

think deeply, strategise effectively, reflect critically, **make change happen.**

strategising for change

workshop resources for campaign strategy

These resources were developed by the Change Agency and Training for Change for workshops held in Australian cities during 2005 and 2006. Please use them with acknowledgement.

**the
change
agency.org**

Contents

	pages
Program, Participants' Agreements, Useful Websites	3
Team Types	4-6
Four roles in tension	7-9
Frameworks for Social Change	10-16
Critical path analysis	17-19
Theories of change	20
Power mapping	21-22
Review of activities	23
Elements of Strategy	24-25
Strategy charts: MidWest Academy, Radford	26-27
Strategising against the Iraq war (including forcefield analysis)	28-30
Strategising in an hour	31-32
Collective Action Frames <James Whelan>	33
Campaigning for Social Change: beyond just protesting for it! <Daniel Hunter>	34-38
Bringing about change <James Whelan>	39-42
The Art of Practicality and Feasibility <Daniel Hunter>	43-44
Other Strategy Tools: Force Field Analysis, Macro Strategy, Tactic Analysis	45-47
Spectrum of allies	48-49
Evaluation form	50-51

PROGRAM

DAY 1 [0900-1700]

Gather

what is strategy?

strengths & skills

tactics to strategy

frameworks for change

homework

any takers for a shared meal somewhere close?

DAY 2 [0900-1700]

visions & mapping

what's the context?

power map

strategic review

nailing it down

where to from here?

Close and evaluation

PARTICIPANTS' AGREEMENTS (proposed)

- Be positive
- Participate equally
- Stay focused on the topic
- One person speak at a time
- Respect each other and each other's opinions
- Be open to new ideas
- Have a bit of fun
- Act as a team
- Be punctual
- Talk to everyone
- Turn off mobiles

Useful websites

- Anyone Can (QCC 1996) <http://www.rag.org.au/anyonecan.htm>
- Comm-Org <http://comm-org.utoledo.edu>
- Campaign Strategy <http://www.campaignstrategy.org>
- Midwest Academy <http://midwestacademy.com>
- Movement Action Plan <http://www.users.com.au/change/council/map.htm#top>
- The Change Agency <http://www.thechangeagency.org>
- Training For Change <http://www.trainingforchange.org>

[An extensive list of useful activist education websites is available from <http://www.thechangeagency.org>]

Team Types Activity

GOALS:

- give participants' an opportunity for self-reflection on behavior and type;
- help participants work together as a team through understanding each other more deeply;
- give participants another "lens" for looking and working with each other.



TIME: 40-60 minutes

SPECIAL MATERIALS: None

HOW IT'S DONE:

Team types is a straightforward tool for participants to learn about themselves through identifying themselves within four different categories. These four types each represent different aspects of how people may operate in group settings. The basic four categories have emerged out of many different cultures. Models like it show up in many indigenous traditions (Celtic Wheel of Being, Native American Medicine Wheel, etc.), modern science's analysis of the human brain, and team theory. For sake of maximum cultural accessibility, we call it "Team Types" – though we want to recognize its many roots.

The four different types are designated by the four directions (and in most indigenous traditions have some associated items or animals; below includes the Lakota Medicine Wheel's and the Celtic Wheel of Being's objects/animals):

East

(eagle, visionary/explorer, yellow, spring, creative, inventive, has fire of inspiration)

- Sees the big picture
- Very idea-oriented, focus on future thought
- Insight into mission and purpose
- Likes to experiment, explore
- Can lose focus on tasks and not follow through
- May become easily overwhelmed, lose track of time
- Tends to be highly enthusiastic early on, then burn out

South

(mouse, producer, green, summer, hearthfire, fertility, bringing together)

- Allows others to feel important in determining direction of what's happening

Training for Change: *Tools for Trainers*

1501 Cherry St. • Philadelphia, PA 19102 • www.TrainingForChange.org • peacelearn@igc.org

- Value-driven regarding all aspects of personal/professional life
- Uses relationships to accomplish tasks
- Innocence and trust in others based on vulnerability and openness
- Supportive, nurturing, feeling-based
- Has trouble saying "no" to requests
- Internalizes difficulty and assumes blame
- Prone to disappointment when relationship is seen as secondary to task
- Difficulty confronting, dealing with anger

West

(bear, judge, brown, autumn, learning, judgement, information)

- Weighs all sides of issues
- Uses data analysis and logic
- Seen as practical and thorough in task situations
- Introspective, self-analytical
- Can become stubborn and entrenched in position
- Can be indecisive, collect unnecessary data, mired in details
- May appear cold, withdrawn

North

(buffalo, white, winter, warrior, open to struggle, decisive)

- Assertive, active, decisive
- Likes to be in control of relationship and steer course of events
- Quick to act, expresses sense of urgency for others to act now
- Enjoys challenge of difficult situations and people
- Can get defensive quickly, argue, try to out-expert you
- Can lose patience, pushes for decision before it's time
- May get autocratic, want things their way, ride roughshod over people

So to run Team Types:

1. SET-UP: Explain that this exercise is about learning about one's self and tendencies people have in working in teams. It is a chance to self-identify and to learn about how other people operate.

2. Newsprint: Describe the four team types, asking people to pay close attention to try to figure out which of the directions might describe some aspect of them.

Training for Change: *Tools for Trainers*

1501 Cherry St. • Philadelphia, PA 19102 • www.TrainingForChange.org • peacelearn@igc.org

3. Affinity groups: People form groups based on the directions, and talk among themselves on what it is like to be "north" or "west." Create sub-groups for conversation purposes if needed. Ask people who are uncertain of which group to come into the center. Talk with those individuals about their situation; suggest they "hang out" in the various groups to see if any strikes a spark or they can eliminate one or more; affirm them if they seem adamant about not joining a group.

4. Dialogue among groups

a. Each group reports how they experience being their direction. Take these "reports" through a couple of sample sharings

b. Ask groups "What do you find irritating?" about another direction.

ALTERNATIVE: ask groups "What is your shadow side? Come on, be honest."

Keep this light, laugh and enjoy what they say, be delighted with the things that drive them crazy

5. Clarify: (use newsprint to anchor for visual learners)

a. Need all four directions for successful community, best teamwork, etc.

b. The usual points of tension (polar opposites)

6. Negotiation time: ask participants to get with someone from a different direction and work with them on "How can we work together in a way that affirms our differences in direction and at the same time enables us to collaborate?"

WHERE TOOL COMES FROM:

This particular design is created by George Lakey [Training for Change (1501 Cherry St. • Philadelphia, PA USA 19102): www.TrainingForChange.org • peacelearn@igc.org]

With thanks to David Baum and Morgan Henderson

For more information on the different cultures that have roots in Team Types see: Angeles Arrien's *The Four-Fold Way: Walking the Path of the Warrior, Teacher, Healer, and Visionary* (Harper Collins).

For notes on some racial/ethnic politics of using the tool, contact Training for Change for an article on "Celtic Wheel Political Background."

Four roles in tension

Team types in strategy

When making a cake, it's important to have all the key ingredients! When creating strategy for our organizations or movements, that is no less true. But, what are the key ingredients for strategy?

The Team Types¹ offers one way of looking at different roles in strategy making and implementation. Each team type has a unique gift to offer in the project of developing strategy.

Certain elements of strategy are sometimes preferred by different organizational cultures. For example, in some organizations there is a belief that the East is seen as *the* role that creates strategy. But that is a real short-coming. All team types are important ingredients for strategy.

Strategy is best done when all roles are filled and are using their gifts for the overall good. After all, isn't a strategy a combination of the vision of the East, the sensitivity of the South, the assessment considerations of the West, and the drive to implementation of the North?

So what does each role offer? Here's a model, from the field of organizational learning that may give a clue about how those four roles surface and play distinct but equally important roles. It is not based on Team Types, has a strong overlap with it. That model is called the 4I framework.

Stage 1: East Intuition

In the 4I framework, each role plays a process in building strategy. The first process, *intuiting*, is the "preconscious recognition of the pattern and/or possibilities inherent in a personal stream of experience. This process can affect the intuitive individual's behavior, but it only affects others as they attempt to interact with that individual."² Thus, the first process is essentially idea oriented – a visionary idea coming from the East.

Stage 2: South Interpreting

The next stage is the process of articulation of that idea in a way that people can understand. Here the South's warm relational energy helps to move it from the individual idea to the group. "*Interpreting* is the explaining of an insight, or idea to one's self and others. This process goes from the preverbal to the verbal and requires the development of language."

This stage, for example, occurs in meetings where individuals begin to try out their ideas and get assisted by facilitators or others to articulate them more clearly. It is a tender stage, where "killer statements" can kill an idea before it births itself ("we've tried that before," or "we don't have the resources"). In the Southern Christian Leadership

¹ The Team Types model is also known by some as the Celtic Wheel of Being, the Medicine Wheel and others. A recent study into brains has created another version of this called the Hermann Brain Dominance Instrument (more information at www.hbdi.com). For more information on the different cultures that have roots in Team Types see: Angeles Arrien's *The Four-Fold Way: Walking the Path of the Warrior, Teacher, Healer, and Visionary* (Harper Collins).

² This and other quotes from *Organizational Learning and Strategic Renewal*, by Mary M. Crossan and Iris Berdrow as printed in the *Strategic Management Journal*. In their article they use a specific case study to examine the 4I framework, which was originally designed for "organizational learning," in relationship to strategy.

Council (SCLC), Dr. King would listen carefully to different ideas as individuals would play them out. Rather than jumping to their conclusion and how they fail or succeed, he would recognize it as a great time for openness and spaciousness (hence led by the South's energy).

Stage 3: North Integrating

The next stage, *integrating*: moving from the group's understanding of an issue to implementation (integrating the ideas into an action). Dr. King would not just listen to ideas, but would then lead the group to action. In organizations, this process may be led by an individual, subgroup or even many of its members. Either way, that movement to *action* is an expression led by the energy of the North.

"*Integrating* is the process of developing shared understanding amongst individuals and the taking of coordinated action through mutual adjustment. Dialogue and joint action are crucial to the development of shared understanding. This process will initially be ad hoc and informal, but if the coordinated action taking is recurring and significant it will be institutionalized."

Stage 4: West Institutionalizing

And that leads to the final phase, led by the energy of the West. At this stage a key principle is used: what makes something strategy for an organization is being able to articulate what one is *not* doing. That is, strategy is about choice – do this and not this. West offers the rigor to be clear we are doing this strategy and therefore *this* action and *not that* action. "*Institutionalizing* is the process of ensuring that... actions occur [in alignment with the agreed upon strategy]. Tasks are defined, actions specified and organizational mechanisms put in place to ensure that certain actions occur. Institutionalizing is the process of embedding learning that has occurred by individuals and groups into the institutions of the organization including systems, structures, procedures, and strategy."

From a strategic idea emerging out of *intuition*, to *interpreting* that idea to the larger group to understand, to *integrating* that understanding into practice and action, to finally *institutionalizing* those actions into a clear and specific strategy.

This process, though linear when written, is not only a step-by-step model but also an on-going model to look at how an organization renews and redevelops its strategy overtime. The following table reviews the overall process of the 4I framework:

Level	Process	Inputs and outcomes
Individual/ Small group	Intuiting (East)	Experiences/Ideas Images Metaphors
	Interpreting (South)	Language Verbal Explanation of idea
Group	Integrating (North)	Conversation/dialogue/understanding Shared understandings Clarity of implementation
Organization		Institutionalizing (West)

³ An original version of this table can be found in Crossan MM, Lane HW, White RE. 1999. An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review* 24 (3): 522-537.

This model proposes one way of looking at the key ingredients for strategy. If we're going to make a cake we need mix all the key ingredients appropriately. Same with strategy.

As we reflect on our experience in different groups, what can this model teach us about strategy? What roles are missing in our organizations? What roles are powerful and may be overwhelming other roles in our groups? How can we cultivate better relationship among those roles? How is our group in relation to the 4I process? What stage are we currently in about certain strategic questions?

