PART 4: CAMPAIGNS

Chapter 9: The scale of campaigns

In this book a campaign is simply a set of encounters. These might be spread over time with much the same group of people meeting repeatedly. Larger campaigns might also involve encounters between many different people at different locations, sometimes even happening at the same time.

The advice given is not applicable to campaigns trying to get the best outcome for one person or group regardless of fairness or truth. Types of campaign included and for which advice is given are:

- **Campaigns for reason and fairness:** These might aim at all situations, a particular repeating encounter (e.g. council meetings), or a particular issue (e.g. climate change adaptations, improvements in education). They promote use of reason and fairness to get to better conclusions. Often progress accelerates because of extra thinking contributed by the influencers and that might be another motive for the campaign.

- **Campaigns with certainty about the conclusion:** These aim to ensure a clearly-correct conclusion is reached or prevent a clearly-wrong conclusion being reached due to manipulative persuaders.

In campaigns for reason and fairness on a particular issue it may seem at times that some conclusions are almost certainly correct and others almost certainly false but there must be openness to new evidence or reasoning.

E.g. Imagine that a crime is committed and the police investigate. At first they do not know who the perpetrator is and their objective is to apply reason to find out. As evidence is discovered they start to suspect a person without being sure so they remain open to new evidence and new suspects. However, more evidence piles up and they become sure they have identified the right person. They arrest him. The suspect also has several past convictions for almost identical crimes. The police continue gathering evidence but nothing emerges to change their conclusion that they have arrested the right man.

When the case comes to court some crucial evidence is excluded on a legal technicality, the defendant proves a very clever liar, and the defence barrister skilfully upsets the crucial prosecution witnesses, reducing their credibility. The jury knows nothing of the man's history of similar crimes. Throughout this process the police and prosecuting lawyers act reasonably and fairly and so the advice in this book is for them. In contrast, the suspect (who knows he is guilty of the crime) does his best to get away with it. Before going into court he practises his

lies and body language with the help of his lawyers and a mirror. This book is not for him.

Case 14: Small-scale campaigns

Examples of relatively small-scale campaigns include:

- Encouraging better behaviour from your children as they grow up.

- Regular committee or management meetings at which similar people discuss similar issues.

- Conversations between the leaders of an organization over many months that gradually shape its strategy and plans.

- Sharing a good idea with a few people who might find it particularly interesting.

- A series of meetings to sell an industrial product to a company.

  E.g. Most committee meetings are regular events with many of the same people attending each time, a chairperson to provide some control over discussions, and often a written agenda, perhaps provided in advance. Sometimes there is voting or a consensus mechanism. There is usually time to prepare for the meeting and the positions and tactics of other participants are often frustratingly familiar. Participants sometimes represent factions locked in conflict (usually non-violent). Committees are often formed to tackle important decisions, so bad behaviour is common. It is important to know what options you have for using power if necessary.

The advice given in previous chapters on exchanges and encounters applies to campaigns, but campaigns (even small ones) have characteristics in addition to those already discussed.

Campaigns provide opportunities to learn and adapt from one encounter to the next. This includes learning about the topics of the discussions and about the intentions, beliefs, and tactics of participants – including how to defeat those tactics.

The following guidelines aim to:

- involve the best people;

- base the campaign on high quality reasoning;

- keep driving that quality up through learning; and

- promote learning among all discussion participants.

Contact the best people

The best people to communicate with will sometimes be obvious from your objectives. For example, if you want to educate your children then they are key people to communicate with. If you want to influence your boss because he or she is

the person who will make a particular decision then your boss is clearly a key person to communicate with.

However, it may be worthwhile communicating with others who can influence those central people. For example, these might include other colleagues, consultants, other children, or teachers.

On other occasions, you would be happy to talk to anyone who is interested. If you have a good idea and want to share it with others then you can search online for anyone likely to appreciate your idea. This might include:

- Politicians representing you (e.g. your MP in the UK, local councillors, county councillors, the Mayor).

- People working in think tanks and campaign groups.

- Academics, journalists, and other writers.

People in these groups often make their contact details public, including an email address. Some of them are open to good ideas, especially if they agree with them or welcome support. It is also easy to find out what they think because they write and speak publicly. This allows you to spot people who already agree with some of your thinking and start your communication by showing you know about their ideas.

In contrast, major celebrities and businesspeople are often harder to reach and less thoughtful. They are so busy that, even if your communication reaches them, they probably will not have time to consider it.

