

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011
'Arab Spring' Issue

Advance notice of publication: new book on values

I've written a book introducing the CDSM values system at the three Maslow Groups level: *"What Makes People Tick? The Three Hidden Worlds of Settlers, Prospectors and Pioneers"* will be published by Matador in July.

If you can help promote awareness of it, get it reviewed or are interested in obtaining copies in hard copy or electronically, please let me know - chris@campaignstrategy.co.uk

Meanwhile you can get my book *How To Win Campaigns: Communications for Change* (2nd Edition) direct from the publisher Earthscan at <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/tabid/102418/Default.aspx>

This enlarged updated edition contains extra campaign case studies, an extended account of use of values analysis and new sections such as on behaviour change and heuristics, with more than 100 'how to's. One reviewer described it as 'Pandora's Book'.

The Power Behind the 'Arab Spring' - Possible Implications for Human Rights Campaigns

What lies behind the so-called 'Arab Spring'? The honest answer is that I don't know, and I don't suppose anyone does, Arab or otherwise. But one enormous factor could be the shifting balance of unconscious motivational values in those countries.

Back in edition 54 of this Newsletter ('Maslow Goes to War' - download at http://www.campaignstrategy.org/newsletter_index.php) I described the work of Shalom Schwartz and Ron Inglehart and how it was being used in relation to military strategy (in Iran and Afghanistan) and Inglehart's predictions of values change making democracy 'inevitable'. I wrote:

Once self-expression values reach a critical level - Inglehart and Welzel say about 45% - democracy seems to become almost 'inevitable'. This is partly because elites within authority structures like the Army or a ruling party (Iran?) themselves acquire these values as generations change, and so will no longer repress freedoms, if they were doing so. As a consequence, there may be 'velvet revolutions' or incremental loosening of the hold of oligarchies and dictatorships. Based on values measurements, Inglehart and Welzel say of China (p 191):

'we predict that China's socioeconomic liberalisation process and its experimentation with local-level democracy will spill over to the national level so that China will make a transition to a liberal democracy within the next two decades'

The sheer volume of analysis assembled in *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy* should make it hard for any decision-maker concerned with evidence-based policy, to ignore. Yet although there's plenty of media discussion involving pundits of all sorts on channels like CNN and BBC (and, generally better informed, on Al Jazeera), few if any say anything systematic about values.

Some of the contagion of protest and uprising has something to do with changes in power and influence created as one government falls or changes and that affects others but numerous commentators remark on how this does not look like a 'normal' revolution. It seems to have caused a lot of head scratching in think tanks and amongst western governments. They ought to take a look at Schwartz, Inglehart and values [1].

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

The young Tunisian fruit seller Mohamed Bouazizi, who last December burnt himself to death and thereby ignited the wave of protest and demands for "rights", change and democracy which has swept the Arab world, apparently did not have a degree, although he aspired to such education. He was trying to earn a living, and support his family, including paying for his sister to attend university [2]. Frustration with oppression and humiliation by corrupt officials stopped him from making his own way as a business man and eventually led him to take his life in protest.

It would be hard to have a much clearer example of the effect of self-expression values than those at work in the Arab Spring. The revolutionaries are not defending a group identity, or even seeking power over others (though of course identity based groups are caught up in it all): a significant, indeed the leading element, are educated, often secular, and seeking the right to be free to make their own way and to express themselves.

This of course is why Al Qaeda has been so totally sidelined by the whole process, although the killing of Osama Bin Laden may give the identity and power-over-others (impose a Caliphate etc) groups a fillip. It looks though that it will be temporary: the current that carries the Arab spring comes from a completely different place and it is a different constituency. Only if viewed from a great distance - eg Washington or London - and with one eye is it possible to think that Mohamed Bouazizi and those he inspired are the same as the followers of Al Qaeda, simply because they seem to be Moslems or Arabs. (A good example of the trap created by the 'representative-ness' heuristic, in which you take one characteristic of something - eg a person is a Moslem - and assume that therefore everything about that person applies to anyone else with that characteristic).

