

The Rising

How Movements Are Changing the World For the Better

Outline

Charles Leadbeater

If you are reading this it will have come from the website of the Social Innovation Exchange, where it was posted following the Wayfinder conference in Istanbul in May 2018. This is a draft outline for a book in draft. Please respect its contents and the spirit in which it is shared.

Charles Leadbeater
London July 2018

Donald Watson probably never saw himself as a revolutionary. He was after all a woodwork teacher in a British secondary school. Yet in 1944, as an exhausted Britain moved into the final stages of the Second World War, Watson came up with an idea that may yet change the world in fundamental ways, and according to some could even save it. Rejecting names such as “dairyban”, “vitan”, and (my personal favourite) “benevore”, Watson created a new entirely plant-based diet and lifestyle, which we know as “vegan”. As a young boy growing up in Yorkshire Watson had worked on his Uncle’s farm and was horrified by the slaughter of the friendly pigs he had got know. He became a vegetarian on New Year’s day in 1924 at the age of 14 convinced that modern life was built on an exploitation of animals that was comparable in its immorality to human slavery. Sixteen years later he decided the logical extension of his commitment to animal rights was to do without dairy products as well as meat. He lived an ascetic life carefully crafted from simple ingredients: wood working; organic farming; cycling and walking; amateur photography. There was no smoking, drinking or other toxins. Critics scoffed that he would never survive on his meagre diet. He died in 2005 at the age of 95.

In November 1944 Watson and his wife, Dorothy, and four friends, took the first step to turn their lifestyle into what would become a movement by founding the Vegan Society, in the British midland town of Leicester. Vegan stood for “the beginning and end of ‘vegetarian’” because [veganism](#) carried vegetarianism through to its logical conclusion.

How things have changed. In the second decade of the twenty-first century, veganism has enjoyed the kind of exponential growth normally confined to tech start-ups. In the UK, the number of people adopting vegan diets has been growing by about 350% per year, albeit from a small base. There are about half a million vegans in the UK, eschewing not just meat and fish but also dairy, eggs and even honey. This is on top of 1.14m vegetarians. Many more are part time vegetarians, so called “flexitarians” or they follow a diet of clean, lean eating. Among young people veganism is an increasingly mainstream choice.

Our son Harry, now 23, is one of them. In his late teens, Harry's hero was Jamie Oliver. He was very proud of mastering a very tasty lamb loin braised with leeks in a creamy sauce. Then, after meeting a new girlfriend and watching two Netflix documentaries that she introduced him to – *Cowspiracy* and *Earthlings* – he decided to become vegan, with no half measures. In the early months of his veganism, every meal became an ethical debate about what we should eat given the harm the big food industry was inflicting: extreme animal cruelty and exploitation; wanton environmental degradation and accelerating climate change; irresponsible risks taken with the health of human consumers. When my wife and I pointed out that the meat and fish we eat comes from sources which variously describe themselves as organic, free range and sustainable our claims were dismissed as wishful thinking and wilful blindness. There was a lot of head shaking, eye rolling and cheek puffing on all sides.

Thanks to recent converts like Harry, veganism is moving from the margins to the mainstream: you can buy vegan meals in Tesco and Marks and Spencer, Pizza Hut and Wagamama. Even the Toby Carvery now does a vegan Black Forest gâteau. The kind of transition that veganism is going through - from an obscure and outlandish cult to a new way to live that is followed by millions of people around the world - is what all movements aspire to. Those that make this transition can become, often quite suddenly and without much warning, extremely powerful, changing social norms and markets as well as industries and public policy. Many movements never make the crossing from the margins to the mainstream. They never get beyond a conversation among the faithful. They never manage to bring about real change because they cannot translate outrage into practical reform and aspirational new products that change industries. This book is about the special set of movements that do make that crossing and what we can learn from them.

How did veganism make the crossing to become one of the most dynamic forces reshaping the world food industry? What does its development tell us about how movements bring about widespread change for good, mobilising new coalitions, changing

social norms and expectations, taking on vested interests, challenging corporations, shaking up political systems?

Like many such movements, veganism started deep in the margins. Sixty years after it was created it was a cult of punks and hippies who were widely regarded as esoteric and even extreme. Their commitment kept the movement going in the social undergrowth even when it had little traction in wider society. Movements often start with prophets in the wilderness like Donald Watson and his friends, people who are prepared to be dismissed as irrelevant oddballs who turn out to be well ahead of their time. For decades veganism languished on the fringes among people who were not looking for a larger following: the whole point of the movement was to remain counter cultural, the province of outsiders and outcasts. Movements never survive the lean times during their early years unless they have a core of true believers, the faithful, to sustain them.

