

THE ART OF FRAMING

This is the fourth in a series of talks broadly entitled, "The New Learnings". Perhaps we should have put the word *learning* in quotation marks, for they surely were not learned sitting in a classroom. The first two talks focused on what we are about: awakening the globe and social demonstration. The learning on the art of maneuvering focused on how we do what we're about. Tonight, we want to discuss how you hold the whole thing together.

The image of a frame is a tremendous one, for the frame is certainly not the picture, and what we're about in history is not framing. Our task is to participate in the rise of local man by catalyzing that revolution as we participate in the Projects and in Town Meeting. We intend to touch every last single village across this earth. That is what the talk on maneuvering was about last night, although I don't think it even mentioned that. How do you do two million villages?

As I think back over where we've come, and stand in this room looking at the world map, the North American Town Meeting dots and the Maharashtra map, it's a rather amazing story. Over the last ten years, we, as a group in history, have moved from working in one nation to 29 nations. Over the last three years, we have moved from doing three Projects to 144 Projects. It was three years ago when we moved from three and did five more and that makes eight. It was only last year that we moved from eight, and we did an extra 16. That was 24. This year, we did another 24, and if you are not a literalist, in India they did 96 -- 96 have been initiated and named. We've done 144 in three years! What a symbol! The world that you and I are living in, as the nobodies in history, has been radically transformed.

Two years ago, it was easy to hide. I'm not saying that we've changed from being nobodies, and I suppose I'll make this point about 30 different times. But we've been exposed, and this exposure is uncomfortable for nobody people. We find ourselves sailing on waters that we're not familiar with, that have storms that we are unable to read. We find ourselves at the bottom of a new orbit. If you know baseball in this country, this shift is like a jump from the Triple A's to the majors. We didn't even make it to the minor leagues. We jumped from the Triple A's somewhere in the country to the majors. We did it in the last two years.

Over the last year we have received support from the private and public sector around this world which is astounding to us poor boys. This last year, major corporations and agencies have committed to us over two million dollars. Our support included \$600,000 from ITT. The EEC in Europe gave us about \$300,000. The Inter-American Development Bank, operating in Latin America, has funded us. UNICEF provided the first grant that we ever received from a United Nations organization — \$20,000 in India. USAID, CIDA, the Belgian Government, have all funded us. We find ourselves in a whole new orbit that is foreign to us, which is uncomfortable to operate in, and demands of us new postures without sacrificing the radicality of that stance. We have a new depth of public support. We've moved beyond simply getting entrees into the 29 nations, to having within those nations people who are willing to stake their careers on what we're about. Senator Percy is one of them. Did you read the speech he made at Fifth City on June 17th? I want to point out one line that's just phenomenal. He's a great politician, of course, but this is tremendous: "And let me tell you, I've been ten feet tall since a few months ago a group of Fifth City leaders came into my office and made me an Iron Man. Every time any group from any place comes into my office, there's two things I show them: the picture of our grandchildren and the Iron Man. It gives me a great chance to tell them about the spirit of Fifth City." And you know the kind of people who go into his office and hear this story — people of great stature and influence. Leaders of nations, presidents, princes, ambassadors, cardinals and bishops of the Roman Catholic church, leaders of the Protestant church have all staked their future on what we're about. As your colleagues went into Latin America, time and time again, the church leaders pointed out, the Episcopal leaders especially, that in their days in the parish, this is what they'd wanted to do.

We find ourselves at a point where we have been forced into building maneuvers of framing that are going to enable us to participate in the major league. For the first time, I believe, we are at the point of being able to formulate a set of global maneuvers that will protect the rise of local man. But we're not interested in focusing and bringing fame to what we're about. We're interested in protecting the rise of local man. In the United States, perhaps for the first time, we've been forced to intensify our maneuvers of framing and authorization, area by area, as we move into new projects. This new intensification is not because of vulnerability, in the first instance, but because the pace at which we're moving demands that we make use of the resources and the power that society has to enable us to move at that pace. We cannot do the cities out of fifty dollar calls, and we have to do the cities. We now stand in a new orbit when we literally can see anybody in the world. The issue, therefore,

becomes not if we can see him, but when and what for. We also stand in the tension between absorption and authentic authorization by the establishment, because we're not interested in becoming part of the establishment. We're interested in using the establishment for the sake of local man. We could see my President Carter tomorrow, if we needed to. We've got numerous different entrees. We could see Prime Minister Frazier, but the time is not right.