The underlying reality is that the societies of North Africa are very different from say Afghanistan or Pakistan. They are, by social and economic development (health, education etc), much further down a road towards self expression. In CDSM's terms there are many more Prospectors and Pioneers, the outer directeds and inner directeds, who tend to seek self-direction and self-determination, to be motivated by making a better life for themselves and their families, who tend to espouse ethics and explore new things, and who, above all, will question authority.

That's not to say there won't be conflict with traditional, conservative groups or with government and their forces who do not share those values, and the Spring may have a very bloody 'summer' but the underlying values shifts cannot be removed by oppression, not even easily by genocide.

What Does It Mean For Campaigns?

So what does this mean for human rights campaigns and for campaigners and foreign governments or international bodies who want to promote democracy, or 'open societies' in which democracy flourishes - 'effective democracies'?

It may be heretical to say it but however desirable democracy is as an end point, or as a new start, is it strategically sensible to try and promote democracy across the board? This takes us back to the ethical clarity versus ethical complexity dilemma which I've written about before in these newsletters. In other words, if democracy is ethically the 'best' system, does that mean that any campaign or advocacy should simply promote or demand democracy? In my view, Inglehart's work and the values mapping done by Schwartz, CDSM and others, suggest not.

It seems to me that if you want to make it inevitable that democracy is demanded and eventually takes hold, the intelligent strategy is to intervene, where it is possible, in ways that create the conditions required, rather than to call on each and every country (which usually means government) to simply adopt a system of democracy. On humanitarian grounds you would need to try and hold undemocratic governments or rulers to certain basic human rights but for practical

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

purposes it would mean waiting to advocate the adoption of democracy as anything more than an ambition, until the time was right.

I've tried to capture this in some diagrams "Strategy Template to Move Towards Democracy" posted at <http://documents.campaignstrategy.org/uploads/Democracy%20Strategy%20template.pdf>. Of course, in most - if not all - societies there are people who themselves are 'ready' for democracy, and who campaign for it. I'm not saying don't support them, communicate with them or that we should ignore them. It is just that other needs perhaps have to be met, and other freedoms gained, first.

If for the sake of argument we accept Inglehart's well-researched mapping of how societies develop, and the way this can be related to unconscious values through CDSM's calibration of their Maslowian segmentation and Schwartz's multi-country 'circumplex', we can see that the people furthest along the Maslowian sequence are those most espousing ideas like universalism, self determination, self choice, globalness and ethics. This is if you like, a strategic intended 'destination' for advocates of democracy - the 'open society' described by Karl Popper and others.

How though do you get there? On the strategy template I've suggested step by step phases, which could become the template for interventions - be they through 'endogenous' politics and development or through external aid, international campaigns or other influences - in seven 'cases'.

In Inglehart's terms these very roughly approximate to (the starting point) 'traditional' societies, then secular societies (emancipated from traditional beliefs) as basic needs begin to be met and education and science take hold, then emerging materialistic societies (with jobs and bureaucracies and systems), then developed industrial societies (where material and esteem needs are beginning to be met and people experience more autonomy and choice in their lives), and then democracy and the open society.

The transitions in terms of satisfying unmet needs, and hence motivational values might be something like:

Case 1 (unmet need is survival)

Strategy: increase survival

Eg health, basic services, food, clean water. Achievable movement is A > B on the template.

Example: countries with v high infant / adult mortality

Case 2 (unmet need is security, safety, belonging)

Strategy: increase safety & security

Eg stop killings, impose order, create stable supportive community and expression of group identity.

Achievable movement is B > C on template.

Example: countries with murder gangs, war lords, internecine strife, war, anarchy/ threat of, or threat of plague, invasion; occupation.

Case 3 (unmet need is power over others, material wealth)

Strategy: 'proper jobs', increase incomes, own-homes, get consumer goods, services.

Eg Achievable movement is C > D on template.

Example: 'under developed' agrarian and v poor societies industrialising, developing public sector

Case 4 (unmet need is success)

Strategy: create success ladders and opportunities.