Yet they never succeed unless they are prepared to go beyond the faithful base to reach out to the unconverted and outright sceptical. That is what has happened to veganism in the the last decade.

New forms of communication and community building played a critical role. Watson and his friends started spreading the word using newsletters printed on a mimeograph machine. Veganism took off with online documentaries, like ‘Cowspiracy’ and ‘Earthlings’, which showed in graphic and distressing detail exactly what it takes for animals to become the meat on our plates. Those documentaries were a delivery system for facts that quickened the pulse and infused people with outrage and passion. Made available by online streaming services word spread fast through peer recommendation. Watching them became a rite of passage for young people, a badge of honour. These documentaries provided a “moving frame” for the issues that veganism is concerned with: modern farming is exploiting animals and killing them cruelly while contributing to climate change and environmental destruction. Seen through this frame the livestock industry is a scene of bloody devastation. The documentaries and the commentary that surrounded them did several things that a moving framing needs to provide to mobilise

support. They explained what was going on and why it was wrong. They made people feel deeply emotional, outraged, at the injustice involved. They showed who was responsible: the industrialised food industry. They told people what they could do to make a difference: to right the wrong, become a vegan.

Movements also need places where converts can join the faith, to become part of a congregation. The Vegan Society created by Watson and his friends did that on a small scale. The Internet and social media have provided multiple new gathering places in forums and blogs, Instagram and Twitter accounts where vegans gather, to learn from one another and the priesthood how to follow the faith. One powerful congregation is the international community that follows Deliciously Ella, the Internet sensation Ella Mills who is one of the leading advocates of clean eating. Deliciously Ella takes many of the ingredients of Watson's diet and way of life and makes them attractive and aspirational to 21st century consumers. She embodies the lifestyle as a personal guru to her many thousands of online followers. In 2014 Veganuary launched as another gathering: a way for people to detox after the New Year by trying out being vegan for a month. The first year 3,000 people took part; three years later 168,000 gave veganism a trial run. The face-to-face counterparts to these digital gatherings were the vegan markets and restaurants that started to appear.

Movements need meeting places like these where people can gather to see the faith made real in public. Yet veganism also gives people tools to embed the faith in everyday life, in moments of private devotion in their kitchen. Movements need to give people tools - like recipes - so they can enact change in lots of small ways, not just in set piece public rallies and demonstrations. That is the way people feel continuously connected to the movement because they are enacting it daily.

All of these ingredients are essential to start and then build a movement: prophets and visionaries in the wilderness; a moving frame to call people to action; bringing people together to join and share their faith; the tools to enact the movement in everyday life. So far so good. But none of that on its own is enough make the crossing from the margins to

the mainstream. To do that movements need something more. How did veganism generate the escape velocity to break out of the margins and into the mainstream?

The crucial development was that the movement went from *opposition* to *proposition*. Veganism started as mainly an anti-movement, against animal exploitation. Giving up meat was a virtuous sacrifice. It has become an aspirational movement for a better way to live: that aspirational ingredients have been provided by people like Deliciously Ella. Veganism has not lost its powerful, emotional moral charge but it has combined it with offering something better and different that works with the grain of the times. That is especially so for young people, when wages are flat, rents are high and they may have little to spend on anything, including food. Veganism makes a virtue out of necessity. It was a perfect philosophy for the more frugal, less hedonistic, slightly puritanical millennial culture that emerged in the wake of the 2008 financial crash.

Donald Watson's asceticism has been reborn as Nordic minimalist simplicity, represented by cultish recipe and lifestyle books like *Kinfolk* which is full of men with beards, tables hewn from planks, bare rooms with painted floorboards and small plates of beautifully presented raw vegetables. As Keegan Kuhn, one of the producers of 'Cowspiracy' put it: "Whereas before veganism was viewed as giving something up, now it's being reframed in terms of what you gain, in terms of your health, having a greater sense of living within the bounds of your values, gains in terms of the environment."

As it moved from opposition to proposition, the movement moved into the middle ground, to make converts and to engage the enemy, the food industry, not just to rally the faithful. Big change happens when the mainstream starts moving closer to what were once the margins. For years governments had been urging people to eat more healthily, with a diet based on five portions a day of fruit and vegetables. That meant that veganism was not such a big step from the conventional wisdom about healthy eating. Meanwhile the mainstream food industry started to sense a new market opening up among younger consumers. From about 2010 they started to make space on their shelves for almond milk, soya sausages and beetroot burgers. Tesco appointed a US chef Derek Sarno to lead its

push into plant-based food innovation. Guinness went vegan by dispensing with the fish bladders traditionally used in the filtration of alcohol. Regimes change when external pressures mount leading to division and dissension on the inside. Regimes change when they start to collapse from within: people desert and defect to the other side. That is true in politics but equally so when the regime in question is the dominant way an industry is organised. By 2017, the regime dominating the food industry was changing, from within and from without at the same time.