As we learn to put together those ingredients better, we'll begin to develop a deeper understanding of the task of strategy. So enjoy and *bon appetit!*

Where tool comes from:

By Daniel Hunter, (Training for Change 1501 Cherry St. Philadelphia, PA 19102 USA www.TrainingForChange.org Feb 24, 2004).

Frameworks for Social Change

Three frameworks for understanding how campaigns and movements change over time.

Six stage campaign planning framework (Martin Luther King, Jr.)

For assisting the group to think ahead about what they'll need to be ready for as their campaign builds. In this case, the group begins by framing their issue, then goes into the following stages:

(1) Gather information; (2) Do education and leadership development, (3) Negotiate with target; (4) Increase motivation and commitment for the struggle ahead; (5) Direct action; (6) Create new relationship with opponent. which reflects the new power reality. [Based on Martin Luther King-related campaigns in the Deep South of the U.S.]

Read more at

<http://www.forusa.org/PeoplesCampaign/WayofMLK.html>

<http://www.dfong.com/nonviol/nda.html>

Five stage revolutionary movement framework (George Lakey)

Working with developmental sociology, this framework assumes that for revolutionary change a movement (or coalition of movements) needs to work on many levels at once and in a cyclical way.

For simplicity of teaching, the five stages are presented in sequence which shows how each preceding stage builds capacity for the next stage. This framework assumes that polarisation strongly increases in society as the movement(s) develop. The five stages are: (1) Cultural preparation; (2) Organisation-building; (3) Confrontation; (4) Mass noncooperation; (5) Parallel institutions which can carry out the legitimate functions formerly carried out by the Old Order (economic, maintaining infrastructure, decision-making, etc.).

Created by George Lakey, described in *Globalise Liberation*, edited by David Solnit.

Read more: See article by George Lakey from Training for Change website.

Eight stage reform social movement framework (Movement Action Plan, by Bill Moyer)

Draws from social movements in liberal democratic societies which have brought about important changes while often opening the way to new movements, as the civil rights movement opened political space for women's movement, gay rights movement, and many other movements.

This framework emphasises the intimate relationship between movement development and public opinion and minimises polarisation; the regime typically reacts to very heavy build-up of momentum by granting a

reform in order to stave off polarisation that might be dangerous to it. The framework gives direct action a prominent place and also explains the let-down which typically occurs in successful social movements after the mass mobilisations force a political shift which is largely hidden from activist view.

This framework was widely used by labor and community organisers in Taiwan while the dictatorship was fraying and space was opening up there. [Created by Bill Moyer and described in his last book, *Doing Democracy*, available from the Training for Change website.]

Read more: See below for a description of the Movement Action Plan. [Click here](#) for a 40-page detailed description of the Movement Action Plan.

A Map of the Course

(from pages 17-25 of *Grassroots and Nonprofit Leadership: A Guide for Organisations in Changing Times*, by Berit Lakey, George Lakey, Rod Napier and Janice Robinson)

The rich history of social movements means that we do not entirely have to make it up as we go along. We can learn from what worked and what didn't, and the lessons from movements then inform the choices we make as we steer our organisations. The authors have learned a lot about the life cycle of movements from longtime organiser Bill Moyer, who worked with Dr. King on the staff of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, was a major strategist for the anti-nuclear power movement, and assisted a variety of other movements and organisations. From his study and experience Bill has created a model of how successful movements achieve their goals, the Movement Action Plan (MAP).

MAP is a development model; that is, it shows how movements evolve, step by step. Just as we think about human beings with a development model (infancy, adolescence, middle age), so also it helps us think about our social change work to have a framework of stages.

Of course MAP is only one way of looking at social movements. We have found it useful, especially in understanding how to steer an organisation through the ups and downs of a cause. Bill has kindly allowed us to summarise his model for this book, and we recommend that you read it with the history of your issue in mind. First, a word about models. A model airplane is a simplified version of the real thing. You wouldn't want to fly in it, but it gives you an idea of what it's like and can even be useful for certain tests. An architect often builds a model of a building before the real thing goes up with all its complications. Like all models, MAP is a simplification of a very complex reality, and helps us to face reality with more clarity and perspective.

Bill's model shows us how the development stages of a successful movement relate to public opinion, so before we get into the internal life of the movement, we'll take a quick overview of the public. Before there is a social movement around a certain injustice, the body politic seems to be asleep. The toxic waste is being routinely dumped, for example, with office holders looking the other way and public opinion preoccupied with other things. This is stage one.

Then stress builds and the body politic wakes up. In stages two, three, and four, more and more of the public notices what's going on, and the office holders get busy reassuring the public that they are taking care of the problem and it's OK to go back to sleep. In each of stages two, three, and four, the movement's growth is in a different place.

By stages five and six the majority of the public agrees with the movement that change is needed (the war should be stopped, or nuclear power is too dangerous, for example). There's a debate though, about possible alternatives. Stage five is a letdown time for activists, and can be tricky; some movements just die in this stage instead of moving ahead to success.

At last comes success, in stages seven and eight. Many office holders are proclaiming that they really

wanted these changes all along, while some of the holdouts are being voted out of office. New groups are spinning off the main reform movement to start the process all over again. Most of the public is glad to stop talking about civil rights, or Vietnam, or nuclear power, and go back to their individual concerns (which, from an activist's point of view, looks like going back to sleep!).

Stage One: Business as Usual

Only a relatively few people care about the issue at this point, and they form small groups to support each other. Their objective: to get people thinking. They do their best to spread the word and often try small action projects.

Stage Two: Failure of Established Channels

A major reason why most of the public does not inform itself and act on an injustice is that people think (or hope) that established structures are taking care of it. "Surely the government is watching out for the safety of our ground water supply." "The government is researching AIDS." "Corporation scientists know which chemicals are dangerous in our workplace and which are not."

In this stage the small groups challenge the established channels. They often do research, or get victims of injustice to file formal complaints. They may sue governmental agencies, or use any opportunities to appeal that exist in the regulations. Usually the activists lose, at this stage, but it is very important that they take these steps. Stage two is essential for change, since large-scale participation will not happen as long as people believe in the established channels. In fact, you'll find that, by stage two, polls show fifteen to twenty percent of public opinion is leaning toward a change.

Stage Three: Ripening Conditions/Education and Organising

Now the pace picks up considerably, because many people who earlier did not want to listen become interested. The movement creates many new groups who work on this issue, largely through education. The groups send speakers to religious groups and union halls; they do marches through their communities; they hold house meetings and news conferences. Much of the content of what they say is refuting powerholders' claims: "People start pollution; people can stop it," "Radiation is not really all that bad for you," "Plenty is already being done to prevent AIDS." This stage can take a very long time or a short time, depending on many things, but constant outreach, through education and forming new groups is essential for the movement to take off. By now, polls show twenty to thirty percent agree that there is a problem or an injustice.

Stage Four: Takeoff

This stage is usually initiated by a trigger event, a dramatic happening that puts a spotlight on the problem, sparking wide public attention and concern. Sometimes the trigger event is created by the movement. In 1963 the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., focussed on Birmingham, Alabama, in a direct action campaign which filled the jails and highlighted the evils of segregation with vivid pictures of police dogs and fire hoses. The Birmingham campaign triggered a national and international response, which resulted in the passage of major civil rights legislation.

Sometimes the trigger event just happens, like the near meltdown at the Three Mile Island nuclear reactor in 1979. Three Mile Island (TMI) precipitated massive nonviolent protest and propelled many new people into activity. Previous movement growth had been substantial, but TMI triggered a crisis atmosphere that brought depth and breadth to the movement. MAP shows that the takeoff stage needs the preparation of stages two and three. Nuclear power provides an example we can explore.

Many years before TMI, the Fermi nuclear plant in the city of Detroit nearly melted down. A disaster similar or worse than TMI threatened then, yet there was no social crisis and spurt of antinuclear organising. Why? Because there was no previous social movement challenging the normal channels (stage two) and no education and organising (stage three). An event becomes a trigger event when a movement has first done

its homework.

Because of the high media profile in this stage, many people associate social change with stage four. Often one or more large coalitions form at this time. Celebrities join the movement, the powerholders are shocked by the new opposition and publicity and try to discredit the movement, and polls show forty to sixty percent of the public say they oppose the injustice or current policies. Activists often unrealistically expect a quick victory at this point and work around the clock. Long rambling meetings occur in which new people come and try to make decisions without the necessary procedures in place. The issue is seen in isolation from other issues.

The objectives of stage four are to build and coordinate a new grassroots movement and to win over public opinion. Part of winning the public is connecting the demands of the movement with widely held values (like freedom, fairness, or democracy).

Stage Five: Perception of Failure

There's an old phrase: "Two steps forward, one step back." Stage five is the step back, in the perception of many activists. Numbers are down at demonstrations, the media pay less attention, and the policy changes have not yet been won. The powerholders' official line is, "The movement failed." The media focuses on splits in the movement and especially on activities which offend public sensibilities.

It is the excitement and lack of planning on stage four that create the sense of failure in stage five. By believing that success is at hand, activists can become disillusioned and despairing when they realise they aren't there yet. Hoping to recapture the excitement and confidence of stage four, some groups create Rambo-style actions of anger and violence or become a permanent counterculture sect that is isolated and ineffective.

Fortunately, a great many activists do not become discouraged, or if they do, accept it as part of the process. They treat it like rafters on a river who most of all love excitement of the white water, but also accept the slow times in between.

Smart strategists lay out strategic, achievable and measurable objectives, and smart movements celebrate them as they achieve them along the way. The powerholders may try to crush the movement through repression at this point, even if they have felt constrained before by a civil liberties tradition. Even repression, however, can sometimes be responded to in the spirit of celebration, as a symptom of achievement.

Stage Six: Winning Over the Majority

In this stage the movement transforms. Protest in crisis gives way to long-term struggle with powerholders. The goal is to win majority opinion. Many new groups, which include people who previously were not active, are formed. The new groups do grassroots education and action. The issue shows up in electoral campaigns, and some candidates get elected on this platform. Broader coalitions become possible, and mainstream institutions expand their own programs to include the issue.

Until stage six, much of the movement's energy was focussed on opposition (to toxic waste, to war, to homelessness, etc.). In stage six, sixty to seventy-five percent of the public agrees on a need for change. There is no vast audience ready to think about alternatives to existing policies, and the smart movement offers some. Mainstream institutions can be helpful at this point. One example comes from the anti-Vietnam War movement: universities responded to stage four with peace studies courses and departments, and during stage six many of the scholars involved began thinking about alternatives to the war system.

The powerholders are not passive. They try to discredit and disrupt the movement, insist there is no positive alternative, promote bogus reforms, and sometimes create crisis events to scare the public. The powerholders themselves also become more split in this period.

The dangers of this stage are: national organisations and staff may dominate the movement and reduce grassroots energy; reformers may compromise too much or try to deliver the movement into the hands of politicians; a belief may spread that the movement is failing because it has not yet succeeded.

Stage Seven: Achieving Alternatives

Stages seven and eight could be called managing success. They are tricky, however, because the game isn't over until it's over. In stage seven, the goals are to recognise the movement's success (not as easy as it sounds!), to empower activists and their organisations to act effectively, to achieve a major objective or demand, and to achieve that demand within the framework of a paradigm shift — a new model or way of thinking about the issue.

Goals or demands need to be consistent with a different way of looking at things: a new framework or paradigm. If a civil rights movement simply demands some changes of personnel in government, industry, or schools, it will get more women, people of color or lesbians and gays occupying functions that continue business as usual, including policies which oppress women, people of color, and gays. Social movements are usually much more creative than that, and project new visions of how things can be. A successful social movement, therefore, can gain objectives that, although grudgingly yielded by the powerholders, introduce a new way of operating and of being.

Stage seven is a long process, not an event. The struggle shifts in this stage from opposing present policies to creating dialogue about which alternatives to adopt. The movement will have differences within itself about alternatives, and different groups will market different alternatives to the public. The central powerholders will try their last gambits, including study commissions and bogus alternatives, and then be forced to change their policies, have their policies defeated, or lose office.