Build a reputation for reason and fairness

Carrying out the recommendations in previous chapters will give you a growing reputation for being reasonable, fair, constructive, helpful, respectful, and generally worth listening to.

Over a series of encounters people will learn that you:

- Are well informed and use reason carefully.

- Will explain things clearly and at a sensible pace.

- Understand the effort they will need to make to understand your reasoning and evidence.

- Understand the effort they might need to make to work out changes to designs or plans as a result of the new information and inferences.

- Understand the practical and perhaps political constraints on what they can do.

It might also be worth showing that you have power you are prepared to use if they will not act reasonably.

These things are best shown by doing them. Hospitality and irrelevant social contact might put the other person in an uncomfortable position and be seen as slimy schmoozing rather than as genuine and relevant.

Focus on the quality of the reasoning you use

Reasoning without mistakes is hard, but keep trying to minimize the number and importance of mistakes in the reasoning you share. Word your arguments carefully, avoiding basic mistakes like unintended implications and over-generalizations. Carefully check your facts and arguments.

The challenging reality is that most people make many mistakes when reasoning, especially about sensitive topics, and often have no idea they have done so. Know your limitations. Test your skills by taking tests of reasoning. Test your arguments by asking people whose abilities you trust to reflect on them, try to find flaws, and explain them clearly to you.

Most of us will do better if we look for useful reasoning by outstanding thinkers and use it if we are sure it is sound.

When evaluating consequences of potential actions, be aware of their size and the certainty of your predictions. Try to be comprehensive and consider other consequences that are too uncertain to analyse convincingly.

Over time you can develop your reasoning and it will become more influential.

> E.g. Consider the challenge of advertising for a charity that wants to help suffering children in Africa. A familiar approach is purely emotional. While a mournful voiceover tells us about the little girl who walks 15 miles every day to collect water from an infected stream for her family, the video shows us the poor girl struggling to get dirty water into her plastic container. Will we please give just £10 a month to help?

> This kind of advertising must bring in some donations so it is effective with some viewers, at least in the short term. However, there are major problems with this approach.

> There are more good causes asking for money than most people can give to and some people are becoming more aware that not all charities are equally good at turning money into improved outcomes for the suffering. Some charitable programmes are ineffective, some even do more harm than good. In many cases there is another charity doing almost the same thing but more efficiently, perhaps by wasting less money on its headquarters or on fundraising activities. More people today want to be effective altruists.

> When I see these purely emotional television appeals, I am put off donating, not encouraged. Their blatant attempts to manipulate through emotions seem cynical to me. I feel my intelligence is being insulted by their attempt to manipulate me this way. I note that they provide no information about what they will do to help using any money I might provide. Worse than that, I can imagine the camera crew and charity workers standing behind the camera just watching the little girl collecting infected water and I picture them doing nothing to help. They give me no reason to think their programme will help the suffering or that they will efficiently convert my donation into improved outcomes. More than that, because they are not talking about those things, I strongly suspect they do not have a good story to tell. There are probably other charities that would do much more good with the money.

A much better advertisement would give me facts and figures about the problem, what the charity does, what it achieves, and how efficient it is. At the same time, it could show me images of the beneficiaries before, during, and after the charity's help. The emotional content is still there, but now combining the initial distress with relief and hope for the future.

Show me a charity worker stepping forward to give the little girl a bottle of clean water. Then show a lorry delivering such water for short term relief at her village. Then show me the well they drilled the week after and happy people pumping clean water from it. Now tell me how much it costs to do that and how many people it helps. And now tell me what percentage of donations goes towards the direct costs of each project.

Without the facts we know we cannot trust the emotions someone else provokes in us. Yes, some people are taken in and that's enough to make emotional manipulation effective. But that does not mean it is the most effective way to influence, or morally defensible. Putting the case using facts and logic often requires more thought and refinement but focusing on the quality of the reasoning you use is worth it.

Continually develop better explanations

Explanations are often misunderstood, sometimes because they are unclear and sometimes because the other person is mistaken. Clear thinkers and expert writers can produce clearer explanations most of the time but everyone makes mistakes sometimes. Whatever your ability it is vital to continue refining your explanations. The reaction to an explanation can highlight opportunities to make it clearer and less susceptible to misunderstanding.

E.g. During 2020 and the COVID-19 pandemic some people argued that it was not worth doing anything to limit infection because 99.5% of people survived it. In conversation it was difficult to counter this immediately but given a chance to do calculations it was easy to be ready next time with '0.5% of the UK's population of around 67 million people is 335,000 premature deaths. That's a lot and would put a huge strain on many people, not just the health service.'