Framing and the function of framing has to do with four things, First, it is to protect the mission. I've already touched on this. We're about changing lives. We intend to enable the profound revolution that is happening in our time to happen, and the rise of local man to become a reality in this time in history. The frame is necessary to protect that rise, not our fame. Framing is not a theoretical analysis of the political situation or the economic situation or the social situation. What I'm talking about is extremely practical, extremely mundane, where live bullets fly. I've been assigned to "Siberia" (Chicago Nexus) for the last two years. After a few years of India and time in Maliwada where there were live bullets, I thought there weren't any live bullets in Siberia. But I can assure you, for those who doubt, that even Siberia is in the midst of this rise. Framing doesn't dictate the mission, it protects it. The point is that we're not interested in doing what society tells us to do. However, we don't mind using society, and the forces of society, to further our objectives.

We were invited to visit Sri Lanka to start a new project, by a man who works right under the President. When we visited him, we discovered that, like all good politicians, he had his agenda. We found we were able to say "no" to his agenda, because a few years ago, some people had done some LENS courses down there, and the President of the Chamber of Commerce said, "Look, you choose the village. We'll fund it, and, what's more, we know the President, too." What we're looking for in framing is global human beings. It's people around this world who, together with us, can protect the mission. By global human beings, I don't mean a foreign native, I mean one who has decided to be a global human being in the midst of being, wherever they are. We're always looking for those people. It's interesting that many of them were educated overseas, in the United States, Russia, and Britain and, in just two or three years, totally transformed them. As we have moved into this uncomfortable exposure, we've run into trouble. It's interesting, as you look back, or as you anticipate the future, that the trouble tends to occur where the government itself is finally not producing. Therefore, they have to go looking for ghosts, and we're a tremendous ghost. You know that international organizations for a start are suspect.

Secondly, framing is about the creation of the fabric of credibility. We're nobodies, and if we try to be somebodies, we'll fail. We ride on the back of the world's statesmanship. Therefore, the traditional means of authorization, like newspaper support, a named board, and fine brochures don't help us. All of these presume, finally, that we want to become part of the establishment, and we don't. We want to ride on the establishment. As a Developer, I am most appreciative of the tremendous brochures. However, I heed a word of warning. If those brochures don't reflect the reality intended by them, they'll get us into trouble. Our framing has to do with an invisible web of Those Who Care around the world, holding the phrase of the Invisible College. This is our frame: individuals who care, and who happen to be placed in seats of prominence in the midst of the world. But they are not helping us because of their seats of prominence; they are helping us because they care. They are everywhere; you just have to find them. And interestingly, it's easy to spot them. You can tell in three minutes in a call whether you have one or whether you don't. And if you don't, you won't be able to convert him. Framing calls are not about conversion.

Thirdly, framing has to do with breaking loose the bureaucratic structures. The bureaucracy intimidates local man. The bureaucracy, or more broadly, the institutions of this world, usually labeled the bureaucracy, are structured against the rise of local man. It's not that they're bad, it's just not their function. They are creations of a previous era. They are creations of a time when, no matter what form it took, some kind of imperialism dictated that a few people ran the universe; and, therefore, they set up a structure that enabled them to continue to run it. A bureaucrat sees his job as a lifetime profession. Therefore, he's in no hurry. He doesn't want to rock the boat, because he might get tossed out. It's his job, and you can't blame him. Now, there are bureaucrats who care. I'm not saying that bureaucrats are bad. No! I could stand here for two hours and list the bureaucrats of the world who have helped us. But it is interesting that they have all helped us on the other side of some kind of protection or encouragement. Framing uses the visionary dynamic of society to break loose the bureaucracy, to give it permission, if you will, to move out beyond the rules and regulations that are a part of the stability of the bureaucracy, so that it can participate in a revolution that the bureaucracy is not yet built for.