It's not unusual for another trigger event to come along (the Chernobyl nuclear meltdown) or be created (the 1965 Selma freedom march in the civil rights movement), which gives increased energy to the cause and wins over still more allies.

Each movement needs to develop an endgame which makes sense in terms of its own goals and situation. The fight against nuclear power is an example of change in which there was never a showdown in the United States Congress. Instead, the movement created enough obstacles in the U.S. market to result in a de facto moratorium on new plants, partly by showing them to be unacceptably costly.

Stage Eight: Consolidation and Moving On

The movement leaders need to protect and extend the successes achieved. The movement also becomes midwife to other social movements. We saw growing out of the 1960s civil rights movement, the student movement, the anti-Vietnam war movement, the farmworkers union, the women's movement, the American Indian movement, and others. The long-term focus of stage eight is to achieve a paradigm shift, to change the cultural framework.

The paradigm shift the civil rights movement initiated is still a major part of the U.S. agenda thirty-five years later: diversity as a positive value. In the 1950s, difference was shunned and feared. The rule was to conform. Even rock and roll was attacked as "a communist plot," because it was different from prevailing pop music. Ethnic minorities were taught to be as white and middle class as possible to fit in — that was their only hope (and not a large one) for acceptance. The momentum of the civil rights movement and the movements it midwived continues today as an often intense struggle to see difference differently and to create the structures and processes that make diversity a strength in building community.

While the movement is consolidating its gains and dealing with backlash from those who never were persuaded, the powerholders are adapting to new policies and conditions and often claiming the movement's success as their own. At the same time, they may fail to carry out agreements, fail to pass sufficient new legislation, or weaken the impact of new structures by appointing people who are resistant to the change. A major pitfall awaiting activists in stage eight, therefore, is neglecting to make sure of institutional follow-

through.

In this stage, the movement not only can celebrate the specific changes it has gained, but also can notice and celebrate the larger ripple effect it has in other aspects of society and even in other societies. The U.S. movement against nuclear movement was inspired by the mass occupations of construction sites by German environmentalists. On this shrinking planet, we get to learn from and inspire each other internationally.

If You Think You're Lost, Check the Map

The course of the river is winding, and sometimes it divides and goes in unexpected directions. Maybe you feel lost; maybe someone wants you to feel lost. Notice that powerholders generally continue the policy you are campaigning against, even while they secretly are laying plans to announce new policies and to prepare the public to accept them. They deliberately hide their defeat from the public, understandably. When you give in to discouragement, you are accepting their definition of the situation. You don't need to — a strategic framework enables you to define the situation.

The last four years of the anti-Vietnam War movement provide our example. The U.S. government stepped up its bombing of Vietnam, exceeding all the bombing of Europe in World War II, and publicly stated its commitment to continuing the war indefinitely. This visible, aggressive policy depressed most antiwar activists, who thought that their ten years of effort had been wasted.

Activists did not know that the U.S. government was at the same time quietly beginning to give up the war. The United States began peace talks in Paris with the North Vietnamese. It then gave in to two key movement demands: withdrawing U.S. troops from Vietnam and ending the military draft. Movement activists saw these moves as irrelevant plots that undercut the movement's opposition. In the last years, the anti-Vietnam War movement became totally depressed. Then, suddenly, the war ended. Former government officials have acknowledged that the movement was extremely effective in ending the war. To activists at the time, however, it felt just the opposite!

You're likely to find yourself beached on that same shore with those activists unless you have a stable strategic framework to use when your work seems discouraging. Check out the MAP — it may keep you going long enough to win!

[Read more about the Movement Action Plan in Bill Moyer's last book, [Doing Democracy](#), available from the [Training for Change website](#).]

Eight Stages of Social Movement Success Bill Moyer 1990

1. Critical Social Problem Exists

- Powerholders support problem
- "Official Policies" and "Operating Policies" violate values
- Public is unaware of the problem
- Problem is not a public issue

2. Prove Failure of Official Institutions

- Many new local opposition groups
- Use official channels
- Courts, government offices, commissions, hearings ...
- Prove they don't work
- Become experts, do research

3. Ripening Conditions

- Recognition of problem & victims grow
- Public sees victims' faces
- More active local groups
- Need pre-existing institutions & networks available to channel new movement
- 20%-30% of public oppose powerholder policies

4. Take-off

TRIGGER EVENT

- Dramatic nonviolent actions / campaigns
- Actions show public that conditions & policies violate widely-held values
- Actions repeated around country
- Problem put on social agenda
- New Social Movement rapidly "takes-off"
- 40% of public oppose current policies/conditions

Powerholders

8. Continuation

- Extend success (eg even stronger laws)
- Oppose attempts at backlash
- Promote paradigm shift
- Focus on other sub-issues
- Recognise/celebrate successes so far

7. Success

- Large majority opposes current policies and no longer fear alternative
- Many powerholders split off and change positions
- End game process: Powerholders change policies (it's more costly to continue old policies than to change), are voted out of office or slow invisible attrition
- New laws and policies
- Powerholders try to make minimal reforms, while movement demands social change

6. Majority Public Opinion

- Majority oppose present conditions & policies
- Show how the problem and policies affect all sectors of society
- Involve mainstream citizens and institutions in addressing the problem
- Problem put on the political agenda
- Promote alternatives
- Counter each new powerholder strategy
- Demonology: Powerholders promote public's fear of alternatives
- Promote a paradigm shift, not only reforms
- RETRIGGER EVENTS, re-enacting stage 4

5. Perception of Failure

- See goals unachieved
- See Powerholders unchanged
- See numbers down at demonstrations
- Despair, hopelessness, burnout, dropout, seems movement ended
- Emergence of Negative Rebel

Critical-path analysis

Goals:

- inspire positive future thinking
- shift to outcomes rather than tactics focus
- outline some threads in the campaign's stages
- develop capacities to "cut issues";
- provide experience and skill in defining clear objectives;
- allow further understanding of one's own notions about how change happens.

Time: About 1.5 hours

Campaigns don't win all at once – they win through taking successful steps. Being able to break down the steps towards winning is a key skill for successful strategizing. This tool gives participants challenge and practice in setting stepping stones of achievements along the way and sequencing those towards an eventual win.

The basic concept is to have each person write down the outcomes they think need to happen for their campaign to be successful – not so much the steps or activities they need to do, but the changes that need to happen for their hoped for changes to be made real. Since it is such a big challenge -- so easy to be broad and unrealistic, not specific and realisable -- this tool utilises (a) a physical set-up and structure (paper plates) to support clearer thinking; and (b) support from other participants in small groups; and c) debriefing midway to support clarity of outcomes.

Step 1: Quiet writing time

First provide people with about ten minutes of quiet writing time. While everyone is in the circle together, ask them to close their eyes if comfortable, and think of an issue or problem they feel really passionate about. Now encourage them to take themselves to the time when the issue or problem is resolved somehow, the social or environmental changes they hoped for have been realised or the campaign they've been working on has won. Let them get a feel for it. What does that change look like? Feel like? Now what happened? Tell a story of how that vision came to be. What changes happened along the way that led to the positive social or environmental change. Ask people to record the five or six changes that needed to happen before their vision was made real.

Step 2: Create groups and explain the set-up

Now put participants into small groups – groups between three and five work well. Have the groups spread out around the room. Ask people to share their stories with each other.

Then put in the middle of the room some symbol, like a bowl of fruit, and explain that this is the "vision." It's what folks are working towards – their specific (as opposed to broad) campaign goals.

Each participant will be given five to six paper plates (extras are available if needed). The task for each participant is to place paper plates starting from where they are now to their vision (or working backwards from the vision to now), putting specific outcomes that are important "stepping stones" to that vision on the plates – this pathway does not have to be linear.

Someone working on a campaign to end the use of plastic bags in their state, might have as some of the stepping stones (1) "broad-based coalition of 5 action groups established and working successfully together to abolish the use of plastic bags," (2) "regular statewide media publications present positive news stories in newspapers and magazines," (3) "people working in grocery stores and jobs that use bags, inform shoppers about the problems with

plastic bags and urge them to say 'No to Plastic Bags', (4) "shoppers refuse plastic-bags on mass"; ...and (5) "state government passes legislation to ban plastic bags"; and so on, until eventually they win their campaign. It's always good to give a bit of a demonstration.

Each paper plate is one outcome that needs to happen for the ultimate campaign goal or social change vision to be realised. While most of those outcomes can be objectives that the organisation can work towards; a few of them might be external factors, like an oil crisis, that can help progress the movement's goals.

The reason for having people in groups is that folks can bounce ideas off each other, get challenged about the clarity of each outcome, and get some feedback about the order of the steps, too. Acknowledge up front that it's intended to be challenging.

Invite questions and clarify as needed.

(Note: If you're using this tool in a group that's all working on the same campaign/issue, you may want to adapt it so folks are creating the outcomes/plates together.)

(Also: It may be a challenge to get the group to think in terms of bite-sized campaigns. While "economic justice for all" is a great vision, this tool is most effective when identifying outcomes with a clear scope, like "getting five affordable housing complexes built in five years time." One way to support the group to get more specific is to allow the larger scope in an earlier exercise, by using tools such as with the Vision Gallery or Scenario Writing.)

Step 2: Groups work

Allow groups to work, giving support as needed to get specific. Between 20 to 40 minutes may be needed for this part. Disagreement and discussion among participants is great here for learning. Facilitators should be very available for support, coaching, and as a resource. In particular, you need to watch out for people writing tactics or activities on their plates – we can't help ourselves, we often focus on the things we are going to do, rather than what needs to change or happen. This tool is about outcomes – "what are we trying to achieve" or what needs to change" rather than "what are we going to do". If you find people writing tactics on their plates, get them to flip them over and ask themselves, "what outcome are we working towards with this activity or tactic?".

Step 3: Debrief on what makes for good outcomes

Interrupt before most groups look finished for a quick check-in with how people are doing. Make a quick list of what qualities good outcomes have, what do people notice about the visions and outcomes they are constructing?

In terms of framing visions, you might introduce the concept of "cutting issues". Cutting an issue is about taking a big picture social or environmental problem and making it a specific, immediate and realisable issue that you can mobilise community around. Where a problem is a broad area of concern, e.g. pollution, racism and unaffordable healthcare, an issue is a solution or partial solution to a problem, e.g. green energy, affirmative action or national healthcare.

In terms of outcomes, you could introduce "SMART" objectives: **S**pecific/strategic, **M**asurable, **A**chievable, **R**ealistic, **T**ime-specific. People can use SMART as a way of analysing their outcomes and reframing them as objectives that they can then develop strategy and tactics for. Do their objectives match those qualities?

This step may take 10-20 minutes.

Step 4: Give folks some more time to finish up

As people are finishing, you might move in to a break so that people can informally share with each other, spend part of the break finishing if they so wish, or just read people's stepping stones that they created.

Step 5: Short Debrief

After the break, spend just a few minutes debriefing how that was for people. Invite people to consider the usefulness of what they've just done. You might have a couple of people demonstrate how they see their campaign winning through modeling the steps.

In essence, they've created what's called a "critical path analysis" -- which is an analysis of what outcomes/objectives need to be achieved in order to successfully win. Those, of course, may change as the context changes. But having a sense of the scope of a campaign, the different strands and how the pieces work together, i.e. seeing how different tactics lead to the next step, deeply supports strategic campaigning.

Where this tool comes from:

Created by Sam La Rocca and James Whelan (The Change Agency) and Daniel Hunter (Training for Change). For more information on critical path analysis, see: www.TheChangeAgency.org. For the Vision Gallery and Scenario Writing or other tools, see: www.TrainingForChange.org.

Theories of Change

Goals:

- Help community organisers consider their underlying assumptions and beliefs about how change happens;
- Encourage groups to articulate their understandings about power and agency, and to work towards a match between their beliefs and actions.

