

From Passion to Politics: What Moves People to Take Action?

Final report of the 2007 Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs, April 20–21, 2007

*Office of the Dean, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs,
Princeton University*

The sixth annual Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs explored a question of vital importance to contemporary humanity: what motivates people to move beyond cognitive awareness of a problem to take actual steps to provide assistance? Cosponsored by the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and Princeton University's Office of Religious Life, the 2007 Colloquium, "From Passion to Politics: What Moves People to Take Action?" focused on social action.

This theme was examined from multiple perspectives throughout the two-day event. From the psychological perspective: what do we know about the circumstances under which our outrage at what happens to others (either in our community or half a world away) translates into concrete steps to stop it? From the political perspective: how do successful community organizers and political activists motivate individuals to take action? From the economic perspective: what are the implications of our ability to move from empathy to action for traditional economic models of rational choice based on individual self-interest? From the religious perspective: how does faith move the faithful on behalf of others? And from the historical and cultural perspectives: are some cultures more empathetic than others? Are some historical periods more marked by a desire or ability to translate empathy into action than others?

Two keynote addresses and six panels explored these questions in collaboration with departments and programs from across Princeton University. The Colloquium challenged its audiences of students, alumni, faculty, and citizens to debate the insights generated in light of the problems facing our community, our nation, and our world. How can we move from passion – outrage, commitment, anger, grief – to the politics of change? How can we translate the empathy – and even agony – we often feel when faced with images of human suffering into action that can reduce that suffering or tackle its underlying causes? The Colloquium sought to answer these questions and translate our awareness of our common humanity into help for the human community.

KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS

Dr. Paul Slovic, a professor of psychology whose ground-breaking research served as the basis for the colloquium theme, and Ms. Jody Williams, founder of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and 1997 Nobel Peace Prize recipient, delivered the Colloquium keynote addresses to capacity audiences in Dodds Auditorium in Robertson Hall on Friday and Saturday afternoons respectively. Both speakers addressed the issue of what drives people to social action and offered personal reflection on the issue from their own fields, professional expertise, and wide-ranging experiences.

SSWW

First Keynote:

If I Look at the Mass I Will Never Act: Psychic Numbing

Dr. Paul Slovic, Professor of Psychology, University of Oregon

Sponsors: Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and the Office of Religious Life, Princeton University

The Colloquium's first keynote address featured Professor of Psychology Paul Slovic from the University of Oregon. Dr. Daniel Kahneman, Nobel Laureate and the Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, introduced Dr. Slovic, explaining that he had recommended to Dean Anne-Marie Slaughter that she consider using Dr. Slovic's work as the basis for a lecture at the Woodrow Wilson School. Kahneman praised Dr. Slovic for his contributions to the field of psychology, as well as the broader behavioral sciences. Synthesizing a distinguished forty-five year career, Kahneman described the significance of Slovic's work on decision-making, also noting the numerous awards he has received.

Slovic's empirical research examines the repeated violation of the rational choice models that economists use as the basis for much of that discipline. The fundamental question at stake in this debate is, "How do people perceive risk?" According to Kahneman, Slovic's work on this question was the beginning of the conversation between psychology and economics. When people make choices, they consult their emotions, a process Slovic has painstakingly traced. In fact, much of his career has been spent analyzing this phenomenon. His work has focused primarily on the individual and how they respond to risk and choices. As a result, we now know that there are cognitive limitations when talking about risk and dealing with irrationality. Rather than calling this process "irrational," Slovic has postulated that there is an "alternative rationality," which explains the choices people make, ranging from fear of heights to cigarette smoking. When individuals think about options, they make choices or evaluate options, but then ultimately consult their emotions.

Dr. Slovic began by explaining that the title of his talk, "If I Look at the Mass I Will Never Act" was taken from a quote from Mother Teresa. (The full quote is, "If I look at the mass, I will never act. If I look at one, I will.") In Slovic's

terms, the essence of that question is, "Why as humans are we moved to aid the individual, but not the masses?" Slovic used an example close to home: "Why do we care about Virginia Tech and not Sudan? 2.5 million people have died there (Sudan) in a genocide." He noted that for over sixty years, since the liberation of the Nazi death camps, we have said 'never again'. "Since then we've had mass extermination of human beings in China, Cambodia, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kosovo, Rwanda. Each time we tut-tut, but we do nothing. 'Never again' has become again and again."

According to Slovic, the difference between how we treat the tragedy at Virginia Tech and the ongoing genocide in Sudan (or any other genocide of the 20th century) may help us understand why we respond more strongly to some tragic events. Unlike the single incident in Blacksburg, Virginia, there is no single cause in Darfur upon which to focus our attention. The media coverage on Sudan has also been poor, as emphasized by Slovic's question, "Do you know the name of the Sudanese leader?"

"What can explain this lack of action on the part of Americans and humans more broadly in the case of genocide?" Slovic suggested that certainly lack of leadership, the dangers, cost and difficulty involved are all factors. There may be elements of racism in some of the genocide instances mentioned. Distance to the tragedy is relevant, lack of information, lack of compassion in certain circumstances all can be contributing factors as well. Slovic also pointed to a diffusion of responsibility. "The ostrich effect, we sometimes don't want to hear about these things. We sort of hide or block the information." Citing the work of Samantha Power, Slovic surmises that the knowledge that existed around the various genocides was simply ignored. As Power says, the atrocities that were known remained abstract and remote, "...because the savagery of genocide so defies our everyday experience, many of us fail to wrap our minds around it."

Slovic explained that there are different normative models for saving human life, but humans don't think analytically in this way. Affect is a key ingredient because it conveys meaning upon information. One model is based upon the notion that every human life is of equal value, so that as the number of lives to be saved or lost increases, the line grows in a linear fashion (the "psychophysical model"). An alternative model begins linearly, but as the number gets larger, it starts to climb steeply, symbolizing the notion that large losses threaten the

viability of a group or society (the “collapse model”).

However, according to Slovic, “Our feelings override our analytic judgments.” If we were to place losses of life on a graph, “We might look at things in terms of gains and losses on the x axis, and then the value on the y axis changes most steeply around the origin; the first few lives saved are very important, and the value changes.” In other words, the difference between 0-1 deaths is not the same as between deaths 87 and 88. Slovic’s research has shown that the proportion of lives lost is more important than the absolute number, demonstrating that we are unable to multiply one person’s suffering by 100 million.