Eg market economy, bureaucracies, education, mass consumption, individual autonomous action.

Achievable movement is D > E. on template.

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

Example: rapidly emerging economies, economically liberal

Case 5 (unmet need is stimulation)

Strategy: increase self expression opportunities, entertainment.

Eg rock/ youth music, Nollywood. Achievable movement is $E > F$ on template.

Example: emerging 'middle class' countries and some post totalitarian countries

Case 6 (unmet need is stimulation)

Strategy: increase freedoms for travel, communication

Eg blogs, experimentation. Achievable movement is $F > G$ on template. Example: non democracies with high personal economic/ material freedoms becoming communication access freedoms

Example: internet freedom

Case 7 (unmet need is self-direction)

Strategy: increase freedoms of expression, artistically, emotionally, personally including dissent. Eg Demand values turned into rights. Adopt democratic constitution. Achievable movement is $G > H$ on template.

Case 8 (unmet need for universalism, open-ness, justice etc)

Strategy: civil and political debate.

Example: democracies arguing about whether all are being fairly cared for (benevolence) in society and globally (universalism) and environment, etc. Debate about whether self choice needs limits in wider interest.

You can try asking where the Arab Spring fits into this, or where other countries do. It looks to me as if the 'Arab Spring' is, if one generalises wildly, at case 7. According to Inglehart, China is not far behind.

I'm not claiming that all paths to democracy smoothly follow this progression - there are many cross currents and local differences. But this at least is a hypothesis which can be tested - it would be possible to measure the values in these countries, and to compare that with their politics.

It could also be used to think about strategy for development aid, for foreign policy, for domestic development policies, and for campaigns. I don't often hear 'western' NGOs arguing that maybe 'democracy' isn't the right answer for any society right now but I have heard, for example, African academics arguing it for some countries. They are not despots intent on oppressing their people - only thoughtful, analytical observers who conclude that in order to stand a chance of creating the conditions for effective democracy to take hold, some other needs must be met, and other freedoms achieved, first. The evidence is that this process can take generations.

Bread, Education and Music Before Democracy?

Could it be that they are right and that western democracies and civil societies need to recognize this - and accept that development has to come first? That might also mean for example, that rather than advocating institutionalisation of freedoms as rights (eg in political campaigns), in some cases campaigners might do better to look at how to get clean water, or reduce infant mortality, or in another case, encourage freedom of choice not at the polling booth but in music or entertainment?

It is said, for example, that the music of Bob Marley helped inspire the Tunisian uprising. Film Director Kevin Macdonald who is making a documentary about Marley said: "... recently in places like India or Tunisia, Marley is kind of the soundtrack to the revolution. He speaks to people

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

politically in a way that is very important. In the slums of Nairobi, there are murals of Marley and people quote the lyrics to you." [3] Is freedom of musical choice a precursor of democracy? I can imagine all sorts of arguments against this. After all, it sounds rather like the conventional excuses used by the more predatory multinationals seeking a licence to exploit the resources of poor countries, or the tune of institutions like the IMF, which many see as sanctioning economic development without freedom or justice.

Human rights aside, environmentalists may see it as unpalatable because it sanctions materialism. My response to them would be that you must deal with reality - in almost every society I know of, people do want more material goods before they reach the point where they feel they have enough, and other priorities take over.

The easy but futile option is for those with more than enough to lecture those with little that they should not want the same as them. The effective but much harder option is to dematerialise the symbols of esteem, so that gaining it does less or no environmental damage. That means doing it and proving it first at home, in the developed world, not trying to export a 'Case 8' ethical prescription to countries with more basic needs.

Are You Still Using Facebook?

A month or so back I attended the very interesting E-Campaigners Forum organised by Duane Raymond of <http://fairsay.com> in Oxford. I gave a short presentation [4] about some basic campaign planning systems and was surprised by the enthusiasm of the audience. There seems to be a growing gap in many NGOs between the sophistication of the e-campaigning world (basically, the use of social networking in campaigns), with its ever-spiralling array of online tools and widgets which frankly baffle me, and fundamental campaign skills.