Time: 30-60 minutes individual writing time, followed by 1-2 hours of group discussion

How it's done:

Step 1

Individuals go to a quiet place and write. Don't feel compelled to write on every point. What does your experience and observation of social action tell you about...

- The nature of human beings
- The nature and sources of power
- The nature and sources of truth and authority
- The analysis of the causes of social problems
- The role of individuals and institutions in social change
- The vision of the way it can or should be
- The mechanisms of change, existing or potential

Step 2

Gather and discuss

- Does your theory make sense to you?
- Is it consistent with your present observations of reality?
- Is it flexible and comprehensive enough to deal with the unknown?
- Can it be tested?

Where tool comes from:

Questions sourced from Coover, V., Deacon, E., Esser, C. & Moore, C. (1978) *Resource Manual for a Living Revolution*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia.

Power mapping

Goals:

- To help participants consider the social and political context within which they are developing strategy.
- To creatively consider allies, opponents, targets and constituents prior to embarking on a campaign.
- To serve as a reminder and framework for subsequently revising strategy.

Time: 1 hour – 2 hours.

How it's done:

In pairs/threes:

1. Think of a campaign you are involved with (or might become involved with).
What is it you are trying to achieve with this campaign?
2. Briefly describe your campaigns to each other.
3. Select one campaign for this exercise.

Consider: **“What is the main outcome your campaign hopes to achieve?”** Define this outcome in terms of a realistic and achievable objective (eg. recycling bins in every classroom or a doubling in council's budget for native tree planting).

4. With this outcome in mind, write on the cards provided the names of organisations and people with whom you might need to engage in order to achieve this outcome. Start with yourself and the main decision-maker/s. You might like to include:

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• your own group• other community groups - consumer, residents, environment, etc• local government - which officers?• state government - which departments or ministers? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• churches• federal government - which departments or ministers?• local, regional and national media• property/ real estate developers• local businesses• experts• professionals (eg teachers, police) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• particular sectors of the community• indigenous people• youth, unemployed,• men/women, the aged• industry |
|---|--|---|

5. Place the card with the name of your organisation on the floor
6. Identify the organisation or individual holding the most power in terms of delivering your desired outcome. Place this card on the floor, leaving some distance between the two cards.
7. Place each card in turn on the floor. As you place them down, say something about how they are related to your organisation, to the main power-holder and to each other. How much influence do they hold? Do they cooperate with each other or are they in conflict? Do you presently have a relationship with these people? Are they likely to agree with your position?

- Position the cards according to the relationships that exist between them.
 - Consider the relative power of the stakeholders in your campaign. Who is closest to the key decision makers? Move them around. Spend at least five minutes until the map feels right.
 - Your partner/s in this exercise can help clarify power relationships by questioning you as you go along.
8. When your map is complete, identify the two or three locations within the map where you feel your campaign might effect the greatest influence. Are there people or organisations who hold power and who you might successfully influence?
9. Report back, discussion.

Where tool comes from:

James Whelan, <http://www.thechangeagency.org>

Review of activities

Timeline of activities

So, list the activities that you've done in your organisation (in pairs/threes). What are strategy lessons as you reflect on that list? If you were a historian looking at that list, what would you say about the groups strategy? What's smart about what they're doing? Share with partner(s).

Debrief.

Four Purposes of Strategy

Introduce four purposes of strategy (according to an author named Gordon Pearson).

Direction

Defining a clear and simple long-term goal which is capable of motivating effort.

Concentration (or focus)

Focusing all resources, efforts and enthusiasm in the agreed direction.

Consistency

Progressing in the same direction, with the same focus over long periods of time, deviating only when necessary.

Flexibility

As a successful strategy become more embedded in the organisation's culture it tends to become set and increasingly resistant to change. It is therefore vital to maintain a continuous assessment of the various environments and key variables on which the strategy depends and continually review the necessity for revising the agreed strategy

Then go back and look at one's organisational activities. Relate that to the list: what are your strengths? What are areas that you need more work?

Optional addition:

TACTIC	1-10 Amount of power it SHOWS	1-10 Amount of power it CREATES	1-10 Amount of energy it TAKES	1-10 Amount of energy it CREATES /REPLENISHES

→ How to be different: Max/Min each tactic (i.e. how to make the most of a march).

Where tool comes from:

Daniel Hunter, Training for Change, 1501 Cherry St, Philadelphia, PA 19102 • www.TrainingforChange.org

Four Core Elements of Strategy

Let me start with what might be a radical assumption. All organisations *have* strategy. They are all trying to get to their goal. It may or may not be effective. And, in most cases it is not consciously laid out (but built on unacknowledged assumptions about how change happens).

So how can we identify an effective strategy? Here's a definition that looks at four core elements that result from a good conscious strategy. Using it can shed light on the dynamics of your underlying strategy.

Most organisations have these elements in varying degrees and with varying levels of consciousness ("do we have a clear direction?"). When looking at one's organisation, you can use these four elements to decide – "Are we effective at this aspect? If not, how can we maximise it in the organisation?" As one makes their strategy more conscious and deliberate, you'll be able to develop a group that can check how they are going on certain strategy challenges ("are we concentrating our resources?").

The purpose of strategy is to achieve the following four elements:

Setting direction

Defining a clear and simple long-term goal which is capable of motivating effort.

Concentrating resources

Focusing all resources, efforts and enthusiasm in the agreed direction.

Maintaining consistency

Progressing in the same direction, with the same focus over long periods of time, deviating only when necessary.

Retaining flexibility

As a successful strategy become more embedded in the organisation's culture it tends to become set and increasingly resistant to change. It is therefore vital to maintain a continuous assessment of the various environments and key variables on which the strategy depends and continually review the necessity for revising the agreed strategy.

Setting direction

Strategy can be identified in operational terms as setting the direction, as in: Where are we now? Where do we want to get to? This directional idea is far from being the whole story, but it is nevertheless surely crucial. Once the direction is set, it becomes possible to take decisions in a consistent manner with regard to strategy. Only when direction is set is it possible for all members of the organisation to know which way they are headed, and only then can they shape their own efforts accordingly. With no direction, members may well allocate their efforts and enthusiasm in random and conflicting directions with no prospect of building coherence.¹

Concentrating resources

This element is the most often violated principle of effectiveness. When working for a goal, the need is to make a commitment as an organisation to that direction. That means efforts within the group must be concentrated on that direction, not always going in different directions.

One strategist, in trying to explain strategy, said: "You know you have strategy when you know what you are *not* going to do." Concentration is about keeping to the goals set out by the direction, and marshalling resources to make that happen. For Gandhi, this meant constantly assessing and deciding, "*If we do this worthy project, will it push forward our eventual goal, the overthrow of the British Empire and the cultural uplift of the Indian people?*" If not, then he might applaud the project, but not spend energy working on that project.

The reason for lack of concentration are various. The most difficult aspect of concentration is the decision to *not* do things (not join a certain protest, pass up a particular opportunity). And yet, concentration remains one of the key determinants of success.

Maintaining consistency

A third main purpose of strategy is to provide consistency. All that has been said of concentration applies to consistency. Consistency is simply concentration over time. Like concentration it applies to big, large decisions and it applies to the myriad mini-decisions which determine how an individual's time, effort, and enthusiasm will be allocated. Without consistency the organisation will continually change direction, flitting like a butterfly from one project to another.¹

Retaining flexibility

As an organisation with a direction learns to concentrate consistently, the established position and effective culture of the organisation gradually becomes more deeply imprinted on the organisation. Individual members become expert and make heavy personal and psychological investments in their expertise. The organisation as a whole accumulates substantial commitment to the existing and successful approach. This will tend gradually to render the organisation less capable of noticing, let alone creating, change in its approach.

Strategy needs to set direction, concentrate effort and provide consistency, but at the same time, it needs to ensure organisational flexibility. Direction, concentration, and consistency require determined action for their achievement. And when achieved, they militate against flexibility. Thus the purpose of strategy is rather subtle: a balance between commitment to a successful direction and the ability to change direction when required.¹

Where tool comes from:

Daniel Hunter, Training for Change, 1501 Cherry St, Philadelphia, PA 19102 • www.TrainingforChange.org


¹ Adapted from Strategy in Action: Strategic thinking, understanding and practise by Gordon Pearson (Financial Times Prentice Hall 1999). The original four elements of strategy are from this article.

Strategy Chart

Goals	Organisational considerations	Constituents, allies and opponents	Targets	Tactics

Source: Midwest Academy

GRAND STRATEGY	PICKING A CAMPAIGN	CAMPAIGN GOALS & OBJECTIVES	ORG. CONSIDERATIONS / GOALS	CONSTITUENTS AND ALLIES	OPONENTS AND OBSTACLES	TARGETS	CAMPAIGN MESSAGE	TACTICS	Time-Line
<p>1. Describe the key, over-arching problem</p> <p>2. Long-term goal (10 years)</p> <p>3. Platform: list the core principles that define any solution you will seek.</p> <p>4. Background of issue: votes, corporate stances, previous work on issue</p> <p>5. Lay of the land of political power</p> <p>6. Solution: define the specific approach necessary to solving the approach</p> <p>6. Avenues of Influence: Potential sources of victory</p> <p>A) Legislation B) Litigation C) Corporations D) Persuasion</p> <p>7. Critical Pathway</p>	<p>1. Opportunities due to shifts in power:</p> <p>When targets are vulnerable (eg. Scandal, weakening person or company, close elections), change of frame (eg. 9/11, oil, security), new political alignment (eg. Ross Perot's group on trade, Right/left alliance on oil)</p> <p>2. Scale of environmental impact</p> <p>3. Widely felt</p> <p>4. Deeply felt</p> <p>5. Right size / real</p> <p>6. Fits niche</p> <p>7. Is appropriately divisive</p> <p>8. Is winnable</p> <p>9. Serves constituency (geographic or people)</p> <p>10. Urgency</p> <p>11. Meets long-term organisational goals</p> <p>12. It fits in the critical pathway</p> <p>13. Does it alter power?</p>	<p>1. Reiterate long-term goals from your grand strategy</p> <p>2. Intermediate goals not necessarily covered in this campaign</p> <p>3. Short term objectives: What constitutes victory for this campaign? How does this help you address intermediate and long-term objectives?</p> <p>Make them SMART:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Measurable Achievable Realistic Timeline 	<p>1. Does this campaign fit within your core competencies?</p> <p>2. List resources that you bring to the campaign (i.e. money, # of staff, facilities, reputation, skills, relationships)</p> <p>3. What is the budget for the campaign?</p> <p>4. What do you need that you don't have to win?</p> <p>5. How can this campaign build your organisation towards your long-term organisational goals?</p> <p>Could be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to new sources of money Build relationships with key players throughout country Access to new reporters Build new constituencies Compliment other campaign efforts <p>5. What internal problems must be addressed in order to achieve victory?</p>	<p>1. Constituents: Who can you mobilise on this issue? Who cares about it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who cares? Who must deal w/problem? What do they achieve from victory? What risks are they taking by joining you? What power do they have over who? <p>2. Allies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are your allies' "bottom-lines"? How will you use campaign to move them in the right direction? What resources can they bring? What are your allies doing now? Who new can be brought in? 	<p>*What does your victory cost them?</p> <p>*What will they do/spend to oppose you?</p> <p>*How will they respond?</p> <p>*How strong are they?</p> <p>*What will they support under what circumstances?</p> <p>External Obstacles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal issues or threats Perception of organisation Others... 	<p>1. Choose a person (or a set of people), not an institution</p> <p><i>Who has the power to give you victory?</i></p> <p><i>What power do you have over target?</i></p> <p><i>What power can you obtain during campaign?</i></p> <p>2. Power map target</p> <p><i>What/who influences this person? What level of influence do these individuals/institutions have over your target?</i></p> <p><i>Consider your relationships with those who influence target. Consider your opponents' access and influence.</i></p> <p>If you can't get to the primary target but you can get to a secondary target who has power over the primary then power map the secondary target.</p>	<p>1. Message. What is the one concise and compelling phrase you will repeat throughout your campaign? What are the concise supporting arguments for your message?</p> <p>2. Story. What is the story that will convey the issue to your targets? Who are the victims, villains and heroes? How does your campaign solve this?</p> <p>3. Does this message motivate your constituencies, allies and targets?</p> <p>Framing – is your message vulnerable to reframing?</p> <p>Target audiences</p> <p>Full message development plan here – message box, etc...</p>	<p>Tactics are what you do to your targets to get your goals</p> <p>1. Consider targets, then consider your constituencies and allies. What tactics best use allies' power in order to influence targets?</p> <p>Tactics should be:</p> <p>A. In context of campaign/message</p> <p>B. Flexible and creative</p> <p>C. Directed at target</p> <p>D. Within the experience of participants and constituents but outside experience of the targets</p> <p>E. Backed up by a specific form of power</p> <p>F. FUNI</p> <p>G. Inspirational to people viewing</p> <p>H. If people participating, is it efficiently replicated in key areas?</p> <p>Demands are tactical</p> <p>Tactics can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Media Events Direct actions Direct communications Public hearings Strikes Demos Petitions Boycotts Elections Lobbying Press releases <p>Media plan Chart for picking, prioritising tactics</p>	<p>Escalating Tactics</p> <p>Fixed dates and times</p> <p>Account for outside events, press hooks, shared resources, contingency planning</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>Make plans for each section of campaign (media, campaign, outreach, research, lobbying, etc...)</p> <p>and overlay them to ensure that it can all be done</p> <p>Plan backwards</p>



