For over a century, Americans have asked their neighbors for donations to fight diseases and supported health policies that target one disease at a time. Disease campaigns have built consensus like few other causes, and their shortcomings highlight the downsides of consensus politics. They funnel vast sums of money and attention to a few favored diseases and prioritize awareness campaigns and medical research over preventing disease and ensuring access to health care. It’s easy to imagine more efficient ways to promote our collective well-being. But do consensus campaigns actually make us worse off? Does charitable and political attention to the narrow causes we can agree on displace attention to more important problems? Data on the field of disease campaigns over decades reveal that rather than displacing attention to other problems, disease campaigns build up our capacity to address them. Consensus politics, moderate activism, and strategic restraint can help advocacy fields grow without crowding out radical activism.