Explanations can sometimes be tested systematically using a survey.

Continually develop better ways to manage participants

Encounters are often less productive because of muddle, lack of focus, tricks, and abuses of power. Some of these are driven by uncooperative participants who want something unfair.

Managing these should be easier if you are the recognized chairperson for encounters but, even without that advantage, it is usually possible to do something.

Try to understand the circumstances, beliefs, intentions, and tactics of participants. Devise responses to promote a good quality, cooperative discussion. Against persistently uncooperative manipulators this effort must continue because they will adapt to your changing tactics.

E.g. Imagine that in regular management meetings you have noticed two of your peers aggressively defend existing working methods when an attractive alternative has been suggested. They said the existing methods are widely used in the industry and work well in their experience. They described the alternative suggestions as 'half baked' and when you suggested something you had worked out carefully they dismissed your contribution as merely an opinion. At the time you did not fully understand that they were using social proof as their defence. Saying your contribution was an opinion was part of this approach and a sneaky trick to undermine it.

Having identified this pattern you might propose the next innovation by describing the analytical work that went into it and the advantages of doing something better than typical industry practice. You might prepare to respond immediately to the 'opinion' trick by explicitly saying that the proposal is not merely an opinion but an idea that has been carefully analysed.

Later it might become clearer which changes they wish to block and why. That in turn might suggest a better approach to their obstructive behaviour. Their next ploy might be, for example, to undermine criticism of current performance by manipulating performance figures to give a falsely positive impression.

Encourage participants to develop knowledge

Knowledge of recurring discussion topics usually develops between encounters as well as during them. This applies to you and other participants. Anticipate and encourage this progress.

This is particularly important if deep understanding of issues is needed.

E.g. When governments around the world first started to respond to the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic (the virus that causes the disease, COVID-19) there were many meetings between medical specialists, epidemiologists, vaccine experts, and politicians. Most politicians have very little scientific knowledge so for them this involved acquiring a lot of new knowledge. Within a few weeks many were comfortable talking about 'R' numbers and even 'R zero'. This was because of learning during meetings and reading in between. As this happened their ability to make wise decisions in response to the pandemic improved.

You may notice that people who seem not to understand your explanations during one encounter come to the next with a much better understanding. Between encounters they may be thinking, consolidating memories, reading, or getting advice to educate themselves. Encourage this.

There will also be points where everyone was uncertain during one encounter but before the next some people do more research and return better informed. You may be able to point out issues like this. Think about the importance of what is uncertain during each encounter and direct research effort towards the more important areas of uncertainty.

Knowledge develops more rapidly if people are prompted use it (e.g. by writing up notes from a meeting or explaining points to others in writing or conversation).

Psychologists call this 'retrieval practice' and it is a powerful way to build long lasting memories.

> E.g. A school teacher of mathematics will assign homework and set tests to get students to rehearse their knowledge between lessons.

Build knowledge in a planned sequence

Over multiple encounters knowledge should accumulate, though hindered by forgetting. This accumulation often leads to new conclusions in the minds of participants. The sequence of knowledge building is important and sometimes can be planned.

Just as a single presentation within an encounter should build in a logical way, so too should learning from one encounter to the next. Perhaps nobody knows where the discussions will lead and so it is impossible to anticipate the conclusions. At the other extreme someone who knows the logical conclusions may be passing that understanding on. Either way, it should be possible to sequence learning sensibly.

> E.g. A series of university lectures may need to lead students towards conclusions they would not be able to understand or justify without several sessions of learning beforehand. The lecturer has the power to put the material in a good sequence.

> E.g. Members of a working group assigned to review the way public funds are given to support sports might start with an open mind about their conclusions. However, they can still plan to think through the issues in a logical way that builds knowledge gradually. They might start by understanding how funding is currently decided, then consider criteria for evaluating the social impact of a sport, then apply those criteria to some sports to see what happens. In the UK we tend to regard all sports positively and want them to expand, with more participants and more of the sport shown on television. However, some sports are much more beneficial to society than others. For example, on net health benefits (fitness less injuries) and cost of participation, badminton rises above show jumping and middle distance running beats boxing.

As with sharing reasoning within a single encounter, preview the overall progression and likely conclusions if you can. At least try to eliminate worries about conclusions that might concern participants if you honestly can.