Strategizing Against the Iraq War

by George Lakey, *Training for Change*

Here's an approach to add immediately to your strategy tool kit, just in time as activists are gearing up to oppose another U.S. war. The good news is that this approach doesn't require getting a coalition of 80 grumpy people into a room. The bad news is that it does help to get a half dozen or so folks together. Even that news isn't necessarily bad because many of us do our best thinking when we're interacting with others. (In fact, it may pay intentionally to invite a few people who have differing perspectives, to allow yourself to be stimulated by difference.)

This strategy approach is actually quite flexible and is sometimes helpful in large coalition meetings. The reason I'm choosing to focus on small group use is that, in the true spirit of decentralist politics, the more small groups use this approach and become familiar with it, the more effective it will be when large groups use it. This approach to strategizing serves bottom-up preferences in building social movements. In Starhawk's terms, it serves power-with rather than power-over, and is inherently democratic.


As you'll see, using the tool on a small group level also frees you to go right into action without waiting for "the movement" to get it together. You can be confident that the tactics you choose will likely serve the big picture when the big picture gets organized. That's what I believe we need in this very individualistic U.S. culture: organic ways of strategizing that enable independent initiatives that serve the larger whole. My guess is that such organic strategizing will build the confidence activists need, making it easier to shed arrogance and learn to cooperate better on a macro level.

START WITH THIS PARTICIPATORY TOOL AND GET EVERYONE INVOLVED

Using newsprint or a blackboard, draw a horizontal line parallel to the floor. Imagine that the left-most point of the line represents the individuals and groups that are most opposed to the war against Iraq. Imagine that the right-most point of the line represents the individuals and groups that are most in favor of the war.

Then imagine that the line you drew represents a spectrum. The rest of U.S. society is ranged along the spectrum, with some groups inclined to be closer to the anti-war position, some inclined to be closer to the pro-war position, and many groups in the middle. Above the line draw the shape of a half-moon; make it like half of a pie with wedges. Be sure to have one wedge directly in the middle, because (as usual) there are a lot of fence-sitters or people and groups that aren't much inclined one way or the other. Now our strategy group takes a big analysis step: we fill in the wedges. Which

groups are closer to us and which farther but still not fence-sitting? Which groups are inclined to be closer to the hawks but not as close as others? You'll have arguments about where some groups should be placed, and may decide that a category like "mainstream Protestants" or "mass media" will turn up in a couple of wedges and need to be broken down further.



KEY STRATEGY ASSUMPTION

At this point it's time to wrestle with a major principle in making social change: To win, it's usually enough to move each wedge of the pie one step in our direction!

Figure out how to move the nearest allies one step into our camp, and the next wedge out into the position vacated by the nearest allies, and move the fence-sitters one step toward sympathy with our cause, and get the groups on the other side of the fence-sitters to become neutral, and de-fang the group next to them (just moving them one step only). You get the idea. There's no need whatever to win the opponent, the group at the other end of the spectrum, to our point of view. Relax. Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld can want war forever. We can still stop the war, if we move the wedges one step toward us.

There are plenty of examples of that in recent U.S. history. The civil rights movement won campaign after campaign without converting their arch enemies to racial equality. The U.S. pulled its troops out of Vietnam even though our war-mongering powerholders still wanted to bomb the country back to the stone age. Gay rights activists win again and again, even though pulpits continue to reverberate with homophobic thunder.

This is why it is both incorrect and a waste of energy for activists to focus so much attention on their opponents. When I hear activists talk I sometimes visualize a radical equivalent of People Magazine -- such fascination with the personalities and opinions of people we don't need to obsess about!

What counts -- to win -- is the wedges in between "us" and "them" -- especially from the fence-sitters on over, and the wedge just to the right of the fence-sitters. Move each of

those wedges one notch, and one notch only, and we'll stop the war. The opponents know this, and so they don't usually waste their time obsessing about us (except for Richard Nixon, who truly was an obsessional figure). The opponents' objective is to isolate us, and so they focus most of their attention on the wedges in between, not on us. The National Rifle Association is not going to waste its time picketing the Quakers. The NRA is much more interested in the wedges in between.

CREATE YOUR STRATEGY

Now that your group has some clarity about who is where on its spectrum of allies, it can create a strategy. To do that, ask: which wedges we do have some access to or credibility with? - which wedges already get a lot of attention from activists and which ones suffer from neglect? - which wedges do we personally feel most called to reach to?

From that discussion reach a provisional consensus on the first wedge you'd like to tackle. Then brainstorm the tactics that are most likely to reach the group(s) in that wedge successfully. Be creative. There are hundreds of tactics already available, but it's fine to make up new ones. As you get ready to try out tactics open up lines of communication "inside" the wedge so you can get valuable information on how the tactics are working when you try them. In that way you can keep tweaking what you do and become ever more effective.

HOW DOES THIS ALL ADD UP?

Picture groups of various sizes in your town, and state, and nation, "taking on" other parts of the population that need to confront the reality of the war and what it means. Listen to the buzz which that creates, and you'll be listening to the kind of buzz that brought down Yugoslav dictator Slobodan Milosevic when the thousands of young people in Otpor did this kind of outreach and brought each wedge a step closer until the dictator was isolated.

Enjoy the empowerment that comes from putting yourself outside the comfort zone of futile messages directed to Washington, and make yourself warm and sweaty by plunging into the civil society that is this country at its best.

It adds up to victory, not simply by tens of thousands of groups acting from their own initiative with their own creativity, but because the use of this strategic principle promotes synergy: the whole becomes greater than the sum of its parts. Will macro-movement coordination come about? Will charismatic leadership appear which adds soul and eloquence? Will well-funded national organizing initiatives emerge which add focus? Perhaps, and in my controversial opinion all three might be terrific.

In the meantime, let's put that pie diagram on the newsprint, and get to work!



Strategizing in an Hour

by Daniel Hunter, Training for Change
 peacelearn@igc.apc.org

"Strategy -- in the face of impending war, financial crises, time crunch, staff changes or despair -- is impossible." Well, I don't think that's true, but certainly lots of us do carry that belief! So here's a one-hour tool that I've used when all of those factors were true! -- maybe it can work for you and your group, too.

Here's the design in two steps:

Step 1: Brainstorm the Negative Conditions in Society

[about 20 minutes]

First, break the group into small groups (groups of four or five should be sufficient). Clearly give them the task of coming up with the conditions of society that block them from winning on their issue (for example an anti-war group might ask: what conditions are part of the war machine in our society?). What we're looking for here are as-specific-as-possible conditions. So rather than saying "thoughtless patriotism" encourage the small groups to get specific: "US Patriot Act," "bad US history textbooks," or "US government acting unilaterally over and against the United Nations."

In fact (and you don't need to let the participants in on this secret), these make targets for social change because they are root causes of violence and greed in society. These conditions may include comments about the culture of the group -- "staying in reactive mode" is one I've seen. That's perfectly fine to be on this list -- it's another root cause!

So, after explaining their task to the small groups have them write down (yes, tell them to get a note-taker!) the conditions they come up with in ten minutes.

After the small groups have about ten minutes with the task, bring them back together and put up their results. I do it by having each group read one condition at a time and I write it up on a big newsprint so everyone can see. The groups then rotate around adding to the list -- in this way, each small group keeps contributing. You do not need to get everything on the big list -- get enough so people have a number of conditions out there.

Step 2: Brainstorm Actions we can do or are doing to fix those conditions

[about 40 minutes]

In the same small groups they were in before, have the participants repeat the brainstorm and notetaking process. This time, since it's a bit of a harder task, give them at least fifteen minutes. The task this time is for the small groups to come up with specific programmatic changes or actions to address/change those conditions. For example, to challenge the US Patriot Act one might suggest getting City Council to pass a resolution against it and other actions to undermine that condition. Try to give a couple of examples of things the group could do and a few of things the group is doing.

After the small groups have worked for fifteen minutes, bring them back together and get together their ideas. Allow for some discussion when the group is having useful conversation/debate, but try to balance the energy of the list, too. Continue to go as long as you have time or groups have ideas. Once you finish you should have a great list of actions to take! It will be easier for you to sort through them not only for feasibility but also to compare which one is most likely to contribute toward your group's larger goal. That's what makes actions strategic -- when it isn't only an expression of how we feel or a brilliantly designed action -- but helps build a movement that achieves its goal. So congratulations!

Why this works

Underlying this notion is the idea that strategizing is about putting activists on the offensive! Step 1 clearly has us choosing the target. Step 2 is about designing actions to get our targets! In playing football, for example, to catch the ball you need to go to where the football is going to be -- not where it currently is! Similarly, as activists, we need to design strategies which move to where the trends are -- where the football is heading -- not just responding to the current headline.

Of course, a one-hour strategizing tool is no substitute for the work of planning a campaign, or figuring out how short-term objectives relate to building a movement in the long run. All that does take more time. But doing strategizing in bite-sized amounts may whet the appetite of the group for the bigger strategic feast!

If you try the tool, tell us if it works or how it could work better for your group! Feel free to adapt and pass around.

Collective action frames: why theorise about how change happens

James Whelan <http://www.thechangeagency.org>

When the only tool you own is a hammer, every problem begins to resemble a nail.

Abraham Maslow

The tactics and strategies of many environmental campaigns are determined by habit, routine or instinct. The development and communication of coherent theories about *how change happens* can motivate supporters and help environment groups become both more strategic and more successful.

I was introduced to theories of change during a Heart Politics gathering in northern New South Wales. This annual activist education event provides great learning opportunities for environmentalists and other activists. I met inspiring organisers including Fran Peavey, spent time each day with a wonderful support group and participated in a range of workshops.

During one workshop, the facilitator asked participants to consider the roles they adopted in working for social and environmental change. Did we see ourselves primarily as citizens, rebels, reformers or as change agents, working toward long-term change by creating and modeling alternatives. We were invited to place ourselves in a quadrant of the room corresponding to the role we identified with most strongly, then to explain how and why we chose particular roles and the value of other roles.

The workshop was based on Bill Moyer's Movement Action Plan (MAP). Moyer suggests these four roles and eight campaign stages can be discerned in most successful social change campaigns. He campaigned with Martin Luther King during the 50s and 60s, and with the US peace and other movements. Bill's model is used by many groups to plan and evaluate their strategies.

The MAP framework was a revelation. As a forest activist, I was aware of the divide between rebels (the direct action crews) and reformers (lobbyists and political strategists). Few groups appeared to consider alternative tactics, or question the assumptions that explained their strategic decisions. It was also uncommon to examine other environmental campaigns, to evaluate strategies or discuss ideology. As the quotation above suggests, the group I worked with had a limited set of preferred tactics and considered them adequate to achieve our objectives.