Framing of the bureaucracy is done through the private sector of the political dynamic. This is the key. It's found in the statesmen of this world who are willing to go to bat for us. Now you know that moving around the bureaucracy is the way things get done. Everybody does it; it's not just something we thought up. You want to get something done, you move around the bureaucracy. However, we don't belong to the Old Boys Club—the usual method of moving around the bureaucracy. My colleagues say that my country, Australia, didn't want any

Americans in there next year. All of the forms had been in the immigration department and delayed for nine months. Finally, we asked an ex-senator to call them and say, "Look, these people are okay. We want them. We need them here " She did it. In thirty minutes, the forms were out. signed and moving. That's the way things get in society. You don't think that the president of Standard Oil waits two years for something to be processed

The fourth point is that framing releases us into action. It breaks loose our paranoia and inertia which is a residue of the uncomfortableness of the new orbit we find ourselves in, and creates an advantage from which we can move forward. It gives us courage. While setting up one of our projects, our colleagues had run into a bit of a stall. Finally, they received the support of the attorney of the Chief Minister who said, "Look, go ahead with it. I'll handle this in two months time." So they went ahead. Framing releases effective action, not flurries of bureaucratic activity.

The art of framing has four keys to it. First, targeting who it is that forms that frame. This targeting is a multi-faceted approach. We don't ride on the back of any one thing or any one person at one time, but we cover ourselves from all anticipated angles. For instance, when we're establishing or moving ourselves forward in a country, we work with the church and the business community. We find entrees to statesmen in that country, to prominent women, to political leaders, to international organizations, to American Embassies and Canadian Embassies where we have tremendous support; then, putting all of these together, eventually we discover and create a frame of protection that allows us to move. It's similar to those silver balls that are on the end of strings, and you start the end moving. That's what framing is. You start one going, and you play one over against the other, until eventually this whole thing is going. Nobody really knows how it all started, except that this is a tremendous thing!

The secret of the matter is, we're not asking people to support the ICA, we're asking them to support this Human Development Project or Town Meeting in this community. It's an indirect approach. The direct approach would be to go to the Home Ministry or to the Ministry of External Affairs, who's in charge of it all. We've discovered that the best ministries in a country to go to are the economic, the agricultural and the industrial ministries, focusing them on the project to get their support to move. It is best to stay away from the Home Ministry because that kind of credibility takes years to build. If we sat around and waited until we had that credibility before we ever moved, we would never have done one country to 29. We'd still be in country number three.

We're out to find indirect openings. This is the same kind of process used in moving into a city or a small town to set up a Town Meeting or do a Project. You decide to work through the business people, the church people, the school principal, the prominent citizens, town organizations, national networks, like Rotary Club and so on. You want to weave the groups together because the likelihood is that the Chamber of Commerce president belongs to the Rotary Club and is a good Christian. You have to be able to ensure capturing his confidence, one way or another. You go to these people with a critical request, but never to ask permission. If you ask permission, of course they'd say "no", or at least that would leave them the option of saying "no". You assume their permission and then ask their blessing upon the permission that's there. You create the invitation out of the invitation we have. And we're invited every place. I could substantiate our invitations to every place, if I thought long enough. We've got them, it's just a matter of putting them together. I was intrigued with the story one of my colleagues told about setting up Town Meeting, where you go into the school principal and say, "This town is being chosen as the demonstration town in this county for doing Town Meeting." They didn't ask the school principal whether we had his permission. You assumed you had his permission, told him that, then asked if he thought Wednesday night or Thursday night would be better. He'd say, "Wednesday night", so you would ask, "Who are five, six, seven or eight people we ought to see in this town and let them know about this?" You'd look them up, see the first one and say, "The school principal thinks Wednesday night is good for this demonstration Town Meeting. Is that all right with your schedule?" After two of them said "yes" you were off. We're after seeking the blessing of society to do what history has given us permission to do.

We're after cherishing those old contacts. It's rather intriguing. We know a lady in Singapore who hasn't helped us for seven years, but every six months we go by and keep her updated, and one day we'll need her help. It's easy to forget that Bishop so-and-so, seven years ago, invited us to do an ITI there out of which this whole thing has emerged, especially when he's no longer as interested in this whole thing. It's very easy to write him off as irrelevant. One day we'll need him, so we keep him alive in our back pocket.