Recalling Stalin’s purported quip, “One man’s death is a tragedy. A million deaths is a statistic,” Slovic commented that statistics are human beings with the tears dried off. He stressed that his work asks, “How might we put the tears back on and create the emotion that is needed to motivate political action?” The answer, according to Slovic, is by communicating with the images, narratives, personalized stories, and faces of the tragedies. Pointing to recent research demonstrating that individuals are less likely to help a group of people than a single individual, Slovic confirmed similar results from his own research. Describing various cases in which a specific news story about one particular victim or even a particular animal in danger moved communities to take action, Slovic reiterated that we must communicate and make things more personal. “We must put a face on statistics.” Humans have to make a connection to be moved to contribute.

Slovic emphasized the built-in cognitive and control processes of human beings that can invoke deliberate moral reasoning. These processes can override emotional responses to achieve utilitarian goals. Herein lies the key to maximizing life saving: “In that spirit then, I think we need system two, which is deliberate, reason-based, moral judgment, to create laws and institutions that will enforce proper attention to genocide.” Slovic stated that while as a society we have created a very elaborate, rigid, quantitative set of rules, enforceable by law, that dictate for each of us how much taxes we owe to society, nothing similar has been done when it comes to genocide. In addition, Slovic pointed to the importance of humanizing the genocide. Drawing from his research showing that individuals are more likely to help one particular child in need who has a name and a face versus a group of children that have similar needs but are not personalized, Slovic emphasized the

importance of media coverage. Such coverage conveys the message that we value those lives that are lost, and that this could happen to our own community. Therefore, “I think it is important to convince the media of relentlessly and vividly reporting the realities of Darfur, that is, treating mass murder as important news.”

The disparity between the extent of media coverage of Martha Stewart’s jail time and the genocide in Darfur is only one indicator of where America’s current priorities lie. “We don’t think Darfur will happen here,” so it is not something the American media intensely follows. In Slovic’s view, statistics can interfere with our feelings. Therefore, “I’m basically saying that our feelings are necessary, but ultimately they may let us down.” Therefore, to have political action on genocide we must first make individuals care about individual acts of murder before we can deal with the larger policy of organized mass murder.

During the question and answer session following Dr. Slovic’s presentation, a number of questions were raised about the genocide convention and whether this might work to force governments to act. However, as Dean Slaughter pointed out, international law responses can not be effective without political will. Slovic suggested the prosecution of specific individuals who perpetuate genocide. Using the Darfur example, he put a picture of Sudanese leader Basher on the screen and pointed out that if the media or the United States government could personify evil through this man, then Americans might be moved to act.

Second Keynote:

The Power of Collaboration in Trans-National Action: The Power of One

Jody Williams, 1997 Nobel Peace Prize Co-Winner and founder of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines

Sponsors: Center for Human Values and the Pace Center for Civic Engagement, Princeton University

The second keynote speaker was introduced by Dean Slaughter. Jody Williams received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for her work to eliminate antipersonnel landmines. She is only the tenth woman in its one hundred and one year history to be awarded the Peace Prize, and she is the third woman from the U.S. to be so honored. Williams founded the International Campaign to Ban Land-

mines (ICBL) and still is active in this organization. Her interests have since expanded, and she has had the chance to work with the UN among many other international organizations. International organizer, activist, teacher and writer, Williams was introduced as a passionate individual who saw a need for change and acted upon it. Slaughter welcomed Williams to Princeton and invited her to deliver her remarks.

Williams began by thanking Dean Slaughter and Princeton for inviting her to speak and for organizing such a thought-provoking colloquium. She explained that contrary to the subtitle of her keynote address, she did not endorse the statement, “power of the one.” Williams joked that this subtitle was only included to make her parents happy because in actuality, the effort to ban landmines had involved many people from around the world.

Williams noted that she came from a very homogenous, tiny village in Vermont. Outlining her start in activism, she talked about being in Washington and learning for the first time what the U.S. under the Reagan administration was doing in El Salvador from a flyer passed out on the street. After attending a meeting in which an El Salvadorian man gave a report about his country and what the U.S. was doing there, Williams became interested in what she could do to help. She explained that to her, the U.S. stood for many good things, but that its foreign policy put people at risk. Instead of entering the government, Williams became a peace activist and worked for eleven years to build public awareness about U.S. policy toward Central America. From this experience, she saw the need for ICBL, which she launched in 1992. Williams oversaw the growth of the ICBL to more than 1,300 NGOs in over eighty-five countries and served as the chief strategist and spokesperson for the campaign. Working in an unprecedented cooperative effort with governments, UN bodies, and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the ICBL achieved its goal of an international treaty banning antipersonnel landmines during the diplomatic conference held in Oslo in September 1997.

Despite having founded ICBL and being credited with single-handedly raising awareness of the dangers of landmines, Williams remains humble: “I’m just the face of the landmines campaign.” She went on to explain that winning the Nobel Peace Prize was a most humbling experience.

Noting that “just because you get the Nobel Peace Prize doesn’t make you a saint,” she went on to express frustration over how people suddenly thought she had a magic plan for campaigning because she won it. Every time people would ask, “How did you do it?” Williams would respond: “There’s nothing magical about campaigning. It’s making a plan. It’s following through. Every time you say you’re going to do something, that’s exactly what you do.” If a government or person does something you like, you applaud it and if they do something you don’t like, you denounce them. “Curiously enough, this builds trust.”

Williams cautioned against simply celebrating what was accomplished last time and encouraged people to plan future action after a success. After the landmines treaty victory in 1997, Williams and her team didn’t just close up shop. They started a new phase of their project, “...we had an action plan and didn’t just rest on our laurels.” Now, on the 10th anniversary of the treaty, ICBL continues to work with governments. She emphasized the cooperative nature of the work because of the importance of making sure the treaty works and not simply just signed into law.

“Today international law is more threatened than at any other time in history,” Williams continued. In her view, the U.S. had worked so hard to form an international system that it was now systematically undermining. Asking, “How can we think that foreign policy doesn’t matter? 9/11 was a criminal act and the criminals should have been chased and prosecuted.” Instead this administration went into Iraq, which has caused more trouble and security concerns than it solved. “How does this U.S. response stop men from killing themselves in New York, London, and Madrid?” She apologized for this excursion into foreign policy, but emphasized that it is interlinked with her most recent work in Darfur.