Maintain knowledge

Progress made tends to slip away between encounters even when good conclusions have been reached and it seems that influence has been achieved. This could be due to forgetting, the effect of further (mis)information (e.g. a popular misconception), or reminders reasons for preferring other conclusions (e.g. because they are comforting even though untrue).

It may be important to remind people of knowledge and conclusions from time to time, ideally by getting them to retrieve those memories rather than just having the points explained again.

Case 15: Large-scale campaigns

Examples of large-scale campaigns include:

- Efforts to get more people to live in more sustainable ways, drop less litter, or be kinder online.

- Activity around a proposal for a major train line, aiming to stop it, improve it, or get approval for it.

- Activity to encourage politicians to change the law.

- Campaigns to get people to vote wisely in a referendum.

- Efforts to block the activities of a religious cult that aims to gain power and is neither rational nor fair.

Campaigns as we usually understand them are typically exercises in persuasion, not influence. Organized campaigns usually have a fixed objective (e.g. win power in a vote, stop Brexit, achieve Brexit). They aim to win, not to reach good conclusions whatever those might be.

However, in this book the only campaigns of interest are exercises in influence. These aim to reach good conclusions through cooperative, high-quality discussions and mutual learning. For example, while it is hard to argue against shifting to more sustainable lifestyles, the details of what is more sustainable shift as more evidence and better ideas emerge.

In campaigns like this the only strategy is to seek better conclusions by promoting good quality, cooperative discussions.

The advice for small scale campaigns still applies but large-scale campaigns bring new issues. There are more diverse opportunities to learn. The people involved can change over time and between encounters. Leading participants may emerge. Perhaps most importantly, the resources needed typically become large.

The guidelines in this Case build on the guidelines for small-scale campaigns and aim to:

- involve more people in promoting application of reason and fairness to an issue;

- tackle uncooperative, unreasonable people in a controlled way; and

- promote learning on a large scale.

Involve more people

Influencing many people usually requires many people, for two major reasons. First, people who have not thought about the issues pay more attention if they see that many other people have. If it is just one person talking then they pay less attention. Second, for people to be influenced they must pay attention, learn, and think. They may need time to understand complexities or work out new behaviours. Often someone must spend time with them in discussion, promoting that learning and learning with them.

E.g. Think how long it takes, on average, to get one person to learn how to sort waste for recycling and learn enough about why they should bother to do it carefully all the time. Over several encounters, at least, it might be an hour or two. Now multiply that over, say, 25,000,0000 householders and you have the learning and teaching time required for the UK: roughly 30,000,000 hours (i.e. 3,425 person years of effort). Post about recycling on social media or create an informative website and you might reach people more efficiently but most will not see the pages or pay much attention. Your online effort will be a tiny drop in the ocean of effort needed.

Reason and fairness give explanations more influence than other communications but rarely let one person influence many significantly.

The challenge of influence is far greater if many people are uncooperative. (In the recycling example above the resistance is usually just mild annoyance at inconvenience.)

E.g. As I write, many people currently own some Bitcoin and want its value to increase. It is not known how many people own some Bitcoin but it is thought to be tens of millions. Others are getting money by Bitcoin mining, running crypto exchanges, selling related software, and doing other Bitcoin-related activities. They too would like Bitcoin to be popular. Some of these people speak in support of Bitcoin in conversation or online. If they see someone post something critical of Bitcoin on social media, they will attack it, deploying a variety of arguments to nullify the effect. Nobody knows how many people do this, but if it was just one in a thousand of as few as 10 million people then that is still an army of 10,000 advocates with a pressing vested interest.

Similar mathematics and large numbers apply to consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and cannabis, people who have had bad romantic relationships and now have a general hatred of men or women (over 90,000 divorces in the UK each year gives some sense of scale), people who are angry at the police for arresting them for a crime they committed (roughly 11 million people in the UK have a criminal record), Muslims who have Islamist or fundamentalist tendencies (an unknown percentage of roughly 3 million Muslims in the UK), and people who think they have been unfairly discriminated against in some way (regardless of whether they actually were). Some other troublemakers are simply very young people, some of whom may have linked their friendships to activist work or crime. These are just some obvious examples.

In all these cases, the people motivated to be uncooperative and unreasonable are a minority but it rarely seems that way. The motivated ones speak up. They spend more time developing their rhetoric. They get together in groups and show themselves. They sometimes intimidate others, discouraging them from expressing other views. Just a few of them in a social media discussion can create an overwhelming climate of rage.