Many of the participants were suppliers of online services, or staff within the older NGOs (ie those, which unlike for example MoveOn or 38 Degrees are not built around a social networking model). Listening to them talk about the internal problems they face - such as, at its crudest, how to explain twitter to your CEO - they sounded to me rather like press officers in the 1970s or 1980s. In those days, antediluvian NGOs were moving from thinking that simply knowing the right people and quietly making your case in private would 'do the trick', to realising that NGOs were becoming a form of politics and that the conversations that counted were those that could be won, 'in the media'.

What then followed was a race to dominate news media space, and press coverage was seen, especially by organisational leaders who had no idea how the media worked or how it interacted with decision-making, as a sort of magic. The more coverage the better! Got a problem? Then use the media.

Like e-campaigners today, press offices then acquired a new importance but were likewise perceived as miracle workers. Then and now, the truth is that your campaign needs to have a strategy that engages in the real world, not just in the media or online, for it to 'work'. Very few campaigns were ever really won 'in the press' and very few will be won 'online'. Campaign directors and CEOs need not just to remember that but to plan their resources and activities accordingly. Do not judge the success of campaigns by the amount of online engagement you have, any more than you can by the weight of press clippings: it is real world results that count.

I was also struck by how, in discussions of emerging new players in the online world, Facebook was repeatedly cited as the online behemoth - a media monster gobbling up anything that looked like competition or an exploitable acquisition. In some ways it has become the online equivalent of News

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

International, a *de facto* political player, not just a channel. Which makes Greenpeace's choice of Facebook as its strategic target (unfriend coal <http://bit.ly/d3t4la>) to help green the ICT sector, all the more sensible.

As I mentioned in Campaign Strategy Newsletter 67, the truly online campaign groups like 38 Degrees have become very like campaigning newspapers used to be. Back in the 1980s at Friends of the Earth in London it was a regular 'silly season' (ie summer, no politics, not much 'real news') phenomenon that the phone would ring and a newspaper like the Daily Mirror, which had ignored you all year, would call to say they wanted it run an environmental campaign.

We all knew what this meant. They would plunder your files and contacts, announce and run 'The Mirror Campaign on [insert subject]' and then after saturation coverage for a week or so, declare victory and drop it entirely. The dilemma was that this produced results (as they had many millions of readers), so one went along with it.

I experienced such a campaign 'take over' when the Mirror, in the shape of their lead reporter one Alastair Campbell, later to achieve prominence as Tony Blair's press secretary, ran a pesticides campaign. The deal was that we would get a prominent credit when they broke a particular story - which turned out to be so big that the Prime Minister had to respond personally - but we didn't, and I ended up in the Mirror offices complaining to a puzzled night editor, at 1am. Too late: Campbell had long since left, probably for the pub. It wasn't his fault anyway - we got 'subbed out' and a contrite (they were nice people) Mirror gave us prominent mentions for all sorts of un-newsworthy stories for a week or so in compensation.

The relationship between groups like 38 Degrees and the older established NGOs is now rather like that. The old style NGOs find it hard to match the reach or dynamism of the likes of 38 Degrees or Avaaz. Yet without the depth of real world knowledge and contacts of the old groups, or their local equivalents, the newer social network models would have little or nothing to campaign about. Who knows what will happen? It's in flux.

Reverting to values for a moment, just as the leading edge of the Pioneers can be expected to be the first to experiment with anything new, you can also expect them to be the first to put it down, or set it aside or change the way they use it. The last session I went to at the ECF Campaigners Forum was dominated by very interesting discussions of how NGOs were using Facebook in campaigns; including the paradox of the campaign supporters who posted signs that they endorsed a campaign on their wall, without actually taking the campaign action: classic outer-directed. So I sat in the ECF sessions pondering on whether anyone would mention a trend to people going 'off-line'. But nobody did.