Williams described being asked to serve on the UN Human Rights Council’s Darfur commission. At first she didn’t know if she could or should serve on this type of commission. Thinking that she was not even a specialist on conflicts, nor on Africa, and that the Human Rights Council had very little real power, Williams at first hesitated. However, she felt compelled to do something and believed that civil society’s voice needed to be heard. “Because words are lovely, but if you don’t do something, they don’t matter, unless you’re a writer.” Therefore, Williams accepted the position as head of the UN Mission for the Human Rights Council on Darfur.

From the very beginning of the mission, the Sudanese government was unhelpful and denied visas to the group believing this could keep the investigation from happening. However, Williams and her team traveled to neighboring Ethiopia and Chad where they collected plenty of information from the refugee populations there. Describing the problems of the refugees and the over-capacity camps, Williams said, "As we flew over these camps and deserts we got a new perspective." Describing the refugees former villages as structured with 10-15 families in huts comprising a ring around a village center, armies could come in from all sides and separate the men and women to commit unspeakable crimes.

Williams and her team had the chance to sit down with 30 women who had been victimized in these types of attacks. The women had all been raped repeatedly, not just in Sudan but now in the refugee camps in Chad. They did not feel safe and lived with the scars from their experiences. Williams told the story of one village in which the soldiers burned the oldest woman alive and then raped all the other women as they executed all the men before their wives. The army did this because they wanted to destroy the fabric of society. Williams clearly articulated that she saw this as a "systematic attempt to destroy and ethnically cleanse the native tribes in Darfur."

Meanwhile, back in New York, the countries of the Human Rights Council were fighting over how they were going to deal with Williams' report. Instead of taking an interest in what Williams and her team had discovered, they were already trying to discredit the report before it was even written. Williams underscored that the Sudanese government was responsible in large part for the crimes against humanity her team had witnessed in Darfur. She emphasized that the most difficult part of the process was not the horrors they encountered or the lack of water or the people they met, but rather having to leave and not be able to offer protection and security. To offer this type of support, all members of the UN would have had to unanimously agree, and Sudan clearly had no interest in this course of action.

One senior UN official came to Williams and asked her to make the report more "palatable" to the UN Security Council. While the UN Security Council was trying to figure out how to make the report acceptable, Williams informed them that her team was not going to make recommendations based on political necessities. Williams asked, "If the Human Rights Council can't hear the truth, then what purpose does it have

to be around? If the council's role is to protect government and not human rights, then what is the point?" Even if her report forced the Human Rights Council to fail, it was worth it. "If it (Human Rights Council) fails, it should fail. If it can't hear the truth, what business does it have existing? I don't see any."

The eventual report was written in terms of the responsibility to protect. Governments have a responsibility to its citizens and when this responsibility is relinquished, the international community must get involved. "For some reason, 'never again' doesn't apply to Darfur." Williams continued that this type of experience is why she does what she does. "'Never again', even though they knew it was going to happen. They did let it happen and somebody has to hold them accountable." Williams said there is nothing magical about change. "The only magic about change is actually doing something."

Williams has tried to raise awareness not only of the genocide in Sudan, but also in Burma where a fellow Nobel Prize Winner is under house arrest. Talking about the Chinese involvement in Burma, Williams warned that unless such countries are isolated, they will persist with their crimes against humanity.

Williams implored the audience to find something to be passionate about. "Emotion without energy to bring about change is a waste of time." If every person of good faith were to get involved in activism and then ask the question, "What am I doing every day to make a difference?" the world would be a better place. "Nobody can change everything in the world." But if we focus on one particular issue and can help people, why not do it? "If there are laws about war, shouldn't we do something about them?" Making a personal connection to the issues can make all the difference.

"If you pick one little thing that you really care about and you work on it, you contribute to making a difference." Williams asked her audience, "What do you think is right and important? Now what are you willing to give to have this?" According to Williams, we each have the power to make a difference. As she concluded her talk, she wrote her e-mail address on the board and said, "Don't write to me and tell me you are concerned about global warming or you're concerned about gender and equality or you're con-

cerned about Darfur or you're concerned about whatever. Write to me and tell me what you're doing about it and I will be your partner forever."

PANELS

In addition to the keynotes by Dr. Paul Slovic and Ms. Jody Williams, the Colloquium presented a variety of panels focusing on what moves people to action. The panels challenged participants to understand and explore their own motivations when they see the need for social action.

Opening Plenary Social Bases of Political Action

Sponsors: Center for the Study of Democratic Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

Moderator Larry Bartels, Director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics, Donald E. Stokes Professor of Public and International Affairs and Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, began by emphasizing the social nature of all political revolutions. Highlighting the civil rights movement in the United States up to the democratization in Eastern Europe, Bartels noted all of the most important political actions were social, not individual, calculations. Framing the debate in terms of social inspiration versus social costs, Bartels stressed the importance of networks and social resources. Turning to the panel, he asked the two panelists to address the guiding question, "What moves people to take political action?"

The first panelist was Delia Baldasseri, a Ph.D. candidate at Columbia University who will be joining the Princeton Sociology faculty in the fall. Addressing the moderator's question, Baldasseri began with an emphasis on the value of social networks in political action and explained how understanding these networks can lead researchers to understanding why individuals take particular actions. Baldasseri pointed out that there is an underlying assumption within the question that people know what to act for and therefore the problem is simply one of coordination. However individuals must first understand how they place their interests.

By prioritizing and defining what one's interests are, Baldasseri noted that people's collective interest and individual interest are very rarely the same at the beginning. "What I'd like to ask you to do today is to conceive individuals as mainly an intersection of multiple group affiliations that accept diverse and often contrasting pressures on them." Following this logic, what counts or is most politically salient to any individual depends on the people around them.

Using the example of a divided Germany that unified to bring down the Berlin Wall, Baldasseri explained that initially their slogan was simply, "We want more power." However, over time that slogan changed to reflect the common interest: "We are a unique people and want to unite." Just as in Germany, individuals begin by looking at their own political interests. But, because people have multiple affiliations that connect and contribute to the overall level of social integration, a shared identity emerges that leads to political action.

Baldasseri noted that scholars sometimes assume that political interests must be determined by economic interests. On the contrary, it is the identity formed from being part of social, ethnic, or religious groups that is the main factor. This identity comes from group application and can effectively overcome collective action problems. Baldasseri concluded by claiming that social networks are the best indicator of what political action an individual will take, even outweighing individual characteristics.