If reasonable, fair people are to prevail then many of them must understand the issues, know how to speak safely, and speak up. People may be motivated to join in because they like the idea of spending time with people who are fair and use reason, or because they want to do something good, or stop something bad happening.

It is encouraging and pleasant to spend more time talking with people who, like you, rely on reason and fairness. It is more agreeable also to spend time with people who have reached conclusions similar to yours on some important issues. For example, scientists work with other scientists, go to science lectures, and attend science conferences.

There is nothing wrong with this. It will usually be more worthwhile to find and meet allies than to find and meet opponents.

Hold cooperative meetings

Meetings, in person or online, where interesting issues are discussed with no tricks or other manipulations are attractive to many people. Such meetings offer a zone of reasonableness to inhabit, at least for a short time. The meetings are an opportunity to share information and reasoning, develop thinking further, and get closer to good conclusions. This requires excluding unreasonable, unfair, uncooperative people and encouraging good behaviour. If this is done then productivity should be high and the atmosphere pleasant.

> E.g. The Royal Society, based in London, is a scientific society for top scientists only. The quality of discussions is unusually high (on average) because of the outstanding scientific focus and abilities of the members.

These meetings are also an opportunity to discuss the thinking and behaviour of uncooperative, manipulative people interested in the same issues. Responses to their tactics can be devised, shared, and refined.

Prompt reasonable people to speak up

It is obvious that, when voting is required, the more people who vote based on reason and fairness the better. What is less obvious is that numbers are also important in consultations, letters to politicians, tweets, and other expressions of view. The ideal situation is for sound reasons and fair proposals to be given by many people.

Whether you are just an independent individual wanting to have a positive influence or a campaign manager, you should try to reach the often silent, reasonable majority. Let them know that when they read something sensible their feeling of agreement is not influential unless they tell someone. To be influential they must click 'Like', post a supportive comment, write a similar letter to the right people, or do something else that shares their thinking.

Too often there is a vocal minority that seems to speak for everyone while a silent majority is wishing they would go away. With public and media perceptions, silence looks like agreement with whoever is speaking.

Gain attention constructively

Protests gain attention (e.g. news media coverage) for your cause but are often counter-productive because of inherent contradictions.

E.g. A disruptive protest demanding sustainable lifestyles is contradictory. Sustainable lifestyles are efficient, not disrupted. Resources are conserved, not wasted. Disruptive protests also associate sustainability with disruption, irritation, and less enjoyable lives, which is inaccurate, unattractive, and unhelpful.

E.g. Going on strike to demand higher pay is contradictory. If you want more pay then surely you would do more work, not less. It suggests that you do not understand the basic mechanisms of business.

A better way to gain attention is to get many people to take part in the same inspiring action simultaneously and publicize it.

E.g. Examples of such actions include:

- 10,000 people recycling and posting online about it.

- Litter picking expeditions.

- 500 people suggesting ideas on a specific topic to their local MP on the same day.

- A city losing a massive amount of body fat collectively.

- 500 people posting reviews of products on a major supermarket's website focusing on wasteful packaging.

- 1,000 young people suggesting healthier eating ideas to family members.

- Many people making a lifestyle change, or switching away from using a product, or towards using a product.

One way to coordinate the timing is to have people sign up over a period of time with the idea of launching the action when a large enough number of people have signed up. Another is to name a date for the actions and try to get people to act when that date arrives. Another way is for a small number of people to perform an extreme feat (e.g. make 1,000 polite comments on Twitter consecutively and ask people to sponsor it in aid of a charity).

Sometimes a practical demonstration of the truth can be effective and attention grabbing.

E.g. A stunt organized by the Merseyside Skeptics Society in 2010 aimed to highlight the fact that so-called homeopathic 'remedies' contain no medicine. The campaigners wanted to discourage Boots, a large retailer, from stocking homeopathic products. Around 300 volunteers each 'overdosed' on around 80 homeopathic pillules, as a result of which nobody was harmed or cured (Coghlan, 2010). The stunt gained attention though it was not enough to stop Boots stocking the products.

Choose people to focus on

There are important choices about how to focus influence activities. Who should receive most attention? The choices should be guided by the fraction of the target population that currently does not know what it needs to know.

> E.g. As SARS-CoV-2 vaccines were being developed and rolled out, levels of vaccine acceptance were surveyed and monitored closely. They differed considerably between countries.