The second key to the art of framing is moving from advantage. One aspect of this new orbit is we don't have to be opportunistic. It's just a matter of putting it together. It may not be obvious in the first instance, but if you decide to win at it, you can win at it. The advantage is always there to be found and to be created. Framing is not Russian roulette. It is not trying to see if you can win, because nine times out of ten you won't. In this new

orbit, framing has shifted from simply individual contacts to indirect strategies of setting up the advantage. This became most clear to me in Zambia. The breakloose in Zambia was that we went ahead and did an ITI, eight RS-I's, two GWF's, three LENS's, and several other events. That process created such a broad network of support and collegueship that questions began to disappear. I was intrigued when one of our colleagues in India came up with the possibility of a Global Guardians meeting in India. I don't know if we should do that or not. I'm not pushing it at all. But they came up with it in the context of framing maneuvers. They're not interested in anything other than building that frame. The future of our authorization is the multi-faceted maneuvers of Social Demonstration and Town Meeting. We have moved from the entry stage in a country when we lived off the story that we told and the support that we had. Now, we're living off the fact that we produce and when we don't produce, our frame will be weakened.

The third key is the use of clout. I'm told that if you live on the East Coast of this country, you call this influence. But we live in Chicago, and we just call it clout. We don't mince words. I mean the use of people who run interference for us and fight our wars for us, while we walk behind them and never have to get bloody. Clout is not bureaucratic reference. It is the use of the powers of society for the sake of the revolution. It's from the top down, and that has many forms. It's, for instance, the use of the private sector, the people who make the money in society. If you remember the social process and the imbalance, it's the use of the dominant sector of society on the rest of society. Your colleagues were extremely wise when they set up the Fifth City Celebration on June 17th. Along with Senator Percy, Mr. James Kemper was there. He happens to be one of Senator Percy's contributors. I don't see how the Senator could have made any other kind of speech. That's the way society operates.

It's the use of statesmen, like Robert McNamara. When we visited the Inter-American Development Bank, we visited the head, who authorized and gave us funds and support for setting up our work in Latin America. Without this we wouldn't have moved into Latin America so rapidly. He said, "If it's good enough for Bob, it's good enough for me." And we told him our story in five minutes.

It's moving from the boss to the junior. We have been fortunate in this. One prominent ambassador we know has just been to number three man in the State Department in Washington. That means every ambassador around this world, USAID, and all of the State Department falls under him somewhere and he's seen our work. He's been to Sudtongan and to Langub. Clout is never a single entree. Effective clout is more than one avenue at once. It's where you cover yourself from different perspectives; from credibility and from personal relationships and so on. We met with the Director of the United Nations Development Program, who is an American and also a Republican from Massachusetts. Ambassador Lodge wrote him a letter before our visit outlining our work and his support for it. Ambassador Andrew Young spoke to him on the phone and a wealthy colleague went with us on the call. The man looked at our colleague and said, "Are you Mr. So and So from Boston?" There wasn't any need for any more conversation.

It's intriguing that our most valuable avenues of clout are the people who have supported us. I have an argument with some of my colleagues about the old line, which is, if you have a good authorization figure, you shouldn't have development visit them. I'm not saying development ought to visit government people, but a man who's given us money is far more willing to give us his name, because giving money is easy compared with giving time. And giving time is easy compared with putting your name on the line, and saying, "Look, Bill, these people are okay."

The way you use clout is critical. It's best if they go with you, because when you are sitting in that room the world can tell your story for you. Our story tells itself, and if real clout is in the room they can't say no. If you misjudged, you're in trouble, but you would have been anyway. The second best method is if they pick up the phone and speak personally to them on the phone. Here, you know it's always risky because you never know if they did or not. Many a suicide has been committed by assuming they did, and not confirming it, and a man appreciates being checked up on, I've discovered. Thirdly, and infinitely less preferred than the other two options, is a letter. Letters are a dime a dozen, especially general letters. You write them yourself, you take them along, get an aide to sign the guy's signature, and you go leave with a letter. Everybody knows that that's the way letters happen. So that is quite useless. However, if you get a specific letter on a specific subject written to a specific person, especially on a first-name basis, then you have some ammunition. Finally, and most useless, is "Use my name. It'll be all right. Just go ahead. There's no need for me to call. There's no need for me to go with you. No need for me to write. Just use my name. It will be all right." That means the guy already knows he's not clout, and doesn't even have enough courage to tell you, so he's willing to send you off to commit suicide on his behalf. If you're not set up with clout, it's better not to go on the call, because there isn't a call in this world today that we need make without clout. There's nobody we can't see.