The second panelist to present was Robert Putnam, the Malin Professor of Public Policy at Harvard University and a visiting senior research scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Politics. Professor Putnam emphasized that there are multiple things that move people to take action, but that he was choosing to focus on social networks. Putnam justified this by pointing out that in order to take any political action, there has to be a certain amount of trust and mutual obligation between participants. For this reason, social networks are important not only in motivating and enabling collective action among people, but also because these networks help individuals define interests and identities in more inclusive and broader ways. "Interacting with people effects our definitions of self-interest, therefore I define things in a broader way."

Putnam recounted how most political action takes place because a friend asks someone to do something and the individ-

ual can't say no to their friend. At the most basic level, having a friend involved means that an individual knows about the activity and therefore is more likely to participate. Beyond the informational impact, Putnam also emphasized the reciprocal nature of political action, "To have any political action there has to be a sense of reciprocity, I'll go if you go." Additionally, where there are pre-existing networks, individuals are more likely to act.

Putnam's most recent research has focused on religious associations as a particular type of social interaction and pre-existing network within America, which he grouped within his broader work on social capital. According to this research, half of all social capital in America can be defined as religious. "Half of all group membership, volunteering, are religious in America. The United States is unusually religious in this sense." Putnam brought up the idea of religious awakenings throughout America's history and questioned whether America is presently going through another "great awakening." He noted that the pattern in America history is that "great awakenings" have been generally associated with progressive politics, not conservative politics, which makes the present period an anomaly.

Presenting some of his findings from a year-long research project focused on the role of religious associations in America, Putnam shared with the audience some of his conclusions: "Evidence shows that religious Americans are better leaders and better citizens than non-religious Americans." The more religious an American is the more that they volunteer in general, not only for religious causes, but also for secular causes. According to Putnam's research, 25% of secular Americans say that in the last year they worked with other people to solve some community project while that number rises to 40% for religious Americans. Furthermore 17% of secular Americans say that they have been a civic leader in some sense, while the number is 32% for religious people. By all measures tested, including race, gender, and age among many others, Putnam concluded that religiosity is the best single indicator of the level of an individual's civic involvement. Therefore, "We do have evidence that religiosity tends to produce altruism and altruism does tend to produce more civic and community involvement."

Putnam attributed this finding to the social networks that religious Americans have. However he emphasized that it goes beyond religious people simply having more friends, although

that was also found to be true. "Religious friendships turn out to be more than just the sum of having a lot of friends and being religious." Religious friendships are synergistic, meaning that being in a prayer group, for example, is not the same as belonging to a bowling league. Religion serves as a unifying identity and helps make individuals part of an informal community.

Putnam included a series of caveats about his research. "Praying alone doesn't cut it, when you converse with a shared moral community you are more likely to be civically engaged." Therefore, simply being very religious is not what Putnam's research was capturing, rather it is the degree of friendships or informal connections that individuals have at churches, mosques, or synagogues that make the biggest difference. As an example, Putnam noted that while religious people are more generous than non-religious American, liberals are actually more generous when controlled for church attendance.

Putnam ended his talk by saying that, "America is both very religious and relatively tolerant." Normally these two attributes do not go together, however in America because of the cross-cutting webs of social networks, this is possible. Americans, both religious and secular, can form personal connections which can ultimately lead to political action.

In the question and answer portion of the panel, many audience members challenged Putnam on his emphasis on religion. One participant touched upon the concept of a "moral community," which they described as being a stand-in for religion and could be anything from a university, extended family circle, or civic society. Putnam responded that, "Religion is different." He emphasized that religious individuals don't simply see religion as a moral community, but as their entire community with whom they have the deepest connections and strongest networks. Religion implicates an individual's deepest values and therefore is the most fascinating social network to study. Putnam concluded by saying that, "Religion gives us an external view that allows us to transcend the present moment."

The Demands of God: Perspectives from the Evangelical Movement

Sponsor: Office of Religious Life, Princeton University

Rev. Paul Raushenbush, Associate Dean of Religious Life and the Chapel at Princeton University, served as moderator for the second panel of the colloquium, which built on Putnam's early discussion of religion as a mobilizing force. Rev. Raushenbush began with the parable of the Good Samaritan from the New Testament. From this parable, Raushenbush extracted three questions for each of the panelists. First, "Who is my neighbor? How do we know and how do we prioritize who we view as our neighbor? What sort of concentric circles will be used?" Second, "What moved the Samaritan from pity to action, given that individuals had previously had pity but were never moved to act?" And finally, for the evangelical movement in America, "At what point do the demands of God on believers bring us from passion to policy?"

The first panelist to speak was Professor Allen Hertzke, Director of Religious Studies at the University of Oklahoma, who has worked extensively on the role of religious lobbies in Washington. Dr. Hertzke began his presentation by pointing to the passages of the International Freedom, Trafficking Victim, Sudan Peace, and North Korean Acts in the U.S. Congress as foreign policy successes for the evangelical movement in America. Agreeing with Dr. Putnam on the concept of a recent "great awakening" in America, Hertzke laid out four factors contributing to Christian evangelical activism in the arena of U.S. foreign policy-making.

First, Hertzke pointed to the rise of global Christianity. According to a report by Global South, in year 2000 roughly two-thirds of all Christians lived in Asia, Africa, or Latin America. Over half of sub-Saharan Africa is Christian, while more Christians live in China than in Europe. This distribution of Christians means that the Christian church is nested within poverty, war, and persecution, which means that American Christians now identify with their "brothers and sisters" in these places in a new way. The second factor is the advent of global communication and travel, which has created a heightened awareness among American Christians of suffering around the world. This awareness has, in turn, led to the

third factor, which is the unprecedented numbers of American Christians going on mission trips around the world. Over one million Americans have gone abroad for these trips and they generally go to nested communities, meaning that they have a personal connection to those suffering communities. The final factor influencing the rise of activism among Christians in America has been the legislative focus of the evangelical movement. Legislative campaigns provide a clear focus and galvanize excitement for the cause.

Hertzke emphasized that simply talking about these four factors, or the legislative successes of the evangelical movement, doesn't fully capture the story. It is the personal stories about the people that these activists are trying to help in Sudan, North Korea, or Cambodia that really gets at the heart of the movement. These stories and the people who survive are what is so inspiring and upbeat for Hertzke. It is at the intersection of human rights and U.S. foreign policy that evangelical activists have taken passion from awareness to policy action.