Change theories do not need to be complex or based on political theory. In fact, they are most likely to motivate and convince members and supporters if they are plain English and developed in an inclusive way. A theory of change might simply involve asking: (1) what needs changing in the community (2) what would the ideal society look like (3) why is there a gap between the real and the ideal and (4) what strategies can be developed to work toward solving the problem.

During the late 1990s, the QCC Smogbusters action group revisited their strategies and change theories at least once a year. The groups beliefs about bringing about change were articulated in various ways. First, the group developed a problem-solution-action chart that identified specific transport and air quality problems, solutions to these problems and actions to achieve these solutions. Then they developed a power map that identified all the stakeholders likely to influence the achievement of these solutions. Yellow post-it notes identifying stakeholders were clustered to indicate allegiances. Power and influence were suggested by stakeholders relative positions and connecting arrows.

Theories of change can be much more complex, of course. But they are essentially an accessible expression of the environmental philosophy that motivates your action. They may address questions such as: (1) Are group members eco-centric or anthropocentric, working to protect the environment for human purposes or for its intrinsic value (2) Are you committed to democratic ideals, inclusion and non-violence or do you tolerate secrecy and monkey-wrenching. (3) Can your long-term objectives (forest conservation, sustainable transport, etc) be achieved within the existing society or is fundamental change necessary.

The tools described in this article can be readily introduced in your group. For ideas, resources and support, contact james@thechangeagency.org

Campaigning for Social Change: beyond just protesting for it!

By Daniel Hunter
October 21, 2003

For groups looking for more strategic models and tools to use, here's a time-tested model for effective social change work. It's a tool that's inherently democratic and builds resources for the movement by winning specific goals. And, as an added bonus this tool is sizeable to local as well as national contexts. The tool? It's one used throughout history by large and small social movements for everything from overthrowing dictators to getting recycling in a city. So here's to a reminder of a powerful tool: campaigns!

What are campaigns?

In a nutshell, campaigns are sustained efforts at a specific social justice goal. Campaigns are a powerful way of strategically building the capacity, developing experience, and laying the groundwork for future movements. Simultaneously, campaigns win solid victories for social justice.

Campaigns have a goal. Campaigns are defined by their objectives: such as winning a particular housing reform, overthrowing a dictator, convincing city council to undo a repressive ordinance or law, or getting sweatshop multinationals to allow unionisation in their factories.

Goals require having someone or a group of someones who are "targets" – the people who can make that change. This is different from a future vision of "economic justice" in which no one individual or group of individuals can make that vision come true. Campaigns take a piece of those large visions and demand implementation of it. So a campaign goal under economic justice might be "universal health care" (so the target would be the national government). In a local context it might be "5 new affordable housing developments in an area" – the target would be the housing contractors who make those developments or government to create contracts to build.

Campaigns have an attainable goal. Some goals are also more useful than others. Unattainable goals aren't as useful as attainable goals (it doesn't build the movement to set ourselves up for failure!). To be attainable the goals need to match the size of the group's capacity (a local group would, before a national movement shows up, take on a local-sized goal, though it might be a goal with national/international implication).

To combat sweatshops, United Students Against Sweatshops (USAS) used students' schools as the location to wage local campaigns. In schools across the country, students forced their administration to sign contracts requiring full disclosure over where the various products were made. With that information in hand, students could make and get others to make visits to the sweatshops to inquire about human rights violations, ability of workers to unionise, wages and other notorious acts (like no bathroom breaks). Workers in sweatshops like Indonesia, China, Haiti and territories of the United States would no longer be fired in secret.

Nike and other apparel companies said knowledge of their factories were "trade secrets" and could not be shared without ruining business. After months of organising on dozens of campuses, the campaign paid

off with the largest apparel leader – Nike – doing partial and then ultimately full disclosure of factory sites. Other apparel industries followed suit.

So that gives a glimpse of another aspect of goals: Goals that have more meaning and impact on people's lives can be more useful than goals that have less impact. I personally went on a speaking tour during the USAS campaign with a union organiser named Haryanto, who had been fired for passing out Nike's Code of Conduct in a factory. Because of the pressure mounting against Nike for full disclosure, when his factory got exposed to the public he became the first union organiser in a Nike sweatshop to be reinstated through international pressure.

Goals that set up the movement for future wins are more useful than goals that prove to be dead-ends (does that new achievement encourage more activism? Does it lead to a practical next step?). In the case of full disclosure of sweatshops, it led naturally to a campaign to create and get campuses to endorse using a monitoring organisation, now called the Workers Right Consortium.

Campaigns may be made up by many different tactics. Blockades, sit-ins, strikes, marches, street speak-outs are all tactics that might show up in campaigns. In the case of the USAS, all of those tactics were used, plus many creative ones like the sweatshop-in (sowing all night and day in a public square).

In campaigns, the tactics are designed in a way to keep the pressure on. Throughout the campaign the pressure on the target keeps being applied until they accept or can no longer oppose.

Otpor, the student movement organisation in Yugoslavia, understood this when they built their campaign that successfully ousted the brutal dictator Milosevic. They picked tactics that kept mounting pressure on Milosevic. They started with creative forms of popular education and guerilla theatre and moved to illegal public protests combined with other tactics. (One highly effective tactic was "stalking police officers," getting the names of police officers involved in brutalising students on the street and then showing up in their neighborhoods with signs, "This police officer beats up peaceful protestors." It was so effective at shaming police officers in front of their neighbors/families, that Milosevic could no longer count on them to follow orders.) As the public pressure mounted, Otpor eventually shut down the capital city and literally stormed the parliament building and ousted Milosevic.

Different tactics are used to do education and outreach to specific allies/ally groups, mobilise support and show power (like marches or petitions), and noncooperating with the system (threatening not to buy campus sweatshop apparel unless they ask for full disclosure).

Campaigns take time to build. In this way, they differ from one-time actions. They are sustained and involve building pressure over time. While a one-time march might scare the politicians, they want to know if they can "stay cool till the heat blows over." Campaigns make sure the temperature on politicians (or whoever the targets are) stays hot. They keep increasing tactics until a win is gained.

This also distinguishes campaigns. They have an end-point: when the campaign wins. Campaign groups can clap their hands, celebrate, and then tick off a checkmark on that campaign! (In some cases, like that of USAS, there may be a need for monitoring organisations to protect the win to keep from rollback.)

If they choose, campaigns organisations can end as an organisation and free up individuals to work on the next campaign. That's different from building an action organisation that does a protest every month for years, with no end in sight. (Don't get me wrong: I also believe in organisation building! But one advantage of campaigns is they do not always need a wide organisational base to win.) Indian National Congress gave another model which was doing an "all out" campaign every couple of years and then returning to their "regular" political activity.

Why do campaigns work?

The movement needs leadership and experience at the grassroots: In order to carry out effective national campaigns, we cannot rely solely on national or international leadership. King, Gandhi and Che may be great: but the real power of social change lies in the grassroots.

Campaigns build local capacity and local leadership in a natural, dispersed way. With local victories comes increased self-confidence and readiness to take on more and more. With experience, groups make smarter and more sophisticated decisions.

Campaigns are also radicalising processes: people who get deep into one issue are likely to learn – not at a book-reading level but via personal experience – the ways issues connect. When campaigning about local housing issues, for example, people naturally run into environmental, economic, and political issues, too.

As local activists get smarter and more experienced, they get less caught up in useless political skirmishes or sidetracked by negotiated settlements with the opposition (bargaining for higher wages but breaking the union). Reflected upon experience creates wisdom, which is a pool we will have to draw from again and again.

Local campaigns can be replicable: As local organisations explore issues and try out new tactics, they are more likely to run across tactics that are replicable. The national sit-in movement, for example, began with four students in Greensboro, NC who decided to take on their local Woolworth. The tactic they created we now know as the sit-in.

The innovation was the tactic – and the implicit campaign goal. It was local, so it could happen in hundreds of other locations. Out of one local action came a national movement. So even while the national/international organisations and coalitions are arguing out details, we can change the agenda by our combined local actions.

A more recent example of that occurred in the struggle against the US's domestic war on Muslims, Arabs and other marginalised groups. Hundreds of cities passed city council resolutions against the so-called USA PATRIOT Act. For a long time this growing movement went unnoticed by the mainstream until a New York Times reporter was reporting from Flagstaff, AZ (a fairly conservative city) and found out that city passed a resolution against the USA PATRIOT Act. Thinking it was a fluke, he investigated and broke to the national media the fact that dozens of cities had passed such resolutions. Some of the resolutions were symbolic statements, others pushed the envelope and constrained local officers to not be involved in any USA PATRIOT Act-related round-up.

Though a local campaign, the impact of cities like Detroit, Philadelphia and Flagstaff, AZ passing such resolutions stands as a testament to the groundswell of support against the PATRIOT Act. In fact, resistance was so high that just recently John Ashcroft tried to take back the offensive by launching a major publicity campaign and doing speaking tours on the PATRIOT Act around the country. The campaign has given a way for communities to not act powerless and voiceless in the face of oppression. In fact, it has resulted in a major scaling back of plans to launch a PATRIOT Act II (senators who authored the document recently claimed they had never even heard of it!).

Campaigns take the offensive: As in the case of the PATRIOT Act, campaigns reclaim the initiative. It puts the oppressors in the mode they should stay in: defensive.

Protests often keep us on the defensive: responding to the last war, bemoaning the most recent destroyed housing, attacking the latest action by our mayor/Senator/Governor, or doing mass actions when and where powerholders hold their meetings. Campaigns are about achieving *goals* – and therefore inherently on the offense. *We* set the goal and *we* push for that goal. Local sit-ins challenging the Jim Crow laws inherently put the law on a defensive. Campaigns work by pulling the foundation of society – the grassroots – out from underneath the pillars of oppression. As more campaigns win, more and more people are ready to resist and noncooperate with the oppressive patterns of society. A roof cannot support itself without its foundations.

Campaigns bring in new energy and form new allies: For many of us our goal is not just social change but a meaningful social revolution with a new paradigm. We are not content with just a single isolated victory.

What campaigns do is bring in new energy and mobilise new constituencies. People like winning and people like being part of a movement that is *headed* somewhere. "What's your goal," people so often want to know. By being in a campaign, you can bring in people interested in meaningful goals but not yet ready for the revolution (unlike trying to convince them of Marxism, and *then* that they should protest the war). New people provide new energy and help radicalise stale organisations.

Furthermore, in a campaign you may be able to engage passive allies. While some political allies may not be ready to sign up for a lifetime of activism, more are ready to work for a specific campaign (which has a limited duration). Campaigns can be key radicalising processes for such potential armchair activists or isolated allies.

For a grassroots revolution to take place: we need a radicalised grassroots base. Without a grassroots ready to challenge the system, confident enough to take on leadership, and experienced enough to make wise decisions, we cannot gain our larger social justice aims.

Targeting specific key allies can also be the difference between victory in a campaign. George Lakey writes of an example of this:

A small group of activists once threw a monkey wrench into a U.S. foreign policy objective by correctly figuring out who to influence through direct action. The U.S. was supporting, as it often does, a military dictatorship that was killing thousands of people. In fact, Pakistani dictator Yahya Khan was killing *hundreds of thousands* of people in East Bengal who wanted independence. The U.S. government lied about its support, but the activists learned that Pakistani ships were on their way to

U.S. ports to pick up military supplies for the continuing massacre. The group also realised that if longshoremen refused to load the ships, the U.S. government would be foiled.