> E.g. The level of acceptance of evolution by natural selection varies greatly between countries. It is particularly low in Iraq and there is evidence that it is slightly higher in Kazakhstan than in the United Kingdom, where the theory was first published by Charles Darwin.

The people who are first to learn will usually have different characteristics to those who are last to learn. When an idea is very new, the people to focus on, if possible, will be intelligent, rational, willing to think, influential, positive about knowing things before others do, and not committed to other ideas. People who publish work on a large scale or have control of large organizations tend to be intelligent and influential but may be cautious and committed to other, longer established, ideas. It may be necessary to seek people who are less established to find those not already committed to old ideas.

In some cases there is a continuous supply of new people coming to the issues for the first time, open to alternatives.

> E.g. New gadgets for distributing and playing recorded music have rapidly swept through societies in part because there are always young people coming to the market to buy their first system. Others may be committed to an older technology but the new customers are not.

Finding people willing to consider new ideas seriously may be as simple as spreading information widely (e.g. through broadcast media or the internet) and following up with people who show an interest.

When something is gaining widespread attention and acceptance it is not necessary to be choosy. Word of mouth may help to spread good ideas.

When an idea is accepted by most people the focus can turn to those who still hold out, if it is necessary to convince them too. They may have worked to block acceptance. Research may be needed to understand their reasons for not accepting the new, better reasoning.

> E.g. During the COVID-19 pandemic, health authorities in the UK were pleased with the high level of vaccine compliance but still encouraged everyone to accept vaccination. This involved research to find out who was not accepting vaccination, what concerned them, and who was increasing those concerns. The reason for this encouragement was that herd immunity relied on a very high immunity rate because of the high infectiousness of the virus. For a time the situation was finely balanced.

Sometimes the actual level of acceptance is not what it appears. Sometimes most people prefer one good idea but think most others prefer a bad alternative more often supported in public. A survey that reveals the true majority view encourages people to pay attention and be more open to reason and evidence on the matter.

Cautiously tackle uncooperative people

Participating in discussions that include uncooperative, unfair, manipulative people is inherently more difficult and stressful if not done well. Try to avoid entering such encounters as the only cooperative person. Instead, participate as one of a group of allies, well prepared to promote reason and fairness and respond to manipulative behaviour.

Being heavily outnumbered by unreasonable people can be overwhelming. They may take turns to speak, leaving you with no opportunity to respond. They may suggest a show of hands on issues or use the majority mood as a reason to close down discussion of inconvenient facts. They may attack you as unreasonable because you are the only one who does not accept the majority view. This is very hard to respond to. Having even a few allies in the discussion makes a big difference.

If more than one participant is determined to stick with reason and fairness then there is more chance that at least one of them will know how to respond. A two-way conversation can develop between cooperative people, for a short time at least.

Share learning from encounters

Encounters including uncooperative people are rarely completely successful. It is important to learn from these experiences.

In addition to learning from repeated encounters with the same people, a campaign can learn across encounters with different people. These may be more varied.

The participants need to share what they have experienced, their insights, and their tactics. A website or social media page can help, and face-to-face meetings can also be used, of course.

Ideally, effective counters to trick arguments should swirl through society's meme-sphere as readily as the tricks they counter. They should be counters that are effective and safe in front of a jury, human resources department, or legal department, not just safe in front of people who are already agree.

Document for efficiency and quality

Two challenges with large scale campaigns are (1) the sheer amount of influencing activity and (2) the difficulty of maintaining high quality reasoning and behaviour in the face of often horrible tactics by uncooperative people. Both challenges can be tackled more easily if you document your best material.

A campaign should gather and refine documents (e.g. reports, well-written letters to politicians and others, articles, blog postings, and even particularly useful social media comments) and recordings (video, audio) that provide reminders of proposals, lines of reasoning, evidence, and so on, and make them freely available.

Taking this further it is possible to create interactive learning tools and decision-support tools to guide people in decisions. Tools could include decision calculators and organized directories of products and career options.

This can reduce campaign labour needed because the items can be distributed or broadcast on a massive scale via the internet. It is also time-saving to re-use existing text.

This also lets the most active and able participants contribute more, reducing average effort and improving quality.

A good proposal or evaluation will often be quite long, covering many factors and stakeholders, or many sources of evidence. Documenting all that work is important so that:

- the full, organized picture can be seen;

- the full picture can be referred to when communicating details of it; and

- people can systematically work through the material, perhaps in stages, process it, and learn it.

Finally, documenting your principles helps keep behaviour aligned with initial ideals as new people participate.