Yet to make the crossing from the margins to the mainstream veganism has had to change as a movement in ways which some of the faithful find questionable. The coalition supporting veganism has expanded as it has become part of a wider set of “flexitarian” approaches to food in which many people are sometime vegans, mainly vegetarian and occasionally fish and meat eaters. That flexible approach would be an anathema to many deeply committed vegans but it has expanded dramatically the potential constituency. That shift has been made possible only with a more distributed leadership of the movement. Like all movements, veganism, is not a free for all in which anything goes. But nor is it anything like an organisation with a traditional hierarchy. The Vegan Society is not like a trade union nor is it a political party. It is not the only source of leadership in the movement which has a fluid, shifting hierarchy of different leaders, whose position depends on their influence rather than power to issue orders. In their way people like Ella Mills and Keegan Kuhn are leaders. A wider movement needs a wider leadership. To attract converts it needs people who can spread the message to the non-faithful.

Veganism has made the crossing from the margins to the mainstream by going from being an oppositional movement for those angry at environmental degradation and animal cruelty to becoming a lifestyle movement for healthy, environmentally conscious consumers. It moved out of the places where the faithful congregate into the middle ground, where it could make converts and engage and win over the enemy - the mainstream food system. The mainstream moved towards to margins; the dominant regime started to change from within. To spread the movement had to develop a distributed leadership which brought in new role models who had a wider reach.

The movement is not just changing the way we make and eat food now. It's biggest impact is yet to come. Veganism will change the world not by making everyone vegan but by making "clean meat" the food equivalent of unleaded petrol. "Clean meat" offers the prospect of eating meat without that having to involve killing animals which are badly treated through much of their lives. Richard Branson, for example, is one of the investors in a synthetic meat business, Memphis Meats, which will use synthetic biology to grow meat from animal cells. No animal will be killed to make this meat. This will be just one part of a vegan inspired meat and dairy substitutes industry which is projected to be worth \$40bn by 2020. Large food companies like Kraft, Nestle, Unilever and Walmart are investing in developing more plant based lines. Analysts at the Oxford Martin Institute's Future of Food Programme estimate that if the world went on a vegan inspired diet the savings in terms of health care and environmental costs would be close to \$2tn a year.

These are speculative figures but it gives a sense of the magnitude of the change in prospect. Who knows how Donald Watson's idea will have changed the world by 2040 by which time it will be only a 100 years old? What is clear is that veganism, which for most of its life survived as a creed for oddballs, is now one of the most dynamic and creative forces driving change in the food industry. It illustrates the central theme of this book: movements that make the crossing from the margins to the mainstream can change the world, by changing norms, making markets and flipping systems on their head. Veganism is one such movement. There are many more in the making. The most exciting work of the future will be in making movements that change the world for the better.

*

Movements are driving change across society, from the Arab Spring to the rise of the Five Star movement in Italy and 'En Marche!' in France to #metoo, Time's Up, Never Again and the Alt-right. Movements seem to generate power from nowhere, an electricity flowing between people, with little warning and often scant formal organisation.

This book is about movements that bring about lasting change for the better. It is for anyone interested in how the world is changing, but it is especially for young people who have the ambition to be part of such a movement because they are fed up with things as they are. I have been driven to write it because for most of the last 25 years I have been trying to understand how good ideas can change society, corporations, markets and public service systems. I've done a lot of work advising governments on how to change education and health systems, to give people more autonomy, control and capacity to change. I've worked with social entrepreneurs and innovators, often working on the margins of big systems, seeking to get them to change. Time and again many of these initiatives failed to reach scale. I fear my tombstone will read: "Interesting but irrelevant". These projects lacked impact because it is easy to have radical ideas outside systems; yet most of the resources to bring about change lie within systems. Too many of the projects I was involved with started out looking promising but then fell into the chasm between the margins and the mainstream. So I became increasingly interested in those organisations that I worked with around the world that managed to move ideas from the margins to the mainstream. The organisations that really succeeded thought and acted like movements. That allowed them to generate change on a scale far beyond their organisational reach. This book is based on my experience of what they do, organisations like Mothers-2-Mothers the network of HIV+ mothers in Africa and Pratham, the education movement in India. That experience is complemented by research I have done to understand how a much more extensive range of movements make change for the better.

