

FRAMING AND AUTHORIZATION

We heard a talk during the Global Research Assembly called, *The Art of Framing*, which dealt with the nuts and bolts aspects of framing. This morning I want all of us to work in the arena of authorization, particularly focussing our attention on the strategic maneuvers that we as a body will be implementing in our work during the coming year. However, first I want to say a few words that I hope will set a context for our discussion. I want to talk in five arenas.

I First, in the midst of this Council, we have participated in and rehearsed the new orbit in which we are now operating in our work. We have a new visibility around the world which is rather staggering. Two nights ago, we celebrated the initiation of Religious Houses ten years ago. I cannot help but once again stand present to the fact that during the last ten years, we have moved from being a body located in one place to being a body located in more than 150 places in 29 nations. In the last three years, we have moved from having three demonstration projects to having well over 100 demonstration projects. We have experienced ourselves exposed globally in a way that we are not familiar with, and as we intensify the Town Meeting work, that visibility and exposure is going to become even greater.

As the people who have rehearsed the "nobody-ness" of our body, and live in the knowledge that we are those who operate on behalf of and those who serve, we are extremely uncomfortable in this new orbit. During the last year, we have received funding from the private and public sectors which places us in relationships of accountability to the world with which we are unfamiliar. During the last few years, we have created and built a level of support from public and private officials who are willing to stand behind us. We could stand here all day and recite their names. Numerous well known figures are now willing to stand up and say, "These people are okay! What they are about in history needs help." We are in a new orbit and we are in the midst of forging out and creating that orbit. Because we have already taken the jump, a new level of inclusiveness and depth to our authorization around the world is being called for.

Authorization and framing is not something new. We have done both all of our lives. On the West Side, we couldn't have operated if we hadn't known how to frame. I stand in a great deal of respect for our colleagues who forged out the framing required to enable Fifth City to be born. I know enough about the gangs and powers that were present in that neighborhood to know that if we hadn't built an adequate frame, then we wouldn't be there now. Therefore, this activity is not something new. We have grown up with framing. We have learned how to do it. The discomfort which I hear us say we experience in this arena grows out of the radical new advantage that we have around the globe. For the first time, we have something to web together globally. We are in the midst of a shift in authorization, moving from creating the entrees, or setting the stage, in 29 nations to establishing some serious stakes in those 29 countries.

II Secondly, I want to talk about the levels of authorization. Authorization and framing is present in all dimensions of our work. It goes on in the work of doing a project, doing a Town Meeting, doing a Religious House, and of working with the broader public and private sector structures in a state or a nation around the world. Over the years, I believe our key learning has been that the symbolic and the bureaucratic go together; you cannot operate one without the other in terms of broad authorization. We have also learned that the public and the private sectors must be dealt with together.

There are four basic levels of authorization. We have participated primarily in the first level and are beginning to probe the second. The first level involves receiving the symbolic nod and structural recognition. Practically, this means receiving an invitation to work. I would remind

us, of course, that finally we don't need any invitation to work. The Lord has already given us the invitation. History has beckoned us. Yet in the midst of that, we self-consciously seek the blessing, not the permission, of the people of the world to be that mission. This includes the permission to raise funds, to locate staff and to form a basic legalized or structural entity to operate. In any nation, this is related to seeking the broad nod from the church, from the business sector, and from various offices and agencies in the public sector whose support will allow us to go ahead and move. This is also true on the local level. In setting up a village project, we must cultivate clout by obtaining the basic nod from a broad cross section of the local residents, so that they will participate in the project, as well as by obtaining some form of basic structural recognition. This might take the form of simply getting the support of the local parish priest, an informal group of businessmen, or some other group. This kind of framing has enabled us to launch the network of projects and release our activity in the Town Meeting effort.

The second level, which is the one toward which we are moving around the world, involves gaining symbolic clout and structural cooperation. This is different from gaining the nod. It requires the depth cultivation of people holding symbolic power who, in visiting the project, writing letters and picking up the phone, support our work, speak for it with power and thereby release the participation or the cooperation of the structures of society. These contacts deliver the public services to the projects, without which they cannot be done. India is a tremendous example. There, the government is open to injecting government appropriated funds into our projects as priority recipients to assure that those demonstrations happen. These contacts also support the securing of visas.

The third level involves gaining symbolic approval and structural assistance. An example would be receiving direct government funding for one of our projects, not as one of many recipients of the pool of available funds, but as the recipient of funds and personnel specifically allocated for that project.

The fourth level involves the enactment of symbolic legislation and structural programming. This will be a future reality in a country like India where our replication program would be fully assumed by the structures of society itself. This is the long range contradiction in India. I would remind us, though, that the day any structure of society takes over any aspect of our program, our edge must be a million miles beyond that which it is taking over. The structures of society are never going to lead the edge of the revolution, nor are they meant to do so. My point is that framing and authorization is a journey, and the key to that journey has nothing to do with who we can see or who finally supports us, but rather reflects the current leap in our mission.