The second panelist to share her thoughts was Dr. E. Anne Peterson, M.D., a Senior International Health Advisor at World Vision International and former presidential appointee to USAID. Dr. Peterson agreed with Hertzke that what brings people to political movements is a personal connection with the suffering. "It's a personal relationship with God and it is a personal relationship with the people that we are trying to serve." She emphasized America's long tradition of international action and particularly focused on the role of faith-based organizations in health issues around the world. Drawing from her experiences at USAID, Peterson stated that over 10.5 million children die annually before they reach the age of five. As a missionary doctor in Africa, Peterson saw children with diseases that could not be treated, but could certainly have been prevented.

From Peterson's perspective, sometimes it is data that calls individuals to action. Using the HIV epidemic as an example, she pointed out that we now have to face the multitude of orphans who are the most at risk. "What is our responsibility to act?" Personally, she felt she was called to make a difference on the local level and found that her calling was to help children. Emphasizing the role of faith in her own life, Peterson shared the need to stay true to the calling she had as a Christian to help others in need.

Peterson warned that the call to action from passion is not sufficient alone. Individuals must overcome weariness. Social networks, particularly religious communities, make a key difference in “refreshing one’s soul.” Focusing on one particular calling and not trying to do everything is also a key for success. Her concluding advice: stay focused; connect with people; and have a calling.

The final panelist was Rev. Richard Cizik, Vice president for Governmental Affairs at the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). Building on his own experience with the evangelical movement, Rev. Cizik laid out three simple steps for effecting political change: cast a vision for your community; give them a strategy; and give them tactics that work. Drawing on this advice, Cizik outlined his most recent work on climate change: “People have to actually believe that they can do something that they’ve never been told they can do, and it has (climate change) never been preached.” Representing over 100 million evangelical Christian Americans, the NAE is seeking to engage these people on the issue of climate change by presenting it as a moral issue. Given that climate change is a moral and theological issue according to the NAE, Cizik emphasized that Christians must have the same vision as God. “I believe that you’re missing God’s calling for your life, because when your vision of your life doesn’t match God’s vision for your life, including that for the church, then you will fail.”

Being gospel-oriented, while at the same time efficient and casting a broad vision, has allowed the NAE to focus on climate change and develop a strategy for effecting change. They have done this by holding political leaders accountable. America can’t give aid to Africa and take it away with global climate change. The tactics are really important for evangelicals since they have to match the strategy of holding leaders accountable in the same way for climate change as they do for other moral issues. Using data, Cizik believes that there can be a “great conversion” within the evangelical world. Political action will then follow. Cizik concluded with a prayer from John Wesley, which captures the vision of NAE for the greenest generation: “To serve the present age, my calling to fulfill. Oh, may it all my powers engage to do my masters will. Arm me with jealous care as in thy sight to live. And oh, thy servant lead prepare and account to give.”

Access to Antiretrovirals for HIV: How Activism Has Translated into Political Action

Sponsor: Center for Health and Wellbeing, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

The third panel focused on the case of HIV/Aids activism, and sought to address the question of what brought various HIV activists to political action. Professor Christina H. Paxson, Director of the Princeton Center for Health and Wellbeing and Professor of Economics and Public Affairs at the Wilson School, moderated the panel. In her opening remarks Dr. Paxson laid out a series of questions she hoped the panel would address: 1) How has AIDS activism developed in different countries? 2) Why has it developed differently in different places? 3) What are the successes and failures of AIDS activism over the past 20 years?

Jennifer Kates, Director of HIV-related policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation, was the first panelist to speak. In her response, Ms. Kates said that personal relationships with those living with AIDS led her to take her first political actions. Describing her time at Princeton in the Wilson School’s M.P.A. program, Kates explained that in the first decade of the AIDS pandemic, there was no real information out there; there was a real void. “People filled that void and they drew me in.” Research activism led to treatment activism which led to political activism. While the international experience was very complicated for AIDS activism, activism in the U.S. forced many of the changes that we see today.

João Biehl, an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Princeton, spoke about his own research on AIDS in Brazil. Brazil made history with universal drug coverage in 1996, and has subsequently challenged the way that other countries do things. Biehl noted that Brazil is a good case-study for successful AIDS activism. As part of his research, Biehl studied the activities of NGO activists, health-care professionals, and scientists and learned that providing affordable medication is the function of the state, but the rest of the treatment is left to the individual and civil society.

Evan Lieberman, an Assistant Professor of Politics at Princeton, studied the flip side of Brazil. South Africa, where Lieberman had a Fulbright Scholarship, provides a tragic example of how the AIDS epidemic can spread and

kill if it is not properly addressed. As a result of his observations in South Africa, Lieberman became interested in the policies of the government refusing to deal with the disease. In South Africa, it was the communities affected by HIV that responded before anybody else did. Comparing the examples of Brazil and South Africa, Lieberman stated: "AIDS is going to bring down South Africa, so why would countries respond in such different ways?" He concluded that AIDS treatment is not just technical but has direct policy relevance, and became the foundation of the research he would undertake to understand the South African case.

David Barr, Director of the Collaborative Fund for HIV Treatment and Preparedness, spoke about his direct connection to AIDS and being at the wrong time in the wrong place. He emphasized that those infected with AIDS always respond first. "All of the major advances and successes in HIV response since 1981 have been developed by people with AIDS." In the U.S., the gay community and those most impacted by AIDS mobilized for support before anybody else did anything. Beyond this first level of mobilization there is a second level, which is informational and educational. These programs were all developed by people within the AIDS community and only finally at the third level did public health professionals enter the picture. Activism from within the AIDS community is crucial in understanding the success of the various public health initiatives. Barr pointed to the importance of empowering the AIDS community to work hand in hand with the scientific and health professionals now at the forefront of AIDS activism. "In order to respond to HIV, we need to have the long term engagement of people who are infected and affected. People who are living with AIDS are the partners in all of the success regarding prevention and treatment."

After their introductory remarks, Dr. Paxson asked the panel if "HIV/AIDS activism is exceptional?" and "How are the experiences you have studied applicable or different from other diseases?" Barr responded, and the other panelists agreed, that the AIDS movement has helped to fuel other social movements in many countries. The panelists also highlighted the fact that what is unique about HIV is that it affects young people, which in turn can reverse life-expectancy gains in developing and developed countries indiscriminately. Instead of affecting just

the young or old like many diseases, AIDS goes right at the most vibrant age groups. The panelists agreed that AIDS is both a disease and part of a health identity. Reinforcing Barr's points, the panelists pointed to the innovative ways (including the use of art and video) that AIDS activism has translated to political action.