I haven't been too practical yet although I promised some of my colleagues that I would try to be practical. So I thought I would talk about a call. The most important thing on a call is the set up, and we've already handled part of it in terms of the set up with the clout. Secondly, the most important thing is to decide what you are going to ask for before you get there. It is like a maneuver, and the key to a maneuver is deciding the victory. You can't build a maneuver unless you've articulated the victory. You can't build a maneuver unless you've walked around the victory. You need to walk through it, let it breathe through you and have it soak into you so that then you can see the angles at which to secure the victory. Likewise in a call, unless you can sit yourself in the room, go through the scenario of the call and articulate exactly what it is you're going to ask the man for, then you can't finally build the call. You can't put the call together. A request is not, "I just wanted to come by and brief you about the Institute of Cultural Affairs". That's a slap at the man; it's a waste of his time. If that's all you need or want to do, you create a request anyway that he can say "yes" to. The request is not a stab in the dark: "Oh, I'll sit there, figure out what his mood is, and then we'll see if we want to go for the moon or what." The request is the call, and, therefore, needs to be worded extremely carefully. I'm such an insecure person, I'll always write my request out, and I don't mind using a piece of paper on a call if it's necessary. At least, it demonstrates that you put a lot of time into preparing for it, and you think the man's time is worth this time you're taking, because, the key to the request is never getting a "no." We cannot afford a "no," not even the most subtle "no." Therefore, you need to decide the request that the man can say "yes" to before you go in there. If, finally, you realize later you can get more, you can always go back. In fact, you can often handle secondary things on the telephone, in this society particularly. Then decide the material you want to give him, but don't leave it until the end of the call. Otherwise he'll start reading the material and not listening to you.

A call is drama with actors. The actors are a team in blue. The actors are two or more persons, because you want to create the advantage. Even though 99% of the time we sit on their soil, you're after capturing the advantage from their office and the blue is one key to that. Although it's very rarely mentioned, I bet subconsciously they see power; they see discipline, and corporateness that they don't ever see when anybody else comes into their office. Period.

A call is roles. I think you have one person do the talking because you're building a drama; you're painting a picture. It's an art form, and it's very difficult, if you've ever worked with an artist, to have three people work on one painting. No matter how prepared you are, you finally are in the midst of an intuitive art form and maneuver. But the other person is extremely important; and, not a wallflower. It's a very active role. One of the most important jobs is simply taking down every word that person says. That demonstrates you're taking him seriously. It also makes him think seven times before he says something. The other person is there to listen. He's there to unblock the call if it gets blocked in order to transfer it back. And finally, he's there as a witness to hear what was said and to be able to stand on that.

In the midst of the call, the corporate presence is there. On a call, if in doubt, we overdress, because we want to honor the people we visit. We intend to demonstrate that they are extremely important to us. So, I find myself wearing a jacket, even when it's 120 degrees. I take it off the minute I get out the door, but it is the symbol, at least from my culture, of seriousness.

These are roles you play on a call. We've done extremely well this year, at creating the role of the "hyena." The hyena is the person on whom we place the mantle of worldly significance and whom we dare to let him speak for us all. This person is given a title that is appropriate for the call. He becomes a "somebody" in the eyes of the person we are visiting, and thus stands shoulder to shoulder with him in society. He is also a consummate name dropper. After thirty minutes, when the call is over, our hyena becomes a nobody again. Martin Pesek and Bishop Mathews have both been tremendous at this. We have people around the world who are willing to be used. They finally are willing to do what they are told, not by one person, but by the corporate group that puts the call together. That person goes in first and comes out last, because he is the symbol of the call. In the midst of the call, we introduce ourselves, "Mr. President, my name is Raymond Spencer". That may be the only thing you get to say, so you say it well, you say it loudly, and you say it with dignity.

The setting of the call is important. I hate the way society has gone. The most helpful settings, (of course, you never have any choice) are conference tables. Here the man will sit up front, and one of you can sit at his left; the other at his right. You really can create seriousness in this setting. The second most helpful setting, and the second rarest used, is a desk.

The third, the worst and the usual, nowadays, is the couch business. Everybody has gone to couches and it is a great drama trying to figure out where that guy is going to sit, because you know that he has a favorite spot and it is not always obvious where his seat is. He'll always say, "Sit down, sit down." So while standing, you fumble around, trying to figure out where he's going to sit so that the person who is going to do the call can sit at

right angles to him, not across the room somewhere on another chair.

Your posture is utterly critical. You should sit with your feet on the floor. We stand at attention to life. Everybody else who comes to see him leans back in the chair, crosses his legs, lights up a cigarette and probably assumes that the man has all day, because they have all day. We don't have all day. We usually have 20 minutes, and we mean to *use* that 20 minutes to win what we're about.