The problem was, the East Coast longshoremen were, if anything, politically inclined to support the government, and wanted to feed their families. The activists repeatedly tried to persuade the longshoremen to act in solidarity with the East Bengalis, without success. It was time for direct action. The group announced a blockade of the port which was expecting the next Pakistani freighter, and began practicing "naval maneuvers" with sailboats, rowboats and the rest of its motley fleet. The media gave ongoing coverage, and longshoremen witnessed on television as well as in person the strange antics of protesters who seemed to believe they could stop a big freighter with tiny boats. The tactic raised the longshoremen's motivation to listen and discuss, and they agreed that, if the activists created a picket line, the longshoremen would refuse to cross it!

When the campaign succeeded in that city, the activists took it to other port cities and finally the International Longshoremen's union agreed workers would not load Pakistan-bound weapons anywhere in the U.S.! The blockade, initiated by a small group, succeeded because the group crafted direct action tactics specifically geared toward the part of the public that most needed to be influenced.¹

Through campaigns we can involve constituencies who are ready to be moved into action and move those who are merely passive spectators into participants! Rather than waiting for groups to agree with our vision, we can use tactics to engage with them: and in the context of a campaign objective, help them see the reasons why they should support that goal.

Ultimately, campaigns are strategic in that they are *headed somewhere*. They are a series of tactics, headed toward an attainable objective, which build skills for resistance and grassroots leadership. They can bring in new allies and activate others that have become passive.

So the question now is: what campaigns are we ready to take on in our contexts? Already there are movements around the world using campaigns – Otpor in Yugoslavia, Nagas in India, farmers in Thailand, pro-democracy activists in Kenya and innumerable others. As we act in solidarity with them, what campaign objectives will help the movement? How can your group/organisation/collective integrate campaign thinking into its work? What campaigns can we imagine – locally, nationally, internationally – and build?

So: let's wage campaigns for social justice, not just protesting for it!

¹ This campaign, which has more to teach us about direct action than there's room to go into here, is described blow-by-blow by Richard K. Taylor, *Blockade* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1977). This campaign in solidarity with Bangladesh happened in 1971-72.

Bringing About Change

Six schools of thought about how to achieve environmental advocacy objectives

A thought-starter prepared for the 2001 Queensland State Conservation Council

James Whelan thechangeagency.org

http://www.environmentaladvocacy.org/resources/articles_papers/Bringing_About_Change.pdf

How can environmental campaigning can be improved by theory? A lot of environmental advocacy appears reactive or routine. Activists could devote more time to considering different ways to achieve desired objectives.

I was a volunteer with grassroots environmental groups for several years before taking on a position with the Queensland Conservation Council where I worked for five years. During that time, I became increasingly interested in how people learn to become effective environmental activists. I'm nearing the end of a PhD on the subject.

This paper is not intended as a lecture or sermon but as part of a conversation. If you are interested in this conversation, I look forward to hearing from you.

School 1

What theory of change? Just go for it!

Some campaigning organisations don't explore or articulate a theory to explain how their efforts and achievements contribute to achieving their long-term vision. "Sure, we want to achieve a sustainable world, but we really don't know how what we're doing is going to get us there." An environmental delegate on a government advisory committee asked a seasoned local activist for advice concerning how best to effect desired changes through representation. His advice was, "Just go for it!" The task of saving the planet can seem so momentous, taking the first step towards activism, overcoming fear and 'action paralysis' takes courage.

School 2

This is the way we do things. Our activist toolbox contains these tactics. Continue the tried and true strategies.

Environmental non-government organisations (ENGOS) sometimes develop their own traditions, adopting particular strategies. The North East Forest Alliance, for instance, prefers direct action in order to stop the logging of old growth forests. They also invest energy in legal challenges to the logging agencies. The Wildlife Preservation Society has a history of community education and providing advice to regulatory agencies. The Democratic Socialist Party and its youth off-shoot Resistance generally organise rallies, marches and occupations. Activists joining these organisations are not encouraged to question these traditions but to become skilled in these dominant tactics.

From the perspective of on-participants, campaigning may appear to be made up of a common set of tactics: skills including working with the media and volunteers, building and supporting groups and networks, financial and fundraising skills, research and communication and so on. This (arguably two-dimensional) analysis suggests that to achieve campaign objectives, environmentalists need to learn some or all of these skills. Excellent training manuals have been developed, seeking to help activists appreciate and acquire these necessary skills.

The Midwest Academy is one of the oldest and best known U.S. schools for community and citizen organisations and individuals committed to progressive social change. The Academy's annual season of activist training courses is based on their popular text *Organising for Social Change* with chapters outlining a wide range of tactics.

In 1996, the Queensland Conservation Council produced the "Anyone Can" booklet describing basic steps in organising environmental campaigns. Similar activist publications have emerged from other campaigns such as the Jabiluka activist handbook in 1998 and TWS Long Hot Summer handbook in 1992.

While social movements in the US have a well-documented history of activist training courses and institutions, the Australian environment movement invests considerably less energy in training activities. Exceptions to this pattern include the 1996 National Conference of Conservation Councils and Environment Centres held in Adelaide and the 1998 Queensland State Conservation Conference which were both built around training programs. In recent years, the National Environment Movement Training Project developed a proposal to establish the Terania Centre for Social Change Training, Resources and Cross-Movement Cooperation, but this vision is some way from being realised.

Resources

Queensland Conservation Council (1996) "Anyone Can" <<http://www.rag.org.au/anyonecan.htm>>
Bobo, K., Kendall, J. & Max, S. (1991) *Organising for Social Change in the 1990s* Seven Locks, Washington.
Midwest Academy
<<http://www.midwestacademy.com>>

School 3

Our chief priority is to protect this high conservation value area or stop that development. We are not trying to change society and often can only (realistically) effect minor or incremental change.

Many Australian ENGOs seek to embed environmental considerations in decisions concerning development and resource management. In this context, the insertion of a clause requiring a regulatory agency to incorporate ecological sustainability in the set of standard criteria for development applications might be considered a major achievement. Advocates adopting a "no compromise" stance are sometimes labeled "extremists" and may be excluded from consultative processes.

Environmentalists in the 1990s learnt to 'work with the government of the day'. John Dryzek (1992, p.92) describes this orientation, which continues to prevail in the environment movement, as *democratic pragmatism*. It is an inherently conservative approach built on:

Committee meetings, legislative debate, hearings, public addresses, legal disputes, rule-making, project development, media investigations and policy implementation and enforcement; it can be lobbying, arguing, advising, strategizing, bargaining, informing, publishing, exposing, deceiving, image-building, insulting and questioning.

Democratic pragmatism typifies the 'third wave' of environmentalism identified by Hutton and Connors (1999) who argue convincingly these strategies have lost their potency. *Insider* strategies by *political carriers* including key ACF lobbyists skillfully created cooperative relations with powerholders during the 80s and 90s, effecting considerable change including the development of environmental legislation and protection of natural areas. Emerging fourth wave environmental strategies including internet activism, direct action (Critical Mass, S11, M1) and the resurgence of shareholder and consumer pressure tactics represent a refreshing and arguably higher impact approach than reformist submissions and lobbying.

Lobbying, submission-writing and insider strategies continue to deliver some positive outcomes. Unfortunately, few groups assess the merit of alternative strategies.

Resources

Dryzek J. (1997) *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Hutton, D. & Connors, L. (1999) *A History of the Australian Environment Movement*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

School 4

Coherent model of change seeking to secure specific concessions. "We will succeed if we can get them to do (or stop doing) that."

The Wilderness Society (TWS) adopted a long-term campaign strategy in the early 1990s to achieve conservation of Australia's surviving native forests. The strategy emphasised regulatory changes including the adoption of Wilderness legislation in each state and advocacy to ensure identified high conservation areas were protected consistent with this legislation. The strategy assumed wilderness values would be protected by outlawing high-impact activities, not by changing social values or behaviour through voluntary measures. The strategy included direct action and reformist tactics like lobbying - different tactics and roles at different times for different purposes. When TWS revisited their vision statement at an early 90s national meeting, the words "social change organisation" were removed.

Some local ENGOs achieve environmental protection outcomes through legal action opposing inappropriate development and seeking increased regulation of polluting activities. In many instances, court action

has been adopted following an assessment of alternative strategies. There is no point writing letters to a politician who, for obvious and compelling reasons, is not going to change their mind.

School 5

Coherent model of change seeking to achieve sustainability through social change. Strategies to secure specific commitments are also geared toward long term structural change.

Friends of the Earth Brisbane have not conformed to the dominant *democratic pragmatism* approach taken by many regional ENGOs. During the group's first five years, the collective prioritised developing legal and institutional arrangements consistent with their social vision (non-hierarchical, inclusive, non-discriminatory) and establishing several innovative enterprises. Their bicycle recycling and repair workshop, consumer waste reuse business and environmentally-friendly paper service fund the organisation, create ethical employment and model the sort of enterprise FoE considers consistent with a more sustainable society.

Seasoned U.S. activist educator Dave Beckwith facilitated workshops and discussions with Brisbane activists and researchers in March 2001. A key question in these discussions was, "*What is the project?*" The *project* at the heart of Dave's work with the National Organizers' Alliance and the Chicago-based Centre for Community Change is long-term social change. This orientation is equally emphasised in Bill Moyer's Movement Action Plan (MAP 1990, 1992). MAP explores eight campaign stages and four roles adopted by activists in successful social change campaigns. Bill was a campaigner and trainer with Martin Luther King and has extensive peace movement experience. He spends up to six months each year in northern New South Wales and has visited Brisbane to conduct activist training workshops.

The Comm-Org discussion group convened by Randy Stoecker of the University of Toledo serves to "connect people who care about the craft of community organizing, to find and provide information that organizers, scholars, and scholar-organizers can use to learn, teach, and do community organizing". The archived discussion papers include several excellent papers on social change theory written by activists.

Many U.S. social change organisations base their strategic orientation on the work of Saul Alinsky whose landmark 70s books *Rules for Radicals* and

Reveille for Radicals influenced generations of campus, union and environmental advocacy. Alinsky established a tradition of organiser training. His philosophy offered an insightful analysis of power relations, exploring strategies to redistribute power between the Haves and Have Nots of society. Alinsky argued campaign means (or tactics) are justified by the merit of intended ends, "doing what you can with what you have". He promoted pragmatic, skilled and planned tactics and coordinated highly successful shareholder proxy campaigns and consumer boycotts.

Resources

Alinsky, Saul (1971) *Rules for Radicals: a pragmatic primer for realistic radicals* Vintage Books, New York. Extracts available

<<http://www.e911.com/exacts/EA051.html>>

Comm-Org <<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu>>

Beckwith, Dave (1999) "Ten Ways To Work Together: An Organizer's View" <<http://comm-org.utoledo.edu/si/beckwith.htm>>

Beckwith, Dave (1999) "Organizing Today: Ten Reasons to Cheer!"

<<http://www.nhi.org/online/issues/101/beckwith.html>>

Moyer, Bill "Movement Action Plan":

<<http://www.users.omcs.com.au/change/council/map.htm#top>>

Moyer, B. (1987) *The Movement Action Plan: a strategic framework describing the eight stages of successful social movements*, Social Movement Empowerment Project, San Francisco.

Moyer, B. (1990) *The Practical Strategist: Movement Action Plan (MAP) strategic theories for Evaluating, Planning and Conducting Social Movements*, Social Movement Empowerment Project, San Francisco.

Moyer, B. (1993) *The MAP Trainer's Manual: a guide for organising and leading Map workshops and using MAP to evaluate, analyze and set strategies and tactics for a campaign or social movement*, Social Movement Empowerment Project, San Francisco.

School Six

Coherent model of change encompassing both social and personal change. "It's not enough to point the finger and say, 'They need to change.' I need to change as well. Adversarial tactics won't bring about the necessary social changes."

This orientation appears much less influential in the environment movement than other new social

movements such as the peace, women's and reconciliation circles. A prevailing culture of rugged individualism (sink or swim) in many ENGOs means personal growth or transformation is off the agenda.

The Heart Politics movement is strongly oriented toward personal healing, building relationships and exploring non-adversarial change strategies. Heart Politics gatherings began in northern New South Wales in the late 1980s, emerging from the work of the Interhelp collective and inspired by Fran Peavey's book of the same name. Fran will be leading a lecture and workshop in Brisbane on 13th and 14th August this year. Heart Politics activities are now held in several states.