Nobody that is, until I went for lunch with some of the session organisers. They, it turned out, were 'fed up' with Facebook, or annoyed by it, and while many had Facebook identities to talk to supporters, they no longer used Facebook for their own networking, or had even left Facebook altogether. They were experts in using Facebook but had become the equivalent of the press officer expert in getting articles tuned to the proclivities of a particular newspaper, into that paper but who never actually read it themselves. I haven't tried looking but my prediction would be that the 'next big thing' in campaigning to emerge from the online campaign community will be new ways of going offline.

Air Travel Drops in UK

Speaking of predictions, numerous previous Newsletters have covered the 'issue' of air travel and climate change [5] and I suggested that this would become a bellwether behaviour issue, starting

Campaign Strategy Newsletter 69 May 2011

'Arab Spring' Issue

with the Pioneers. Last month the UK ENDS Report [6] asked whether transport growth is 'turning a corner' and presented government Department of Transport statistics showing that air travel has declined each year since 2007, starting before the 'credit crunch' of 2008, and that Britons now also travel 6% fewer miles by surface transport each year than they did a decade ago.

Both total vehicle miles and use of cars and taxis peaked around the same time and has since declined - the only exception being rail, which continues to increase. The link between economic activity and transport, ENDS speculates, may be weakening, and 'it's even possible that some people are choosing to drive and fly less because they have become greener'.

This comes as the group 1010 (<http://www.1010global.org/uk>) cites followers (businesses, councils, householders etc) cutting their carbon 10, 20, 30% or more in a year, and, the publication of national statistics based on 40 million British Gas meter readings taken over a four year period, showing a decline by 17 per cent over the years, 2006 to 2010 [7]. Energy efficiency measures accounted for around three-quarters of this decline. The reasons seem to be government policy that works, and for a variety of motivations, behaviour change.

Campaigners, especially climate campaigners, need to rethink their rhetoric, their emphasis and their framing. Of course this sort of change does not in itself 'solve the problem' but they must stop saying that. It shows that the gap can be closed - and in many cases is being closed. The longer campaigners go on saying "it's not good enough" or "it's not enough" or "not enough people, companies etc are doing it", the more, psychologically and emotionally, they are saying "we agree it can't be done" and "nothing is happening" and "people, organisations etc will not doing anything".

If they really want to solve the climate problem rather than just drawing attention to it, climate campaigners need to shift into a positive can-do frame, way of thinking, and campaign style. Remaining blind to positive developments, even to their own achievements, simply plays into the hands of their opponents, and even encourages those pundits who cannot or won't see change but who have carved out a living as prophets of doom, to resort to glamorous arguments of desperation, such as George Monbiot's advocacy of nuclear power [8].

[1] For references see Campaign Strategy newsletter 54 <http://bit.ly/j7vcwi>

[2] See eg http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mohamed_Bouazizi

[3] <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/mobile/entertainment-arts-13002500>

[4] <http://bit.ly/gDX48J>

[5] Eg newsletters 9, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 36, 55, 59 - <http://bit.ly/frRnY4>

[6] ENDS Report Issue 435 www.endsreport.com

[7] <http://www.cebr.com/wp-content/uploads/Forecasting-Eye-British-Gas-Home-Energy-Report-2011.pdf>

[8] George Monbiot is a UK journalist blogging at www.guardian.co.uk

The Campaign Strategy Newsletter - Copyright Chris Rose.

You are free to reproduce all or any part of this newsletter if you credit the source.

<http://www.campaignstrategy.org> is a non-profit website on campaign techniques & strategies, designed to help NGOs. To subscribe to this free newsletter visit <http://www.campaignstrategy.org>.

To offer contributions or comments contact the author chris.rose@campaignstrategy.org

HOW TO WIN CAMPAIGNS pub April 7 2005 Earthscan by Chris Rose see

http://www.amazon.co.uk/exec/obidos/ASIN/1853839620/ref=ed_ra_of_dp/202-6151204-2796606 or from <http://www.earthscan.co.uk/?tabid=102418>