Now here is the pitch for the call. I suppose you won't believe it, but this pitch can be done in three minutes. It can be done in an hour and a half and some of our colleagues have a reputation towards the latter. Usually and most creatively, however, it is done in 20 minutes, although you don't always get that much time. Just as we arrived in the office of the late Senator Humphrey the bell started to ring signaling a vote in the Chamber in five minutes. It was one of those crucial issues and the Senator had to vote. He said, "Look, I'm sorry, but I have only five minutes." So the person doing the call took one breath and did it in three minutes. The Senator, at the end of the three minute presentation just sat there and said, "You sure got a lot said in three minutes." Now, this is a tremendous commitment to what we're about.

I think that no matter how much time the call takes, you begin with:

The Institute of Cultural Affairs is a global research, training and demonstration group concerned with the human factor in world development. It is not-for-profit and voluntary in nature with work in 29 nations. In each nation, the Institute is registered locally as a national charitable society, with a national board of directors and national membership. (In the United States you would say it is incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation or whatever is appropriate for the state you are in.) Globally, we operate as an informal federation of these nationally autonomous bodies and presently have coordinating centers in Brussels, Nairobi, Bombay, Hong Kong, Singapore and Chicago. The major programmatic thrust is two-fold: (1) Demonstration development projects on the local level and (2) local community events called Town Meetings that awaken the local residents to the future before them. In just the last year, the programs of the Institute have been supported by international agencies (UNICEF — or you would probably substitute particular examples, depending on where you were), Regional Development Bank (Inter-American Development Bank), government agencies (USAID or the European Economic Community, CIDA), corporations (ITT and Tata), private foundations (Ford, Aboitiz foundation in the Philippines), and concerned individuals who give everything from \$10 to \$200,000 a year.

This opening statement is helpful so that you know what you are going to say when you are on stage because, if you are like me, you usually lose courage. Some people can be awfully intimidating, so once you get permission to move, you move! We're after telling a story; we're not after answering questions, and you don't want questions through this presentation. You want to say what you've planned to say because your pitch will answer nine-tenths of his questions before he has to ask them. I won't talk through the whole pitch, but I'll highlight a couple of things.

The band of 24 is extremely important. Now that we have so many, I usually use a world map to plot them. Then I flip through the blue book of the 24. You can do this quickly. Here you are after getting one-liners. It tells the story and also illuminates the propensities of the person you are talking to so that you can adapt the rest of your pitch to his responses. I remember the Home Minister, Mr. Reddi, in India, was fascinated by the picture of the man from Oombulgurri. We used that clue to talk about the tribal people of India. In our pitch we demonstrate that we know the world. We know that the small, unknown village of Kelapa Dua is only two hours from Djakarta, which is on one of the most populous islands in the world. We know that Sudtonggan on Mactan Island is where Magellan met his reward. Those little one-liners absolutely intimidate the parochial human being you are talking to. The man sees he's meeting someone who knows what he is talking about. We are out to tell stories about our success. We are consummate name droppers. When you mention Indonesia, you say, "Vice President Adam Malak is one of our patrons there and invited us to do that project. You mention President Kaunda, Andrew Young and the Inter-American Development Bank, if it is timely. You create a montage of credibility that answers the major question which is "Who are you anyway?" This is a difficult question to answer head on.

Then you say something about what we do in depth. This is what the method section is about. This approach is critical because it answers the question of how we are different from everybody else. To some people, we sound just like the group down the road. "Community Development" is a 'buzz' word and a phrase to be avoided at all times. We are concerned about the local approach, not statistical analysis which proves that so many people die of malnutrition every year. When you work at the local level, nobody has to suffer from malnutrition. We're interested in action, not abstract analysis based on the premise that if you analyze something enough, the

solution will eventually appear. Solutions are found in action. We are interested in seeing the local people do this, not in promoting outside forces who come and go and then it all collapses. We are consumed with taking the local wisdom in every community and breaking that loose in tension with outside expertise.

You quickly run through the consult method which staggers him. Open one of the project documents to the index and point out that in five days the local community for the first time began to picture their future. The community looks concretely at what is blocking that from coming into being. Then it builds practical plans and concrete actions that they can do themselves. They formulate the practical actions into a set of programs that the community can participate in and do for the next two years.