III Third, would like to share some rememberings. First, authorization is multi-faceted. If you only have one entree, if you only have one invitation, you can expect trouble. When we are in the midst of setting up work in a nation, we are after the broad support of the business sector, the church, statesmen, women, political figures, international organizations, and foreign embassies. We begin a series of activities, like the game of silver balls that you play over against one another, and momentum is created that we build from and live on. Out of that momentum, we create our authorization. This cannot be done simply in one arena, such as business, or the political arena, or the church alone. Society is interrelated and we depend upon social interrelationships in doing authorization. At the local community level, doing Town Meeting, or setting up a project, this would mean we are after the involvement and support of the local churches, the business people, the shop keepers, the school principal, prominent citizens, the one big man in town, the town organizations and the local chapters of national organizations like the Rotary Club. There again, you create the network of authorization out of the multi-faceted aspects of that community.

The key in doing this is finding indirect openings. The first move is not to the structure that "legally" or "bureaucratically" gives permission. For instance, in establishing our work in a nation,

the first place we *don't* go is the Home Ministry, or to the Ministry of External Affairs where some form of the local Bureau of Investigation resides, because it would take ten years to receive their permission. If we had waited for that kind of permission, we would probably be working in two nations today instead of in 29. We're after indirect openings. We are after finding people who care who happen to be in positions of prominence. Around the world, we have discovered that our greatest assistance has come from ministries like the agricultural or industrial ministries. In getting them directly involved in our projects, their support releases the broad sector of the nation or society to work with us.

Secondly we move from advantage. If we don't have an invitation, we'll soon be in trouble. The key guideline to effective authorization, perhaps, is the old adage, "No ants in your pants," or don't be opportunistic. It is shocking that today, there isn't anybody in the world that we cannot see. We have a way to see anybody in the world. The issue becomes, therefore, when should we see them to enable a breakloose to happen? No more do we need to see people for the sake of seeing people. We are after creating an invitation from the world that assists us to continue doing what we are about. Increasingly, it will be less the visits to our key people that will elicit this invitation. It will be the programs themselves. I believe that the key thing that broke loose the situation in Zambia was the fact that our colleagues went ahead and did an ITI, a dozen RS-1 courses, two or three LENS courses, and a Global Women's Forum. These events created such a swirl of activity, indeed a consensus of support, that it was as if people woke up and said, "Now, what is the problem?" Or, as the President said, "What is stopping you from going on?" We have set up 48 jewels, and it is as those jewels shine that our authorization will be created; where they don't, we'll have vulnerability. The key to the sustenance of our authorization is that we deliver on what we say we will do.

The third arena is developing clout. Clout is that without which you do not move in authorization. To fill up a day in Development, sometimes we go knocking on doors. That is fine. But we don't dare go knocking on doors indiscriminately in the midst of establishing authorization. If contacts are made prematurely and a "No" is gotten, we have received something that we will have to continually work over against. We are after using the powers of society for the sake of releasing local man. We're after riding on the back of the networks and relationships in society to enable the demonstration of the rise of local man to take place.

Clout is not the accumulation of bureaucratic reference. Clout is developed from the top down. It involves getting the private sector to relate us to the public sector. The Fifth City event on June 17th is a fine illustration of this. One of the keys to Senator Percy's fine speech was that sitting on the same podium with him was the cream of the Chicago private sector--including his largest campaign contributor, the man who gave us this building. How could he say anything other than that Fifth City was one of the greatest things going on? I happen to believe he believes that also, but because of the presence of other supporters from the private sector, he was released to express his beliefs at a new depth. The public sector's effect on the private sector is crucial. We're after using the statesmen of this world, whose names themselves carry weight. The finest illustration of this is the Inter-American Development Bank appointment. The appointment was set up for us by someone who knew Robert McNamara and knew of our meeting with him in the past. We met for five minutes with the man in charge and his comment was, "If Bob is for this, I am for this." That event was probably one of the keystones in launching the work in Latin America so quickly. Clout is worth waiting for. To move without clout, to move without the set up, to move with only one line of clout, rather than a number, is to risk our whole future.

Fourth, I want to talk about the enemy. I find that I have to go back to our foundational understanding here to guard against my liberal moralism. I have to remind myself that the enemy is the way it is. The enemy is foundational to the revolution. The enemy is the deterrent of being itself, which is non-being, and non-being is that without which being is not.