Movements are by definition unruly and unplanned. They emerge without a business plan, investors and a management team. People are thrust into roles they did not seek nor expect to take on. This book explains how movements such as this work. It is not a management handbook because movements cannot be managed in any traditional way. But it *is* a structured account of how movements that change the world generate their power and make it count. It is for people who are part of these movements and want to understand them better, but also for people who work within the large institutions,

bureaucracies and corporations that are so often the targets for these movements. Everyone – students, teachers, policy makers, entrepreneurs, designers — needs to be able to understand how the world is being shaped by movements. That is because movements offer the best chances of changing the world for the better but also because when movements go wrong, as they can do, they can become very dangerous. Movements can embody both good and bad power. We will come onto the downsides and shortcomings of movements towards the end of the book.

*

The power of movements – large groups of people joined to act in the name of a common cause — is not new. That is one of their attractions. Movements are primal. Our ancient ancestors moved in great migrations to find food and more fertile habitats. Later, people moved en masse to flee persecution and to go on pilgrimages. Moving with a large number of other people with whom you identify is basic to what makes us feel human. Yet movements can all too easily become an inhuman mob when they pick on the weak, on outsiders or on non-believers. Some of the worst crimes in human history were committed by movements like the Nazis, or the Khymer Rouge. Understanding how we should work with and for but also against movements, in an age of networked power, is vital to our future.

In our own time, movements offer huge attractions to people who are thirsty for change; frustrated by traditional institutions; distrustful of elites; and yearning for a sense of mission in their lives. They want to be a part of something bigger — to lose and then to find themselves in a crowd. People want the stories of their lives, their biographies, to chime with larger forces of change. Movements appeal because they provide a bridge between our personal lives and the grand sweep of history.

The Suffragists and the Anti-Slavery movement, the Chartists and the Labour Movement, Civil Rights and the Green movement all brought change, often through long painful struggles, uniting huge numbers of people in a common cause, pressing their case on

those in power in politics and in business. Contemporary movements like #metoo and NeverAgain share some of the features of these earlier campaigns but also some important differences. Movements today emerge and collapse with greater speed and with sudden, disruptive impact.

This book explains why the eruption of movements since the turn of the twenty-first century has been caused by a combination of powerful factors that will not abate. Particular movements may come and go, rise and fall, but movements as a way to mobilise large numbers of people in making change are going to become even more common and powerful for three main reasons.

First, the costs of organising a movement have fallen precipitously thanks to social media platforms. It is now easier than ever to reach like-minded people, in large numbers, to gather them into groups and to persuade them at a minimum to follow a hashtag — and perhaps much more. Social media provides the animating fuel of shared outrage that propel movements.

Second, those kinds of movements, swiftly formed, loosely organised, providing a sense of identity and purpose which is potent but not all consuming, are especially appealing to young people steeped in a culture which is both highly individualistic and yet networked and collaborative. Movements are something people choose to join, as an expression of their identity and belonging. They are not like communities into which you are born. Movements create a sense of identity that people find appealing: voluntaristic, the product of personal choice and conviction, and yet committed at the same time.

The third reason that movements are on the rise is that lots of different people are frustrated with the status quo and with the traditional means of expressing their discontent. In authoritarian states, popular movements have arisen to challenge corruption and elite capture of power: most recently in Malaysia the coalition that had ruled the country since independence in 1957 was swept from power by an opposition which had been building in civil society for more than a decade. In democracies,

movements attract people who feel abandoned by business as usual. Anti-establishment movements of right and left have become the prime way for people to vent their anger at what they perceive is political stasis.

More movements are emerging, from across the political spectrum. Buoyed up by hope of a better future, they carry the prospect of change.

Yet for all the hope they offer, movements are prone to fail and disappoint. Critics and sceptics, such as the writer Malcolm Gladwell, political scientist Ivan Krastev and social media critic Evgeny Morosov, argue that modern movements which attract Millennials lack the solidity of the long dogged marches of the past. Morosov calls its “slacktivism” a fake kind of activism that only requires supporters to click on a link. Many movements flare up then fade away, leaving those in power ruffled but intact. These movements give people the impression they are part of something big without requiring them to make any real sacrifices and commitments. As a result they fade and die as quickly as they emerge. That was true of many of the popular protests of the Arab Spring and in Eastern Europe. Movements disappoint their followers in this way for two main reasons.

