping their less preferred major party candidate. Fusion also allows voters to vote for a major party candidate they like, without having to signal support for a major party they don't support.
- **Candidates:** Fusion voting produces more votes for major party candidates who appeal to multiple constituencies and are thus able to secure additional party endorsements.
- **New Parties:** Fusion voting gives new parties more influence over the political agenda by incentivizing major party candidates to appeal to the voters represented by that new party.

Why can't the two major parties fix our democracy under the current system?

Parties are critical to a functioning democracy. Most people can't research every candidate; parties help individuals vote efficiently and engage in politics. But the two major parties are trapped in an ever-escalating hyper-partisan cycle that rewards polarization and punishes compromise. Primaries, gerrymandering, geographic self-sorting, and news and social media bubbles keep us locked in partisan warfare. The system won't self-correct by exhorting politicians to be more reasonable or to listen to the other side. Change will only come if the rules are structurally altered to incentivize cooperation and compromise.

Fusion voting would help change those rules and incentives. In this era of political extremes, fusion would serve as a moderating force; as this reform enables new parties to play a constructive role in our politics, more parties are incentivized to emerge, including those that represent the political center.

Imagine a "center" or "rule of law" party that does not run its own slate of candidates, but reviews the records of the two major party candidates and nominates the one with the clearest commitment to cross-partisan cooperation, problem solving, and the rule of law. It wouldn't take long for the nomination of this new party to be an important, even decisive, factor in many elections. This, in turn, could encourage more compromise and productivity in policy making as the major parties compete for those voters. Ultimately, fusion voting would enable parties representing a range of viewpoints to emerge, as is the case in most healthy democracies. More parties would enrich the political discourse and move us beyond just red versus blue. For example, in Connecticut and New York, fusion voting has produced durable and constructive smaller parties, like the Conservative Party on the right and Working Families Party on the left.

Momentum is growing for system reforms and fusion voting

Efforts to build new political alliances, make structural changes to our election rules, and reinstate fusion voting at the state level are gaining momentum. The Center's first effort has focused on New Jersey, where it is collaborating closely with concerned voters and a newly formed Moderate Party in a legal action to reinstate fusion voting in [New Jersey](#). Democrats and Independents are uniting against an anti-democracy candidate and in support of conservative Evan McMullin [in the Utah Senate race](#), a kind of informal fusion voting.

Fusion voting is a meaningful and winnable reform

Fusion voting is not only viable, it used to be a widespread and crucial feature of American politics. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, smaller and emerging party voters consistently leveraged fusion voting to advance their agendas. But the two major parties banned fusion in order to stamp out competition and consolidate their power. Most legal scholars believe this was, and is, an [unconstitutional](#) limit on the freedoms of association and assembly that all citizens should enjoy. As a practical matter, the fusion ban has made it impossible for new voices and parties to exercise real power and influence over the political agenda. This in turn has helped cement the dysfunctional, zero-sum nature of the two-party system and the dysfunctional government that it produces.

Unlike some proposed election reforms, fusion is a winnable solution to our polarization problem. Because bans on fusion voting were passed at the state level, removing those bans requires state action only, bypassing the gridlocked U.S. Congress. The Center for Ballot Freedom is working to reinstate fusion voting across the country using litigation, ballot initiatives, and legislation. The Center unites unlikely allies across the political spectrum in this effort because fusion voting is an urgent, winnable, and impactful political reform that can strengthen democracy, increase voter choice, promote compromise, and reduce extremism.

For more information and to join the effort, visit www.centerforballotfreedom.org.