Another exceptional aspect of AIDS as a disease is the behavior that can often lead to HIV. Barr and Kates highlighted how stigmatized HIV is socially, which makes it harder to deal with. Addressing a question from the audience dealing with the lack of AIDS activism within the African-American community, which is among the most affected groups in America, Barr responded, "So you put stigma, you put homophobia, you put all those things together with the struggles that black leaders have had in this country to get representation, to gain in political movements, mainstream political movements, and they've seen it as a liability."

Addressing the question, "How is international activism helping in countries that are having a hard time having activism take root?" Lieberman talked about research showing that the global AIDS movement is like a "boomerang." When AIDS treatments are thrown out and disregarded, the international movement takes notice and AIDS activism swings back to hit local governments in a boomerang motion. Biehl agreed, noting that often, pharmaceutical lobbyists petition activists to lobby governments, which then turn to medical researchers for advice. As a result, activism became professional. The result is many levels and layers of activism. In Brazil, for example, the government is trying to build ties with other countries through HIV activists.

The panelists emphasized that every country and HIV experience is different, but common themes do emerge. Countries' experience with AIDS activism varies regardless of democracy. Thinking about AIDS as a generalized risk is important. Additionally, access to communication is a huge issue for AIDS activism. Finally, the history of civil society and active political participation in each country matters when determining what types of activism will be successful. However, in every country the personal empowerment of the activist is crucial. The panelists agreed that passion is very much there, but you have to go find it.

Kates and Barr, in response to a question about HIV activism and changes over time, agreed that the notion of people with

HIV becoming empowered and responding to their situation by coming together, forming organizations and doing some sort of care provision or advocacy is universal and can be seen in almost every country. Optimistically the panelists thought that HIV might be a catalyst for changing the way health care and health policy is done. Lieberman commented that, "AIDS is exceptional in that it will transform the way we look at health delivery around the world and the right to health." Barr added that, "If there's anything that's exceptional with AIDS, it's the role of empowerment in addressing the disease."

Taking Office to Take Action

Sponsors: Woodrow Wilson Political Network (WWPN) and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

The second day of the colloquium began with the return of some of Princeton's most prominent alumni. The panel organized around the theme of "Taking Office to Take Action" highlighted the careers of three Woodrow Wilson graduates who have gone on to higher political office. They came back to talk about what motivated them to run for political office and to share their stories with the audience. President Shirley Tilghman of Princeton University welcomed the audience to the colloquium and explained the motivation behind the topic. "The Woodrow Wilson School is seeking not only to explore the motivations of politicians, humanitarians, and other agents of change, but also to encourage all of us to act in ways that will improve the lives of others, whether they live next door or on the other side of the world. If ever a question needed to be asked and answered, it is the one that lies at the heart of this colloquium, what moves people to address the problems that confront society to make the critical leap from awareness to action from their armchairs to their public square."

Turning to the panel at hand, President Tilghman welcomed the alumni back and turned things over to the moderator of the session, former Congressman James Leach '64. Congressman Leach represented Iowa for 30 years and currently is a visiting Professor of Public and International Affairs at the Wilson School. He introduced the two distinguished panelists, though he commented they needed no introduction. Bill Frist '74, a renowned physician and two-term U.S. Senator from Tennessee, who served as Majority Leader before returning to private life in January of 2007 and Eliot Spitzer '81, New York's newly-elected Governor and former Attor-

ney General. Noting that academics tend to know far more about politics than actual politicians, Congressman Leach promised that the panel would do its best to address the colloquium theme. Turning to Senator Frist, the moderator stated that protocol dictated that the private citizen should go before the public official.

Senator Frist thanked the congressman and President Tilghman and commented on how good it was to be back at Princeton where he had spent many of his formative years. Frist said that for the purposes of the colloquium format, he was hoping to stay brief and make two main points. First, the importance of the citizen legislature in America. Drawing from his own experience, combining his private life and corporate experience, he was able to become the first medical professional to serve as U.S. Senate Majority leader. "The citizen legislature is so important and it demands a set of broad experiences and having a history of a real job. Because the political environment is tough and competitive," Frist emphasized that there is a need for politicians to step outside of the system and set clear term limits.

Giving a short personal biography, Senator Frist explained that he had always hoped to marry policy and medicine. He began this journey at the Wilson School, where he was the only public policy major who was also a pre-med student. After completing medical school, Frist practiced in Boston for 10 years. During this time, he became interested in a new type of medical procedure, the heart transplant. Heart transplants had never been done before and in Boston, they were prohibited by policymakers as being too expensive and dangerous. Believing that this was the future of medicine, Frist left Boston to pursue his dream. Coming from a family of doctors, Frist grew up watching his father helping patients and knew that he had to go back to Nashville to pursue transplantation. During this time, he continually asked himself, "How can I convert healing one-on-one to one-on-community?" As a successful physician and one of the top transplant surgeons in the world, Dr. Frist began to look for ways to help impact U.S. policy and began to look at the U.S. Senate as the natural place to take his policy interests. During Senator Frist's campaign, he made a promise to leave Washington and the Senate after two terms. He did so because he believed in the concept of the citizen legislature. "The citizen legislator, somebody who comes with real-life experiences, it took me five years, ten years, fifteen

years, twenty years, sometimes in a profession that is very foreign to what I did everyday as Majority Leader in the United States Senate or as a Senator representing seven million Tennesseans.” Living up to his promise, Senator Frist left the Senate after two terms and has now returned to the medical profession and travels internationally helping people.

In Dr. Frist’s roles as medical professional and U.S. Senator, he emphasized the need to help introduce health to the world as a currency for peace. “I sought to introduce medicine, health, and quality of life into public diplomacy, where we as a society and as a government and as a people can use medicine as a currency for peace around the world.” This idea helps create a common ground for understanding when he talks to international leaders. Summing up his experience in the U.S. Senate and as a medical professional, Senator Frist told the audience, “Again, conceive it, believe it, do it.”

Governor Eliot Spitzer began by thanking Senator Frist for his service to Princeton, to the medical profession, and to the nation at large through his time in the Senate. Describing his own journey into political office, Spitzer commented that he had always wanted to be in the government. What Spitzer has learned is that some people get into politics because it is a profession, whereas for others it is a cause. Asking, “Why do we get involved in government, why do you get involved in anything? What I have discerned over the years and, actually, my college roommate first suggested this dichotomy to me, he said, there are some who get into politics because it’s a profession. And there are others who get in because it’s a cause.” Spitzer stated that politicians need to have disagreements and ideological debates, but once they get in to the legislature they need to accomplish something.