This is the rhythm of the Void. Jesus said, "Love your enemies." We are fighting a war of profundity. We are fighting a war on behalf of the profundity of consciousness and in the eternity of history, the dehumanization which is the enemy also enables humanization, and is still that with which awakening and care must grapple. The form of the final enemy is forever in the form of principalities and powers. Principalities and structural powers are mental. Principalities are manifest in social symptoms and patterns; powers are manifest in mindsets and biases. The face of the enemy meets us in enfleshed structures and in concrete mindsets. It is present in particular groupings of people, and I believe the enemy today has four faces that we need to stand before.

First we encounter the enemy to our work as the liberal ecclesiastic. I have to say that, rather than a liberal churchman, because this liberal ecclesiastic shows up in Buddhism and Hinduism, as well as in historical Christianity. The liberal ecclesiastic has a deep fear of ecumenism: He carries around with him, and operates out of, comparative religion's concept of unity, in which he judges his religion as the best. He evaluates everyone else according to his own, and he is willing to add three cents worth of everybody else's religion into the 97 cents worth of his religion to make up the dollar. He will fight transparent Christianity. He is caught in his own vanity. He is the Christian bigot. Our task is to seek out progressive churchmen, but in the first instance, not the liberal ecumenist. I can think of a number of Cardinals as examples, particularly those in the third world, who support our work and have been of tremendous support to us. I also think of the general secretaries of many of the Christian councils around the world who, in many cases, are the embodiment of what I mean by the liberal ecclesiastic. We need to be on guard.

The second face of the enemy is that of the pious secular who is proud of his religionlessness. He's the good guy. He's the guy who stands afraid of death and religion, and speaks of religion as being the opiate of the people. He is the bourgeois man *par excellence* who has thrown all ramifications of symbol out with the bath water. We're after discovering the secular religious--the people in the midst of our secular world who stand before the depth symbols of their lives. We run into these people every day.

The third face is that of the political utilitarian. He's the one who is even willing to use us, humble and feeble as we are, to meet his own ends; and often, he is the guy who is no longer in office. He's the one who runs up and tells us about the hundreds of contacts he's got and how he can now be of tremendous help to us. He tells us that if we can just latch onto his bandwagon, he'll solve all of our problems. It is always interesting to guess what his response might be if you asked him why he was no longer in power. We're after discovering the astute statesmen, those people who transcend petty politics, parties and ideologies.

The fourth face is that of the abstract academician who talks with concern for the oppressed, but the minute you put local man shoulder to shoulder with him, he points out how local man is but an illiterate creature. He's threatened by the sociology of action. We are after the practical methodologist. Perhaps the finest illustration is a man like our planning commission advocate in India who is a professor. The twist on his academia is that he is a practical methods man. He sees beyond the university to the implementation of his wisdom. We need clues to smell out when we have been tricked by the enemy. Genuine care destroys all of our ideology. Our job is to motivate other people to fight our fight for us. The enemy lives out of a dualistic universe and refuses to live the way life is in this new era of relativity. I know I am trapped by the enemy when, after a Development call, I come back saying what a tremendous call it was, but one that didn't produce any money. When I am trapped into believing that we need to change something about us so that we will fit more easily into the patterns of society--that's when the enemy's got me.

IV
Lastly, there are five things we must stand before self-consciously. The first is that nobody tells us what to do. We are after maintaining our integrity. We are after authorization from the world, not absorption by the world or by any of the structures of the world. We're after maintain-

ing our globality. We don't do projects because somebody in some country says we *can* do a project, or *asks* us to do a project, or even *insists* that we do a project. We do projects out of the framework and freedom of our global maneuvers. Currently, this is much less clear than it was when we were setting up the first 24 demonstration projects. We're after deciding for ourselves what it is that we're about, and then creating the invitation to the world that will allow us to do that mission.

Second, we need be careful that we don't fall into the establishment trap. The way we operate is not the way the establishment operates. The establishment would have a name board, for instance. Every other prominent person across this country would be on our board if we operated the establishment way. The minute we do that anyplace, we will be controlled and become the establishment. We're after dancing the fine line and maintaining our trans-establishment posture. The fact that we have a non-named board is very helpful and creative, for it allows us to use prominent people as support, but they can never control us.

We need to be careful how we use brochures from one nation to another. Some brochures used effectively in one nation could get us in extreme trouble in another nation. We need to be cautious that we don't fall into the trap of thinking that finally our brochures will sell us. Local man is the only advocate we need. Now, I am not saying that we shouldn't have brochures. I thought that the brochure on Sudtonggan was great, not only because the form is good, but also because I know that Sudtonggan is better than the brochure says it is. We may have some other brochures around which might arouse some criticism when compared to the actual situation they depict. We need to be careful of that.