Some implode because of internal weaknesses. Movements that grow by demanding only fleeting attachments from people can then fade away just as fast. Movements are easy to sign up to online if all you ever have to do is click on a link, sign an online petition or make a video of your friends pouring ice cold water over your head. These give the illusion that you are part of a movement for change without having to rouse yourself from your sofa. Movements that become a way for people to celebrate their solidarity with one another, in their echo chamber, in a carnival-like atmosphere of complete self-absorption, do little to further their cause. Movements like this might be good fun but they do not have as much impact as they might like. Leadership still counts in movements and the leaderless movement often loses direction and purpose.

That brings us to the second reason why they fail. They often run into well-organised, entrenched opposition from the incumbent political, economic and social systems they

are trying to dislodge. Those systems often have the stamina and resources to divide, bully and resist these new movements. As a result, in Eastern Europe for example, movements often failed to deliver the systemic change they promised. The result of all of this is more churn and turmoil, more hopes raised and then dashed, more disappointment and disaffection.

This is why this book focuses on movements that have brought about lasting, systemic change for good.

A prime example is ACT UP, which was formed by HIV activists in the 1980s to press the US government and the pharmaceutical companies it was funding to accelerate their efforts to tame the terrifying HIV epidemic. At its height ACT UP had no more than 10,000 members around the world, yet they saved millions of lives. They shamed the government and Big Pharma into action through a brilliant campaign to raise awareness of the plague. But ACT UP was not just oppositional: ACT UP members became world experts in the science of HIV, the conduct of drug trials and the way the US federal funding was channelled into research. Drug regimes to tame HIV were developed only because ACT UP put pressure on the system to respond more quickly and showed how it could be reconfigured to be more effective. ACT UP achieved this by moving out of its own comfort zone, a movement of the faithful, to engage the enemy – the system it was hammering against – to persuade it to change. That meant winning over converts from inside that system – policymakers, doctors, researchers, scientists – to make them see the world from the movement's point of view. ACT UP engaged the enemy, the system and went from opposition to proposition with concrete ideas for new kinds of treatment and drug trials that saved millions of lives.

This book looks at successful movements that have changed how we eat and how we communicate, how we grow food and what we carry our shopping home in, how we have sex and how we raise families. These movements are not David in an era of the corporate Goliath: they are not lone, heroic individuals throwing themselves against the power of a giant. They embody the power Jonathan Swift described in his parable *The Travels of*

Gulliver. Gulliver remember is the man who finds he is a giant in a land of small people and wakes up to find himself in Lilliput tied down by hundreds of industrious little people working in concert. The system - big government and corporations - represents the power of Gulliver; movements embody the power of Lilliput. Many determined little people acting together can tie down a giant. Movements are the one kind of power that might tame massive online monopolies, change markets and force governments to change. How do movements mobilise change not just in lifestyles and social norms but in the deeply entrenched power of systems in politics, business and public service which shape our lives?

Movements that achieve change at scale go through three stages: inception, growth and impact. To do so a movement has to go through often painful developments in strategy, organisation and leadership. Many fail at the intersections between these stages. Movements that succeed do so because they win at these intersections.

Inception

At their inception movements often start with people like Donald Watson, prophets and visionaries who spend a long time in the wilderness. ACT UP's prophet in the wilderness was a cantankerous and charismatic playwright called Larry Kramer who repeatedly berated the movement for its own failure to be outraged by the official disregard of HIV. Time and again Kramer was cast out and then returned to the movement to rally it emotionally and morally. Provenance matters: authentic movements start in margins, with people who care so passionately about a cause they are willing to devote their lives to it.

Movements are not manufactured in marketing departments. The movement that supported the development of the contraceptive pill started with a remarkable woman called Margaret Sanger who in 1916 opened the first family planning clinic in the US in Brooklyn. She was promptly imprisoned. Sanger was one of the most passionate advocates of free love and sexual pleasure America ever produced. She would have been at home at Woodstock. Yet she was born 70 years before all of that. Sanger was a prophet and a visionary, who spent decades in the wilderness, but who eventually found a way to

create the pill she thought women needed to enjoy greater freedom and equality.

At this early stage movements need places to bring the faithful together. Movements need a cellular structure to survive the long haul it takes to bring about change. The Civil Rights movement was a classic case: the Southern Baptist Churches provided the the movement's cellular base, a place where people could come together locally to reinforce their belief even when little evident progress was being made. Other movements need their own equivalents of these churches: places for the congregation to come together to give witness to their faith. For vegans these meeting places are online as well as physical: markets and restaurants. ACT UP's weekly meetings in New York were the focal point for its movement which by the end had chapters in scores of other cities.

This is how movements start. To grow, however, movements have to master the art of making the small become big: to practice the Lilliputian power which can tie down a Gulliver. At its peak, ACT UP had at most 10,000 members, but their work impacted the lives of millions. That ability to leverage a small core into a much larger movement, to suddenly become very big indeed, is why movements are so easily underestimated. How do movements grow in this way?