Spitzer ran for Attorney General of New York because he saw law in a similar light to the health policy Frist described in his presentation. Because, in his view, “The reality is the world changes more by virtue of technology than political theory,” then if the world and social policy needed to be changed, the law is what could be used to change them. “We are becoming less a bell-curve society and more a barbell society. We have a bump on either end, a depressed middle, and really enormous wealth and significant poverty and we’re moving in the wrong di-

rection.” As Attorney General, Spitzer targeted Wall Street when rules were routinely not being enforced. In particular, Spitzer highlighted his work on low-wage labor cases, in which workers were making below the minimum wage. Governor Spitzer explained that this was not a populist crusade, but simply an attempt to right an injustice. He emphasized that as citizens we have many tasks. “But among the American people looking at it, unless we can come back to dignity and respect for individuals and civility, people are getting pushed further and further away.” Spitzer encouraged the audience to be drawn to a desire to do good.

During the question and answer period many audience members pushed the panelists on the need for balance between ideology and partisanship, without degenerating into partisan bickering. Spitzer responded that as Attorney General, he acted as unitary actor and that there was fact-checking and judiciary checks for dealing with violations that transcended partisanship. Frist emphasized that as a physician, he always believed it was important to deal with patients objectively and in an unbiased way. As U.S. majority leader, Frist said he ruled as best he could with party support since this is the American political way. Both panelists agreed that there is a need to bridge the partisan rift that has grown in the last decade and particularly to get rid of “war rooms” when dealing with political opponents. Given that both lawyers and physicians rely upon facts and try not to let emotion obscure the data, both the Senator and Governor agreed on the need for politicians to agree on a set of facts and data.

Another question dealt with corrupt politicians and the case in some countries where politicians take office to make profit. Followed by the question, “Who regulates the regulators?” Senator Frist responded that in Washington, though he is now an outsider, he senses a real commitment to serving the American people. Joking that his own net worth has fallen since being in the U.S. Senate, he dismissed the idea of running for office for profit. Spitzer wondered whether people are in political office for the right reasons. Stating that at the end of the day, there are no ideologies, just interests, Spitzer bemoaned the lack of civility in politics. Both Frist and Spitzer agreed that to be a successful politician, one has to develop thick skin and always put things into perspective.

The audience asked the policymakers a variety of questions dealing with globalization and U.S. foreign policy, as it related to their motivations for taking office. Frist emphasized that

his health as currency for peace idea is particularly relevant for international relations. Having traveled to 40 countries during his time as U.S. Senate majority leader, he stressed the importance of volunteering and reaching beyond your community. Through these international experiences, Frist had the chance to talk to world leaders about reconciliation and to bring attention to particular issues and problems. Saying that foreign policy should be left to the executive branch, Frist emphasized that the international experiences he had were valuable in helping him understand how to bring cultural understanding back to the U.S. Senate. Spitzer said that as governor, it would be overstepping his bounds if 50 governors tried to start making foreign policy decisions. However, he agreed that globalization was having a real impact, and New York in particular has been transformed. The international economic implications are enormous and it is important for New York to build links with China and India, which is being done in a bilateral way that does not include Washington.

In dealing with questions about what types of people should run for office and how to keep the initial passion alive once a person has made it into political office, the panelists emphasized the need for rotation and new blood in political circles. Spitzer said potential politicians have to be willing to lose. People should explore what makes them tick and then come in with both a plan and passion. Both panelists agreed that a policymaker needed to be a good manager and a good generalist, who could find specialists to help them run their programs and implement their plans. The panelists further agreed that the amount of money needed to enter politics, campaign financing, and district gerrymandering are the cancers in U.S. politics right now. Therefore, even if one does everything right, it might not be good enough. However, if driven by a passion to do good, political office is one noble way to make a difference.

Humanitarian Intervention

Sponsor: Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs

The final colloquium panel focused on the role of humanitarian intervention and connecting individuals to the suffering of others. Gary Bass, Associate Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School, moderated the panel and introduced each of the speakers in turn. Addressing the subject of the panel Bass said, "When Hitler came to conquer Czechoslovakia, Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, shrugged it off as a quarrel in a

faraway country between people of whom we know nothing." In contrast, Bass described the panelists as a group of people who try and make the suffering of people in foreign places as real and immediate as the suffering of those around us. As foreign correspondents and journalists seek to cover the stories, they in turn help write the stories that move us to action.

The first panelist was Barbara Demick, the new Beijing Bureau Chief for the *Los Angeles Times*. She has covered stories in North Korea, Bosnia, and Indonesia among many other places. Demick began her remarks by saying that foreign news correspondents often find themselves working on the ground with humanitarian aid workers. "We tell their stories and we suffer from a lot of the same problems, which is that donor fatigue and reader fatigue sort of kick in around the same time. Readers get sick of stories, donors get sick of stories."

At Demick's former paper, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, there was a rule that a correspondent could not start a story with a foreign name; the main subjects had to be easily identifiable. The stories themselves did not often lend themselves to the simplistic lenses that the newspaper audience wanted to read. For example, when Demick was covering the beginning of the war in Bosnia, it was easy to say that it was the bad Serbs versus good Muslims. This generated a lot of public interest. However, events on the ground and the complex nature of the fighting made the story become very murky and confusing which led to people losing interest. Demick learned that, "...if you do not have identifiable good guys versus bad guys, you have to have an arch-villain and a very pure victim, otherwise your story falls off the map."

The real challenge for foreign correspondents is to humanize their stories for the audiences back home and to make Americans care about the suffering. Additionally, a story must make readers feel good about themselves. Therefore, many times what makes a story popular or interesting is beyond the control of the correspondent. For example, when the tsunami hit Southeast Asia it was a huge story. There was the novelty value of a tsunami, which was different than an earthquake, flooding, or a war. Also, the tsunami happened the day after Christmas, the victims were mainly Muslim, and this was in the middle of the Iraq War. So, when the U.S. deployed the Marines to help distribute

aid, Americans felt like heroes. Americans felt good to be a part of the efforts and readers in America continued to read the stories.

On the opposite end of the spectrum is North Korea, which Demick described as the worst type of victim. North Korea has a lot of pride and is not grateful for any help received. To get an interesting story, one has to get off the beaten path and go to the Chinese border to actually see the poor, malnourished refugees that North Korea refuses to acknowledge.