We are going to have trouble in the future, and we might as well learn to expect it. Problems occur for two reasons. One is increased visibility. As we increase our visibility, our problems are going to increase. I don't know much about the President's visit in India, but I know that we didn't invite any President of India to Maliwada. His presence was occasioned by the state government because of our visibility in Maharashtra. The last thing any of us would do is to invite a president to visit any of our projects. The second place we can expect trouble is in countries where the government is failing, or rather, is not producing. In such cases, certain people go ghost hunting to pin the fact that they are not producing on someone else, and we are a fine ghost to hunt. Have you ever tried to really explain to somebody who we are? This difficulty has doubly compounded the situation in India. We are the advocates of local man. As such, we will receive criticism. As people see that we are about far more than a program called Town Meeting or Human Development Projects, they are going to kill us. Finally, people are going to grasp the fact that we mean to see local man win, and when local man wins, and he is winning, the world will be a radically different place and the relationships to society will be radically transformed. We will not eliminate that reality, no matter how good our authorization is. I hope, however, that we will head it off by building a framework of protection that allows local man to win. Finally, that is why we are interested in framing: it is the rise of local man, not the Institute of Cultural Affairs, that we are framing.

To conclude, I want to say we *will* win because we have all discovered the phenomenal reservoir of people who care in the world, and because we don't have to be in any hurry. We don't have to get caught in mock heroism. We can build our authorization and allow it to win with us and for us. We are interested in 40 years rather than some programmatic opportunity tomorrow that could crucify the revolution before then.

Now, I want to stop and have us talk. What are some of the concrete global advantages that we now have around this world? And I would be interested in names and concretions. Think of them particularly from where you are currently assigned, because global advantages are nothing but local advantages anyway. What are some of the global advantages we have at this time?

- * *The fact that the church has given us money; for example, the Jesuits and the Sisters of Charity.*
- * *We have the most fantastic effort going on in India that this century has seen in this whole phenomenon of local man.*
- * *We've done a Town Meeting in every county in the United States and Canada.*
- * *We have support from the party and government in Zambia for the Institute to operate, as evidenced in a letter.*
- * *We are self-supporting.*

Yes, nobody can put us out of business. What are some other advantages?

- * *It seems to an outsider that we've got enough friends and support now in the multi-national corporations to be able to stand on anyone's doorstep and quote a friend or a reference from another one.*
- * *We have a very broad base of support, rather than a narrow one.*
- * *We are registered in the majority of the places we are working.*

Yes, that is a tremendous advantage. We are registered locally, rather than as a multi-national organization. What are some other advantages?

- * *We keep books that are audited.*
- * *A vice president of a bank in Canada is willing to call people and allow us to use his name as authorization for private sector funding.*
- * *We have direct support from many state governors.*
- * *In Latin America and Africa, three fourths of every house is made up of people from within the country.*
- * *We have people in established political structures who are familiar with our work. They make visits to our projects, they have had direct contact with us and thereby have a personalized story. They have not simply read a brochure or had a visit in their office.*
- * *The extended orders in history, the guardian dynamic of a group of extremely committed people is an advantage.*
- * *Nowhere in the world has local man not appreciated our work. Local man across the world has accepted us.*

My next question is, what are some vulnerabilities that we need to stand before in this arena?

- * *One of our vulnerabilities is that we don't have enough gray hairs.*
- * *We don't know what to say about what is going to happen after four years of work in the projects.*
- * *We don't know enough about our advantages to use them.*

- * *There are some areas where we have holes in our contacts with the middle bureaucracy.*

To think globally in this arena is to think locally. If you had to hold up some global maneuvers of authorization in this next year, what would they be?

- * *One thing we must be concerned about is how to maintain the stakes we have put down. I was thinking that for the projects that might be keeping up with all of these people who have given us the nod. For example, in Widen we are beginning to mail the WIDEN VOICE to our in-kind and cash donors.*
- * *Maneuvers on corporations, the American corporations in Latin America.*
- * *We need a shift in the image of what people see we are doing in Australia so that it is less threatening. It is not that we will do it differently, but we are seen as people who are rescuing the aborigines, instead of as people who are trying to catalyze a bi-racial society. I don't think that is it, but something is needed that makes our work look less threatening. I think the maneuver would be to create framing contacts in both the black and the white dimensions of society.*
- * *We need to utilize people from the academic community to look at our projects, giving us greater authorization in both the public and the private sector.*
- * *We need to obtain registration in Singapore.*
- * *We need authorization in NAME.*

Yes, before we can think of any kind of expansion in Egypt or NAME, we need some major funding.

- * *Protestant funding in Europe would raise the level of Catholic funding we have in Europe.*
- * *We need to have a lot of our books worthy of audit. That's a maneuver towards authorization.*
- * *We need to decide what objective data we need to publish. For example, objectively, we have tripled the income in these villages and the health standard has been raised. We don't need all of the objective data evaluators say, but we need some strategic objective data.*
- * *We are going to need to do phasing on the 500 strongholds of awakening. To rush into those 500 strongholds with every piece of weaponry we've got before we have done the framing job is going to cause a ricochet that will probably blow our head off.*