Growth

This may seem an obvious point to make but *movements have to move people emotionally to mobilise them*. They must frame an issue in such a way that it *moves* people to identify with one another, and with the cause to which they are jointly committed. The framing of the issues at stake has to carry an emotional charge, one that connects the people involved and bonds them together in a shared identity and with a shared sense of purpose. Yet as well as moving people, often to anger, the leaders of the movement have to frame the issue or challenge they face so that it seems not only like a vital, moral crusade but something achievable. To do this, the movement has to set out who and what is responsible for their plight and what needs to change to make things better. A powerful frame connects explanation to action through emotion. A moving frame explains what is going on, why it matters and what is wrong with it; who is

responsible for the injustice being perpetrated; what *you* can do to change it.

ACT UP grew in influence through a brilliant series of controversial stunts and campaigns including an occupation of the office of the Food and Drug Administration and taking to the floor of the New York Stock Exchange to protest against the pricing of Wellcome's HIV drug AZT. Veganism grew through the power of those provocative documentaries *Cowspiracy* and *Earthlings*.

Movements then need a way to channel this energy and renew it. They achieve that by mastering the power of Lilliput, the art of ***decentralised productivity: they share value with their members to create more value for the whole.***

They do not centralise nor standardise to achieve scale. They distribute tools so people can enact change where they are, in their workplaces and communities. People can practice being part of the movement in private as well as in large public demonstrations. Movements do not scale, so much as spread. Movements have a distributed root system: they draw on resources as they grow. They make the most of the collective intelligence of their members.

By sharing a common goal, values and identity, movements achieve concerted action at much lower cost than traditional organisations. They do not need elaborate management structures and incentives to make everyone pull in the same direction. Movements rely on lots of lateral, self-organisation. Yet they are not a free for all. There *is* a hierarchy to successful movements which starts to emerge during this growth phase. Yet it is often fluid hierarchy, with people with different skills playing different roles when needed. That means the leadership of a movement can revolve and evolve. There were orators and campaigners in ACT UP like Kramer but also scientists and data analysts. When they wanted to stage a sit in, they had people trained in the art of non-violent civil disobedience. When the task was to challenge the Food and Drug Administration's approach to drug trials, there were people who had trained themselves in the fine detail of drug discovery.

That kind of shared leadership requires a sense of shared ownership. Movements depend on their members to enact change, which creates more value, in the form of more change for the better, which further helps the members. Movements generate a kind of endlessly renewable energy. Through distributed leadership and shared ownership movements can synchronise action among many people who are only following a loose script.

That is how movements grow out of the margins. But it still leaves unanswered how they then achieve impact at scale. How do they change incumbent systems and markets, governments and corporations? How does the margin become the mainstream?

Impact

Movements bring lasting change through three further vital steps.

First, they go from opposition to proposition. They go from railing against the system to also proposing how it could be reformed, improved and transformed. They mobilise outrage and anger in the name of achieving concrete change for the better. Movements are rarely purely propositional. They invariably start as anti-movements: they are against something regarded as bad. But to achieve change they have to marry this to a set of proposals for how things could be made better. As ACT UP matured its propositional work became increasingly important: it became a highly effective campaign to promote a combination of more effective treatments for HIV rather than relying on AZT. Veganism made a different transition from opposition to proposition. It has grown by becoming an aspirational lifestyle movement: proposing clean eating as a better way to live. Making this shift however is not always easy. It requires the movement to make a decision to focus on achievable change rather than railing in impotent opposition. Moving from opposition to proposition inevitably involves making choices and trade offs which may not be ideal. That pragmatism invites accusations of betrayal and sell out.

Moving from opposition to proposition however is vital to the second step. A movement has to go from gathering the already faithful and devout, to winning over converts.

People who decide to switch sides are especially valuable because they will bring other converts in their wake. A movement that is only ever a gathering of the faithful will never make the crossing from the margins to the mainstream. The people involved may well have a good time, enjoy one another's company and reinforce their faith. But they will not bring about lasting change at scale. Only movements that win over converts bring real change and to do that they have to make themselves accessible and attractive to those converts, people who do not immediately see themselves as part of the faith.