This orientation in campaign organisations has also been inspired by Joanna Macey's work on despair and empowerment and Buddhist teachings. Interhelp and Heart Politics organiser Katrina Shields developed a collection of reflections and resources intended to assist individuals and groups seeking to address personal and interpersonal aspects of social change work in her book *In the Tiger's Mouth*. Katrina and Bobbi Allan established the Social Change Training and Resource Centre in The Channon and provide training in conflict resolution, maintaining morale and

motivation, alliance building and other campaign strategies and tools.

Resources

- Macey, Joanna, "Components of an Effective Program of Empowerment for Potential World Changers"
<<http://www2.cruzio.com/~sheryl/change.html>>
- Peavey, F., Levy, M. & Varon, C. (1986) *Heart Politics*, New Society Publishers, Philadelphia PA.
- Peavey, F. (July 1992) "Strategic Questioning for Personal and Social Change" paper presented at Heart Politics Lennox Heads 1992.
<<http://www.jobslatter.org.nz/vivian/strat701.htm>> or
<<http://www.crabgrass.org/strategic.html>> or
<<http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC40/Peavey.htm>>
- Peavey, F. (1994) *By Life's Grace - musings on the essence of social change* New Society Publishers, Philadelphia PA.
- Rainforest Information Centre deep ecology site
<<http://forests.org/ric/deep-eco/welcome.htm>>
John Seed bio <<http://forests.org/ric/deep-eco/jsbio.htm>>
- Shields, Katrina (1994). *In the Tiger's Mouth: An Empowerment Guide for Social Action*, Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.

The Art of Practicality and Feasibility

By Daniel Hunter, *Training for Change*

www.TrainingForChange.org • peacelearn@igc.org (March 28, 2004)

1501 Cherry St. • Philadelphia, PA 19102 USA • peacelearn@igc.org

Having lots of great ideas is great. But for those great ideas to be worthwhile, they have to fit within the group's vision of where it is going *and* have to actually work. Balancing open creativity with a refined sense of practicality can be tough, but is essential to devising strong strategy. Here are some ideas to work with the practical side of things.

Aligning with Vision

Not all ideas will fit into an overall strategy to achieve your vision. In fact, many will not. In order to align with vision, you need to have a vision of where you are going. Your vision may be a personal one (such as yourself as an effective strategist, or your being a public speaker) or worldwide (such as a democratic socialist society). The more you can hold on to your vision, the more effective you will be at aligning your actions to your vision.

Your vision needs to be of the positive outcome. For years, basketball players have learned that to play well, they should imagine the shot as it goes into the basket. A good shooter visualises the perfect shot over and over again. Coaches and players have found this dramatically increases accuracy.

Milenko Matanovic, an artist/activist, explains the same concept: "Images of the future are essential to the health of all cultures, for a society's vitality is lost once its capacity to imagine is gone." Positive visioning helps ground us and prepare us for the future.

Visioning also helps us come out of a place of strength. Dr. King's passion and his dreaming were important in overcoming the fear and the despair stuck so deep in the system of racism. For us to step into visioning offers a doorway out of despair and into our strength. (Recent studies from the field of optimal/positive psychology have shown that people who have an affirming vision are more effective learners.)

Some tools for visioning (available from Training for Change's website: www.TrainingForChange.org):

- Closed-eye processes: allow people to self-reflect on a time of strength or imagine themselves into the future with the skills they are looking to develop.
- Vision Gallery: an activity where people can share their vision for a future world and end up with a "gallery" of vision for a harmonious society

Exploring New Ideas

Once we have a vision, we can check out our ideas against the vision: will they help us get there? Does this new pamphlet fit into our overall vision? Will joining this coalition support our sense of where we are headed? Is this tactic actually effective?

This is the stage where research is especially valuable. What is going on externally that needs to be considered (e.g. a new police tactic or a new housing bill)? What factors need to be addressed in order to make the idea feasible?

Research at this stage can lend itself to help articulate the idea, analyse how it might be implemented, and adapting it to fit the circumstances. As the ideas gets implemented, researchers can also help groups learn from its success or failure.

Failure, in fact, might be the wrong word. Scientists for years have framed their work as *experiments* (Gandhi picked this up when he titled his autobiography Experiments with Truth). For an experiment to work, one needs to learn from it. A group of anti-death penalty activists used this framing to look at their 20 years of work not as a failure, but as lessons waiting to be learned! Failure, in this sense, is a chance to learn. One innovator said, "To me, success can only be achieved through repeated failure and introspection. In fact, success represents the one percent of your work which results only from ninety-nine percent that is called failure."

Researchers at this stage of exploring ideas can also help an idea from being killed prematurely by looking at alternative ways it might be tried out. For example, rather than doing a mass mailing to thousands of individuals that might not work, an activist organisation might try a smaller batch. Chic Thompson calls this looking for "fast failures." He explains:

If failure is to take place, the innovator wants it to occur fast so that [resources] are not unnecessarily wasted. To speed up the failures, the successful innovator will initiate small-scale tests of new ideas, conduct personal surveys to determine the effectiveness of ideas, and always remain open to critical feedback.¹

As ideas are implemented, tested against a vision, and experimented with, groups build capacity at self-reflection and become smarter strategically. So go have some fun experiments!

¹ *What a Great Idea!: Key Steps Creative People Take*, by Charles "Chic" Thompson: HarperPerennial, 1992, page 155.

Force Field Analysis

A force field analysis helps to think about forces affecting the movement including, but not limited to external groups, internal division, psychological powers and blocks. Through discussion with others, the force field analysis can help us tease out differences of perspectives within our group. It can thus produce a rich analysis of potential places of growth for the campaign.

Steps:

1. Clearly identify the problem/campaign vision.
2. Identify forces contributing to the success and forces against success.
(helpful to place in the following table format where everyone can see)

Foces for Success (+)	Foces Against Success (—)

3. Rate the impact/strength of each force
(+10 to +1 or —10 to —1 as relative impact of force on movement; again, discussion is an opportunity for sharing insights with each other)
4. Think collectively about how to maximize the forces for success and how to minimize the forces against success. What are tactics (currently being used and especially those not being used) that can maximize our success.

Where tool comes from:

Created by George Lakey, Training for Change <www.TrainingForChange.org>.

Here's a kinesthetic way to introduce the Force Field Analysis!

Macro Strategy Exercise (Tug of War)

Based on Kurt Lewin's Force Field Analysis

How it's done:

This exercise is designed to embolden the imagination and enlarge possibilities, politicize everyone regarding macro-forces in a dynamic way and to explore how your group and allies can influence the forces "out there".

The basic format is a tug of war, with rope which has multiple ends knotted in middle. Small teams are created, half of which identify a negative force in your group's environment and half identify a positive force. These can be negative and positive forces acting right now and likely to act in the near future. As each team identifies a force, it takes its place on positive or negative side of tug of war.

Then, action!

After one side wins, teams huddle; negative force teams ask selves how their power could be under-mined; positive force teams ask selves how their power could be enhanced.

Each team writes its conclusions.

All teams report to the whole the two most important ways (of enhancing or undermining).

Harvest learnings via newsprint.

Where tool comes from:

Created by George Lakey, Training for Change <www.TrainingForChange.org>.

Tactic Analysis

Activists often love our tactics! We can even be wedded to our favorite tactics. In many of our groups, starting a strategy conversation at the level of tactics is often the easiest way to begin. Here's a tool to help move from tactics to a larger strategy conversation by *analysing* tactics!

This simple chart can create rich, insightful and sometimes heated conversations about the use of particular tactics at particular moments. Even a brief explanation can provide language to helping people frame issues like does this tactic increase our *energy* more than we can afford.

The chart is simple. Brainstorm some common tools you are using or might use in your group. Then as a group do the analysis together – learn from each other as you analyse and see disagreements/similarities, and notice strategic implications.

TACTIC	ANALYSIS OF TACTIC (on a Scale of 1-10 the amount of...)			
	Power it SHOWS	Power it CREATES	Energy it TAKES	Energy it CREATES/REPLENISHES

A follow-up to this tool: Do a Maximise/Minimise of each tactic (i.e. how to make the most of each tactic).


Where tool comes from:

Adapted by Daniel Hunter, Training for Change <www.TrainingForChange.org> from a design by Shari Silverstein, Quixote Center <sharis@quixote.org>.

Spectrum of Allies

How it's done

Use newsprint to describe the idea that in most social change situations there is a struggle between those who want the change and those who don't. Those who do are represented by a point at one side of the newsprint (say, on the left) and the opponents by a point at the other side. Explain that societies (or towns, or states) usually include a range of groups that can be put on kind of spectrum from closest to the point of view of the advocates to farthest away, and draw a horizontal line to represent that.



Then draw a half-moon or half of a pie with wedges (as above). Ask for an example of an issue people in the group might be working on. Suggest a demand the advocates might have (say, free public transport) and ask who in society might be inclined to be most supportive, least supportive, and in the middle. Give examples: "unions?" "poor people's groups?" "Chamber of Commerce?" etc. As the participants identify groups and their location on the spectrum, write them into the "pie." Do this only enough to make the idea clear.

Give the good news: in most social change campaigns it's not necessary to win the opponent to your point of view, even if the opponent is the powerholders. It's only necessary to move each of the pie wedges one step in your direction. Pause to make sure that's clear. Then complicate the picture slightly: sometimes polarisation happens, and the wedges closest to the opponent move away from you and toward the opponent. You can still win, if enough of society takes a step in your direction.

Let the group digest the good news for a bit; let it sink in that activists often have the mistaken idea that they need to win everyone (inviting despair), or that their whole attention needs to be on the powerholders (again inviting despair).

Pass out the handout and invite everyone to fill in the wedges for their particular campaign/ issue/ movement. Move among them to answer questions as they work. Create small groups for discussion. If a variety of issues are present in the group, ask them to form issue groups to compare notes. Let them work for awhile (keeping track of their work), then ask them to brainstorm tactics that might effectively communicate with the wedges that they want most to win as allies.

Harvest the learnings in the whole group, using newsprint. Emphasise points like this: it's a huge win if you can get a group that was slightly hostile to move into neutrality. It's a huge win if you can get the group/wedge next to your end of the spectrum to move into activism with you. It's usually not necessary to move the opponents a step toward you in order to win, although it can hasten the win.

Where tool comes from:

This tool has history in many formats around the world. This version written by Martin Oppenheimer and George Lakey (1965) *A Manual for Direct Action*, Quadrangle Books.

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION

1. How did you find out about the workshop and what factors helped you decide to attend this workshop?

2. What did you hope to get out of the workshop?

3. What were the best aspects of the workshop?

4. How could the workshop have been improved?

5. What have you learnt that is going to change things for you?
eg. your community work, advocacy *Please provide some detail*

6. Are there other things you would like to let us know?

Please indicate your satisfaction on a scale of 1-5. Additional comments on each topic welcome.

1 = very poor or strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree or tremendous



1.....2.....3.....4.....5



great

7. Facilitation

Were you satisfied with the experience, knowledge and approach of the workshop facilitators?

8. Workshop content and structure

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Did the workshop cover suitable topics in an effective sequence?

Were there adequate opportunities for interaction?

9. Application

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

To what extent do you consider you will apply skills and knowledge acquired in this workshop? How?

10. Venue and catering

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Did the venue and catering meet your expectations? Were you comfortable? Please comment.

11. Future workshops:

What future workshops would you participate in? What other ideas do you have for activist training or support? Are there other workshops you feel might be useful?

Getting Strategic Workshop: Telephone Interview

We are very interested in finding out how successfully you apply knowledge and skills developed at this workshop in the future. Can we interview you by telephone in approximately one month's time? The information obtained in these interviews will form an important part of our evaluation process and enable us to develop more appropriate workshops in the future. If you can help us with this evaluation process please provide your name below (we will email you next week to organise a convenient time for an interview).

Name _____