

WES BOYD
Co-Founder, MoveOn.Org

Take Back America Conference
Campaign for America's Future / Institute for America's Future

Special Session: The New Politics of Engagement
Wednesday, June 4, 2003
Washington, DC

Thanks Bob [Borosage]. Thanks Stan [Greenberg]. So, we have the people. That's Stan's point, right? So how do we get them to act, is our point. That's what we're about today. You know, something that's really new in the last five years – and that's what we've been leveraging – you get these emails now, from friends and colleagues, about politics. People are talking about politics. I think politics went underground for a while. It was no longer cool to talk about politics. But then it emerged again and it emerged in another form. You get the jokes, you get the speeches, the news releases, the petitions. This is all new. And this just happened in the last five years or so.

So, although we are living in difficult, really trying times in many ways, we can see the rough outlines of something that's really amazing and hopeful. So, I'd like to tell our story first. A few years ago, Joan Blades and I were frustrated with the Clinton impeachment that was going on. We're business people, and we had some contact with the technology, so we could do a website. We put up a petition and, within weeks, we had 250,000 people. This happened in the first four days. You could have knocked us over – we had no idea this would happen.

Unlike a rally, where people come one day and then you never see them again, we had a way of reaching out to these people and we knew they wanted to act. So, we helped them make calls to Congress. We helped them have meetings with their members of Congress. We helped them be heard. And we believe they were heard. Out of nowhere, this group – which was self-organized in many ways – became the most prominent anti-impeachment voice.

We were shocked at how powerful the vehicle was for organizing. We were completely bowled-over by the work of volunteers around the country who, at just the spark of an idea, would go forth and do the most amazing things – rallies, meetings with members of Congress, press events, that kind of thing.

We're just beginning to understand the power of this and, of course, when you talk about power in politics, the first thing people want to talk about is money. So, the most obvious thing is the ability to raise funds for good leaders and good causes. In 2000, MoveOn members gave \$2.3 million for Congressional candidates through the MoveOn PAC. The average donation was \$35. In the 2002 cycle, it was \$4.1 million. Today, we

have three times as many members. And we believe they're charged-up. We believe they're pissed.

Last December - beyond the fundraising for candidates - we discovered something completely new to us – that this willingness to give support extends beyond candidates to issue campaigns. Which was a whole new thing. Last September, during the Iraq campaign that we ran, we asked MoveOn members to support a \$50,000 *New York Times* ad. Within hours, more than \$200,000 was given. We were really onto something. People liked the idea that they could support something that has an instant impact. During the campaign, we went on to do radio, TV. There's the TV ad, "Daisy," that we did during that campaign, billboards and local print advertising. And each time we asked for help, the support just flooded in. It was amazing.

That was just Iraq, right? People were all charged-up and passionate about that. Well, apparently not, because just in the last couple of months since that campaign, we've run two additional campaigns, working with Bob [Borosage] and others. One fighting the tax bill – this was the blood donor ad. This was parents giving blood to support their schools, while the tax cuts are being argued in Congress. And the other campaign on the FCC battle over the last few weeks. There's our friend Rupert Murdoch. Those efforts were funded by small contributions from thousands of members through instant fundraising.

That's what people in Washington like to talk about. They like to talk about money and fundraising potential. But we're most excited about something else. We're excited about the ability for people to get together and make it happen. Organize it. So, we've been experimenting with what we call "Citizen Lobbying" – helping people to take their messages to their representatives, and create an on-line system to make it easy to set up meetings and deal with co-ordination problems.

Another example of that system of lobbying is our "virtual march". We had tens of thousands of people schedule their calls into Congress so that we could assure every office would receive a continuous stream of calls. That's the anti-war room, with the comments that were coming in from around the nation during that day. Some 440,000 calls were registered at the end of that day. This is a tremendous coalition. Another thing that's enabled by the Internet: there's a tremendous coalition that was pulled together for this anti-war effort, and I believe it really couldn't have happened without the ability to use e-mail and the Internet to keep all of these organizations flowing and moving together.