Next, take out the Programmatic Chart laying out the key nine programs. This chart is the finest thing we have ever come up with to show in depth what we do. If you have only five minutes, you point out that we are interested in three things: total participation, tripling the gross village product, and creating a core of motivity within the village. When the staff leaves in two years the village can stand on its own and participate in its own evolution because a core of leadership has been trained to continue. You talk here about the stakes and guilds.

Next a word on replication. Replication needs to be included in every story because it deals with the crucial issue that the Finance Secretary of India pointed out to us so bluntly: "One village is but a curiosity. I have to be concerned with the 600,000 villages of India." We demonstrate here that we have also thought that through. You are sure to mention that in the one country where everyone knows it wouldn't work, we have 96 HDPs. If you are talking to the United Nations or someone who understands the scope of global care, this floors them.

These four points deal with the critical questions about what we do. How many do you do? How do you transfer commitment? You know he is thinking "That's easy with such nice dedicated people as you all are, but if you do two million villages, you are talking about 40 million dedicated people." You can see the line of their abstract thinking. So you tell the story of the breakloose of local man. Local man himself, given the methods, can be the catalyst and agents of change in his society.

Now he's thinking, "How do you maintain quality? It's easy in Maliwada with all those foreign experts. But how do you get experts for so many projects? And then, how much does it cost? You can do anything if you have enough money." You can say here that 94% of the funding for replication in India comes from Indian sources; 6% comes from overseas. This is not some sophisticated dole. Finally, six percent is but a symbol of the globe's participation in the recreation of the suffering people.

Then Town Meeting — what an amazing story! Often, when talking to people, I do a Town Meeting first. Take out one of the yellow maps, especially if you are talking to an American. They always check to see if their state is done. We have held more than 6200 Town Meetings in 29 nations. It is here that you deal with the underlying issue of the 2,000,000 villages. Here we demonstrate that we are concerned with the changing of the world, which is located in 2,000,000 communities on this sphere. In one sense, your previous thirty minutes of talking sophisticated development is irrelevant. Town Meeting is the key. When Town Meetings are done in coordination with demonstrations, this breakloose begins to happen. You discover a committed constituency of people around the world who are looking for a way to participate in rebuilding their community. The issue at hand is not whether they want to. It is that they don't have the practical methods that enable them to do it and in the last 20 minutes you have spelled out the practical methods that enable local man to win. What a story! Presidents, ambassadors and agency people have heard this story. One of them heard it in two hours over breakfast; another got it in thirty minutes; the late Senator Humphrey heard it in three minutes. But they all got the story. In the midst of telling the story, the bond of unity is formed. Our visibility has been intensified not only by the projects but by Town Meeting. Just compare the number of newspaper stories about Town Meetings compared to the number published about projects. When you hold Town Meetings in 6,000 communities, you become very visible. This is our one global story and needs to get told in every situation.

We can leave these offices and stand tall because we are advocates of local man. I stake my life not on Town Meetings or on Projects, but on the fact that the moral issue of our time is the transformation of the 85% so that their creativity is released to build the new earth. I stake my life on the fact that already I see the rise of local man going on. As we become more visible, people will see the answer to the question that is always there, "What motivates you to do this?" They'll see it is not doing projects. They'll see it is not riding around eternally doing Town Meetings. They will see that it is the vision of the 2,000,000 villages and that local man is on the rise. As they see that, the intensity of the bullets is going to increase. At that time, we will be tempted to forget that we are after authorization and seek absorption in order to decrease the heat. We are the people who have decided to see that local man wins. That is why we need a frame.

Framing and authorization go on at all levels of our work. It is not something that only experts do. It's something you can't avoid doing, if you're engaged. I thought we might spend the remaining time having you talk. Over the last year as you've participated in Town Meetings and Social Demonstrations, what are some of the practical images and illustrations of where you have entered a new orbit? When did you become aware that we are in a new war?