Take the movement which built support for the contraceptive pill as an example. The inspiration for the original research into the Pill was Margaret Sanger. Yet precisely because Sanger was the prophet in the wilderness who inspired the movement at the outset she was the wrong person to sell the idea to the mainstream, especially when the Catholic Church hierarchy was adamantly opposed. Her talk of sexual liberation would have scared them off and played into the hands of the conservative opposition. Instead the task of making the wider case for the Pill fell to an eminently respectable, Catholic, gynaecologist of the highest standing in the medical fraternity, JD Rock. He made the case for Pill not in terms of freedom but the very opposite control: it would give women more control by allowing them to plan when to have children. For Rock the Pill was a tool to strengthen the traditional family by helping parents plan when to have children; Sanger saw the family as a patriarchal institution that needed to be dismantled. Rock was an establishment figure who would never have taken the risks that Sanger took to get the movement going when it had little support. Sanger was the wrong person to sell the idea to the conservative mainstream.

To move from growth to impact movements have to go through a series of mutations and adaptations, many of which are uncomfortable to the founders. They have to move from opposition to proposition. They have to focus on winning over new converts from inside the system, not simply reinforcing the faith of the faithful. They have to encourage the mainstream to move towards the margins. To do this they have to leave the places where the faithful have gathered and protested and enter an uncomfortable middle ground of negotiation and compromise that always invites accusations of betrayal and infidelity.

Routes to Scale

Movements that make this transition bring about change in three main ways which often reinforce one another.

The first is that *movements change social norms, expectations and behaviour*. The most important power they have is to change the relationships between people, often redefining what is regarded as normal, acceptable behaviour. Veganism is in the process of becoming normal. That is what #metoo, Time's Up and Never Again are doing. Movements like this work with the grain of a modern sense of citizenship: citizens do not rely solely on the state for regulation to guide what they do, but instead govern one another's behaviour peer-to-peer. We are finely attuned to the judgements of other as to what is acceptable. In a world in which trust in institutions is low, people tend to trust their friends and peers. The greatest recruitment tool that movements have is this lateral, peer-to-peer power, which has been amplified massively by social media and smart phones. That is why some of the most potent movements are not about laws so much as culture and norms: how we relate to one another as men and women, in our rights to express our sexuality identity or through what we eat. Bottom-up, citizen-to-citizen engagement provides the foundation for a movement's ability to build its power and influence in two other directions: economics and governmental.

Movements make and remake markets. Economists tell us that markets are made by the interaction of supply and demand, which determine the price and quantity of a good sold. But markets are also social institutions and most social movements are seeking to change markets. The #metoo and Time's Up movements are the latest to challenge the way the labour market works. New product markets are often opened up by a vanguard of committed consumers who help to realign markets around new products that embody new values. A good example of the way a consumer movement helped to make a market is the growth of mountain biking: the mountain bike was a product and a lifestyle that emerged from innovative consumers before it became a product made by mainstream bike manufacturers. Veganism is just one example of how a social movement is remaking the

market for food, in the wake of organics, fair trade and vegetarianism.

Increasingly it is movements that bring new markets to life, shaping what is in demand *and* how it can be supplied. The remarkable movement that created the contraceptive pill is an example of one that worked on the demand for and supply of change at the same time. The birth control movement, heavily influenced by the women's movement, enabled and funded the research that led to the creation of the pill in the late 1950s. Yet the pill was a success when it launched because the women's movement had also developed the market: the expectations that women had that they should have more control over their lives, to study and work, get married and have children when they wanted. That preparation of the market helped with the Pill's rapid adoption. Within five years of its launch, more than 6 million US women were using it. The Pill arrived at precisely the right time to be the key enabling technology for a wave social change. The Beatles were just around the corner and the 1960s were coming over the horizon fast.

Movements with missions shape the world that companies operate in. They critique the failings of old systems and embody the aspiration to live a better life. This is why movements are such potent spawning grounds for socially committed innovators who want to create products and services to enable new ways for people to live. Social entrepreneurship to create businesses that have a social purpose, for example in solar energy, come from movements with a mission. Social entrepreneurs are often unsuccessful in achieving change at scale. They are much more likely to succeed when they see themselves as part of a much wider political and social movement to bring about change.

Third, *movements can flip systems, giving them a new sense of purpose and direction.*

This is no easy task. Often movements fling themselves against political and public systems that are so obdurate they can survive the siege battered but intact. Yet sometimes movements can change the direction of a system. Flipping a system takes painstaking work to map the the opposition's structures and understand how they work. That means respecting the knowledge of those working within the system not just railing against it.