It really is a new way of doing business in more than the ways I've talked about. The mother of all meeting days was the vigil that we organized with these organizations during the Iraq campaign. This is the map of all the vigil locations around the globe. There were more than 6,000 locations. I think it's fair to say that even we were shocked at the power of this. We were completely bowled-over. There was clearly something really different going on here. That the breadth of the public opposition to the war was noted by the *New York Times* columnist, Patrick Tyler. "The fracturing of the Western

alliance over Iraq, and the huge anti-war demonstrations around the world this weekend, are reminders that there still may be two superpowers – the United States and world opinion.” There’s a new way to connect people to power.

We’re talking to people who are leaders here, as well. We all can be leaders – that’s what Joan and I showed, I think, through our efforts, and our team’s efforts and the volunteers’ efforts. How does this change the nature of leadership? We’ve discovered a few principles, we think, that are very important for people to look at.

The first principle is listening. People mistake, all the time, this medium as a new broadcast medium. They think it’s like their TV or their radio or their direct mail operations. For us, it’s a two-way street. One of my favorite sayings, passed on by a good friend in the software business is, “strong vision, big ears.”

Democracy is completely compatible with leadership – it doesn’t work without it. So, at MoveOn, we see some feedback. This is an email we have our system send to us every week to tell us what’s going on with our membership. But also, down below, you see a list of the top-rated comments from membership, and the members themselves rate these comments. This is how we force ourselves to keep abreast of what’s going on with people. And it’s something that organizations have to do. It’s too easy to just go forward. You really need to be connected with where people really are. This is how people rate comments. This is our action forum. It’s a really great mechanism for getting everybody to have a fair chance of being heard, and yet great stuff comes to the top. We think leaders should see online engagement like they tend to look at face-to-face contact. It’s two ways. You wouldn’t let some hack direct marketer write your stump speech. This is the chance to really connect and listen.

The next principle is service. We don’t look at our work at MoveOn as persuasion or education. And I think Stan testified to this. Our experience is, people know what they think, and they can be motivated to act, and that’s our job. This is a really hard one for political types, I think, because most people involved in politics and policy believe in their hearts, if they could just find the right words and the right evidence, the whole world say, yeah, you’re right, let’s do that. People know what they think, and they know who to trust. That’s the foundation of any kind of engagement – providing a good service and a consistent voice that builds that trust. Trust is a two-way street. You can’t have trust without giving trust. A similar point on this is that political organizations do not use the vast resources out in the world. These are incredibly talented people, and resourceful people, who are dying to make a difference. These are not little people. These are tremendously powerful and resourceful people out in the world.

The next principle is to fight. The primary way to build trust is to consistently fight for things people care about. It’s pure and simple. It’s not about manipulation, it’s not about polls, it’s not about what the subject-line in the email should be. It’s simply to fight for things that people care about. We are asked all the time to talk about websites and tricks and techniques, and we just won’t do it. Because it’s really not about that.

Why are groups and leaders so worried about leading? It's a mystery, in some ways. I think that most leaders today see the political world as a world of scarcity. It takes so much money to do anything. And so, like misers, you have to hoard your political capital. As a result, everybody's cynical. Global leaders, potential supporters see no reason to do anything. One fundamental difference with Internet organizing – I think it changes everything – when we fight, we get stronger. Internet organizing has a totally different dynamic. It's sticky – it's a sticky medium (in a sort of dot com-ese). When somebody watches you on TV, if they agree with you, so what? You never hear from them again. If somebody hears of you through an Internet campaign, they sign-up, they're likely to stick with you for years. Here's a slide of the growth of our email list through our Iraq campaign. Every time we did something, every time we showed leadership, it goes up. Those are people who are going to stick with us, as long as we continue to have a good voice and provide good leadership.

The final principle is, lead, for God's sakes. I'm kind of new to this stuff, so we come from a different perspective. We've really been impressed by the people we've met in this field. It's kind of like teaching, where you wonder, how do people put up with this? But it only can be one thing – the tremendous passion and commitment that they have to it. It's not fair. It's very punishing. It's a very punishing world. Too many good, public-spirited leaders are burnt-out. If that continues to happen, all we'll have left are the time-keepers, the power-hungry, or worse. Here we are today. We are bringing good news. And the good news is that this medium is a tremendous boon for good leaders. You can build a base of support that will stick with you. No more endless fundraising. No more having to have your story told through Rupert Murdoch. You can develop and nurture a connection with a base of support that will follow you throughout your career. It's a whole new way of doing business. If you do it well, it's democracy. And if we all do it well, we'll take back America. Thank you very much.