- *The Economic Development Administration, on their own initiative, called us in Pace to tell us they wanted to give us \$3,000 to do a study.*
- *A week before the Mill Shoals Consult began, delegations of Mill Shoals citizens went to both Fifth City and Delta Pace to see for themselves.*
- *The United States State Department asked Cannon Ball to allow a Bavarian film company to make a movie on the project because ACTION in Washington, D.C. said it was the best VISTA project they had going.*
- *Our colleagues in Northern Germany sat down to watch television after a day of Town Meeting circuits. They saw a 30-minute program on Cano Negro.*
- *The phone rang one day and it was the Senator's office asking if we were related to a project that was beginning, and we're in Kansas City!*
- *The grandson of the man who donated land for the Town Hall arrived in town on the first day of the Consult. He changed his business plans for the next week to see what was happening to the town and to keep an eye on what was going to happen in the future.*
- *One weekend, in Cano Negro, the Austrian Ambassador to Panama, Ecuador and Haiti dropped by to see what was going on.*
- *We visited a man named Mr. Gibson from Gibson, North Carolina, and found that he had served on the Board of Global Ministries with Bishop Mathews. He remembered Fifth City from many years ago.*
- *You can call a mayor in Georgia, tell him that you are going to be there to do a Town Meeting, and you have it all set up in five minutes.*
- *If you're not careful, you are likely to determine clout by your own understanding of your relationship and standing in society, and to deal with clout on the level at which you feel most comfortable, which is probably a clue that it is the wrong clout. It isn't clout.*
- *Someone arranged for me to stay at a woman's house in Alabama. It turned out that she is a close personal friend of George Wallace and during the ten days I was there, he spent about five hours on the phone with her.*
- *At the start of Town Meetings in Mississippi, the mayor said "I've got to tell you people I've called our Congressman, and I've checked with Delta Pace about the ICA." He had a whole list of people he checked with and he said, "These people are okay."*

All of us have been forced to frame, whether you call it that or not. What did you learn this year that is very mundane and practical?

- *Framing is not just knowing networks; it's knowing networks in relation to geography.*
- *You have to do your homework.*
- *Don't misquote.*
- *You need people in the local geography who are rooted there to inform that frame and keep it going.*
- *You have to be ready to change your plans. If a person has a certain interest, you have to be ready to slant your pitch.*
- *Framing also includes the dis-establishment and knowing how it affects your program.*
- *Framing has to do with neutralizing, from the beginning, the personal enemies.*
- *The right name can do amazing things for you.*
- *We must have the private and public sector working for us at all levels — global, national, regional and local, because our village relates to and is affected by them all.*
- *Walking with the villagers is to show not only the government but also the villagers that there are many people suffering and this is the right time to know that the war is not ours alone. We reveal the innocent human suffering of the people of the villages which is unknown to people in the cities.*

- *There are people in a village who know and can influence that ambassador. However, that one person may change from time to time during the framing happening.*
- *Framing, like maneuvers, requires radical empiricism. You have to come to terms with the fact that this is the way society operates rather than the way you wish it would operate. If you wish that a good idea would communicate itself and that people would readily accept it — it is not the way things operate. If you do not understand this, you cannot frame.*
- *Frames can change overnight, when the government changes.*
- *A structure called our village offering to give special blood pressure tests to the villagers. We didn't need blood pressure tests; that wasn't the major contradiction. So we went to them and established a model of what our care was and how they could feed into that care. Framing has to do with allowing and helping the structure to do the job the way they want and need to do it.*
- *You can't assume that a contact who will get you to another contact is not important. You have to orchestrate every encounter whether it is a clerk, a secretary, or the man himself.*
- *People in the village know the frame better than somebody outside the village.*
- *Use the local people. We forget that. You need to take the people, even if they don't speak English, on calls. If you have to be the translator, do it. Let local man tell his own story, and let your potential donor see local man.*

You've reminded me of something I meant to say at the beginning. Around this world we have never yet, to this day, been asked to leave a community by the local people. That's a radical thing. Just think of other groups that have tried to do this. Local man has never asked *us* to leave.

- *Framing has to mean do-ment. It is a continuous process. You never stop altering your frame. Bad relationships with the bureaucracy very rarely seem to affect our work with local communities. Usually the villagers don't even hear about it. That is where our greatest strength is. We have enormous leverage by doing our work at the local level while the bureaucrats fight over us. The easiest thing to do, however, is to get paranoid. You try to figure out what you ought to do in the light of this. You begin to reframe without getting defensive. You re-manuever very positively while you work with the local level.*
- *People in the social service structures in any government get scared when you do what they were supposed to do years ago. You must find a way to maneuver their mindset or they will attack you.*

This conversation tells me that our category called Learnings is the right one. We will use these learnings as we participate in building the broad maneuvers to reclaim the globe. An old saying comes to mind:

Now is the time when we should be "as innocent as doves and as wise as serpents."