The movement has to engage and work with the very people who were once seen as the enemy. Talking to the enemy involves crossing boundaries and working in a middle ground where accusations of betrayal and “sell out” are easily made. Yet without this engagement, systems will not change. Systems change only when a coalition of outsiders *and* insiders builds up to turn the system on its head. It is dangerous for the leaders of movements to operate in the middle ground between the movement and the system, but it is absolutely critical to achieve lasting change. The margins have to make themselves more attractive and accessible to the mainstream and the mainstream has to start to move towards the margins because it sees its survival could be at stake. ACT UP’s scientific committee became expert at understanding the research funding system for HIV. That won them credibility with key people inside the system who started to see them not as unruly activists but as potential collaborators in finding a way to treat the virus. The key moment came when highly respected researchers from within publicly funded institutions decided to engage with ACT UP to help design new, more effective and efficient drugs trials. This meant that together they were mobilising a much larger and more diverse reservoir of collective intelligence, ideas and imagination from inside and outside the system.

*

Business executives and government leaders have a lot to learn from the power of movements. There will be more businesses like Tough Mudder, the collaborative endurance challenge, which model themselves as movements. Governments seeking to influence people to become more responsible for their own health and environment will seek the power of movements, so that people help one another to change rather than relying on costly government services. All governments now want to influence citizen and consumer behaviour to promote public goods, especially better health. The success of the movement in Australia to reduce smoking is a case in point. In Japan the government has successfully spawned a social movement to promote dementia care within communities.

Yet it is also vital that we understand the downsides and limitations of movements, not

just how they can fail but why they go wrong, in disastrous ways. The strength of movements, their capacity to mobilise people emotionally to take action, is also their weakness. Movements can become frenzied and punitive, especially when they are directed against weak outsiders who are blamed for a social ill.

When movements fuse with corporate and state power they can become a dark force. Fascism was a movement that fused state and social movement. Positive movements need to operate within a framework of law and institutions that guarantee rights and due process. When movements displace or undermine these institutions they become dangerous because they start to use the power of the state to promote the movement's sectarian goals: the Hindu supremacist BJP in India is a prime example of a sectarian movement which has taken over the state. The result is that who you are, your ethnic and cultural identity, has become more important than your rights as a citizen in determining how you are treated. The state becomes really dangerous when it becomes the tool for a populist movement: Hungary under Viktor Orban is a case in point. In Turkey Recep Erdogan is providing a case study of how an authoritarian leader can create a social movement to buttress his power. In those situations not only do we need a counter-movement advocating for civil society but independent institutions that are willing to stand up to populist power by defending the rule of law. A society run solely by movements alone would be a nightmare.

Working for a company modelled on a movement can be uplifting but it too carries the danger that power might be abused. Many companies are keen to reposition themselves as organisations with a higher social purpose. Yet companies modelled on movements can become akin to cults. With full time, secure jobs in increasingly limited supply corporations can demand an unquestioning commitment to the corporate cause. The culture at Amazon is a case in point. Full time employees at Amazon are expected to become 'Amabots' willing to do anything the company asks to prove their loyalty to the cause. Those that do not show extreme loyalty are quickly spotted and weeded out. Companies that become cults are not healthy for their employees nor for society as a whole.

Movements can also be skewed socially. Movements are often organised to campaign for equal rights, from the labour movement and the women's movement to Civil Rights and Time's Up. One of the most impressive egalitarian and cross class movements is the movement of adults with learning disabilities to win the rights, budgets and tools to live independently. We tend to think movements are on the side of the angels and should be good for equality and autonomy. Yet the capacity to engage in movements is not equally distributed across society. The skills, resources, and social capital to mobilise movements lies with the well connected: the middle class. If movements are mainly driven by relatively well off, well educated, socially connected people who already have a voice, then that can be a recipe for middle class capture of change. That is perhaps why we have so many lifestyle movements which are about how people consume: by definition these have to be movements for people with disposable incomes over which they have some discretion. They are not movements of the poor and dispossessed. Movements are more likely to succeed if they can appeal to and win over support from the mainstream. That works to the advantage of movements which can appear respectable and non-threatening to vested interests. That may explain why a movement such as Black Lives Matters has not made the transition into the mainstream as #metoo and #NeverAgain have. Movements can reflect and reinforce inequality rather than challenging and changing it.

Movements are a form of power and all power is vulnerable to abuse. This book helps us learn when to resist and challenge movements as well as when to join them. If we are to avoid the ugly, intolerant and unequal side of movements, and benefit from their transformative energy, we need to get better at understanding them, for good and for ill.

Yet in a world in which power is compounding into the hands of fewer people, social movements are the most potent source of change for the better. Movements can challenge power, including corporate power of the likes of Google, Amazon and Facebook, in a way that competitors that can be bought out do not. Movements draw on the endlessly renewable resource of citizen power and we need to become much better at mobilising them to change society for good. They are our main hope for the future.