In conclusion, Demick observed that to get people to care about a particular tragedy, there must be a clear narrative or single image that can carry the story. Something unusual or novel, along with timing and location, can also greatly help the efforts of a foreign correspondent trying to cover a humanitarian disaster.

The second panelist to speak was Peter Maas, a contributing writer for the *New York Times Magazine*, and the author of a book on Bosnia called *Love Thy Neighbor: A Story of War*. Maas recalled covering the war in Bosnia between 1992-1993 and receiving the most reaction from a small story he had casually written about the plight of horses in Hungary. Readers in America became attached to these horses and even offered to send money to save the horses at the same time that thousands of people were dying.

Maas learned that instead of telling a large story, it was more important to personalize the suffering. "Trying to get people interested in these very horrible things that were going on in Bosnia that sometimes just seemed too far away, too foreign for people to grab a hold of." As a result, instead of writing about the whole picture and what was happening throughout the country, Maas chose to focus on what was happening in one city or in one person's life. Instead of focusing on the statistics of the war in Bosnia, Maas found a young Muslim woman and chronicled her life for a feature story. However, Maas encountered editors who didn't want to upset their readers, particularly over the Christmas holiday, so they kept the story from running until after the holidays.

"We should upset readers, war is upsetting." Maas began to focus more on his reaction to particular events and

learned that readers could connect to the suffering through his encounters. When Maas wrote his book, he had a hard time finding any publisher who wanted to publish a book about Bosnia. He needed an American at the center of the story. Therefore he was asked to make it about his experiences in Bosnia, and then through his experience the readers could learn about the war. Maas pointed to the evolution of media in America, in which star reporters such as Anderson-Cooper spend half of the broadcast focusing on the reporter, while the other half is about the actual story. Speaking about his book and why readers connected to it, Maas said, "It was because it was about my experience of this war. So readers identified with me and were interested in my experience."

Maas concluded that the problem for a correspondent or writer is that even when one succeeds in eliciting compassion, the reaction that as a writer you want to get, it often doesn't translate into the appropriate action. There is still a very large hurdle or barrier of getting the right kind of political action. In the case of Bosnia, the U.S. did eventually intervene and there was a bombing campaign against the Serbs, but it was only done because NATO was beginning to come apart. This demonstrated that the real impetus of the political action was not compassion, but the long-term political interests of the West. Maas said the bombing was not the solution in Bosnia or Serbia and that, in fact, it only worsened the situation. "Bombing was not done out of humanitarian sentiment, but rather out of political necessity." According to Maas, the right response would have been a humanitarian one, and only by helping leaders connect to the situation on the ground could the right action be elicited.

The final speaker was Kenneth Roth, Executive Director of Human Rights Watch. Roth offered a different perspective from the correspondents, noting that his "...is not as objective." He characterized Human Rights Watch (HRW) as taking information, analyzing it, and then trying to advocate for effective policies. Essentially, Roth described his job as translating information into action. For Roth, the way that effective policy pressure takes place is through social mobilization. However, it is more than simply mobilizing people over every policy issue. HRW characterizes the human rights movement as about shaming and naming, but also more than 90% of the time HRW doesn't seek to mobilize people.

According to Roth, mobilization is only effective with certain types of problems. The issue has to be something people can

understand and get their hands on, which does not describe the majority of HRW issues. As an example, Roth described HRW's efforts to get Liberian dictator Charles Taylor tried in a court of law. HRW spent two years unsuccessfully trying to get Nigeria to turn over Taylor. Roth did everything to put pressure on Nigeria to extradite Taylor, including reaching out to the public through media, etc., but it didn't work. Finally, when the Nigerian president wanted a meeting with the White House, HRW found its opening. It encouraged the White House to attach the condition that Nigeria had to hand over Taylor before President Bush would meet with the Nigerian president. This strategy worked and there was very little social mobilization involved.

Roth emphasized the need to involve the public through social mobilization, but most of the time there is an understanding between activists and politicians that if it is in the media, then it is important and HRW can act on it. Media coverage often acts as a surrogate for public opinion. Sometimes the adage at HRW is "All you need is press coverage." HRW spends a lot of time trying to get the press to cover a particular issue. Echoing the sentiments of the previous speakers, Roth said that somehow HRW has to find a way to bring distant problems home to the activists. A lot of what Roth does is cut through the age-old hatred arguments found in civil wars and try to figure out the true political explanation. By carefully collecting data and analyzing the situation, HRW can explain the rationale for the conflict and then talk about the incentives for getting government support for ending the violence.

Citing the recent example of efforts in Darfur, Roth pointed to an innovative approach to applying more pressure on the principal backers of the Sudanese government. Where the Bush administration and U.S. Congress had failed, a simple op-ed by Mia Farrow calling the upcoming Chinese Olympics the "Genocide Olympics" got the most attention. Given that China is the most important player needed to force Sudan to stop the killings in Darfur, going after the Chinese who want the Olympics to be a major success was smart. It is not enough to name and shame, there need to be real consequences to the actions taken.

Telling a story that will move people is important, but also supplying effective policy recommendations is crucial. By enlisting government support and leveraging different types of pressure, the HRW is trying to make the connection between the suffering that journalists report, and the change that is

needed to prevent future suffering.

In the question and answer session, many audience members asked how to tie the sufferings mentioned to particular political action? The panelists responded that engagement and passion have to be there. The journalists described a new way of talking about "news," one which takes into account the level of suffering when reporting on stories and points towards specific actions that could help alleviate the suffering. The panelists also agreed that governments will only take action after pressure is put on them. Therefore, finding the leverage point at which politics takes over is important. Politics has the ability to tie things together, but people have to be constantly reminded. As in the case of Darfur, every day the humanitarian urgency diminishes and it feels more and more distant to Americans. Harnessing compassion and interest with effective policy ultimately leads to the type of political action necessary for humanitarian intervention.

Conclusion

In closing the colloquium, Dean Slaughter thanked the audience, speakers, and panelists for their participation. Reflecting on the panelists' common refrain that to have political action there must be a personal connection; Dean Slaughter asked the audience, "What will your connection be? How will you make the political personal?" Drawing from Dr. Slovic's keynote address, Dean Slaughter emphasized that to make a connection, we each have to find a personal story and not simply look at the statistics. "We have to believe we can make a difference. If we hand people the tools, then we will ultimately empower them through a political process. From passion to politics, you each can take this with you in your own personal journeys."

Policy Recommendations

The mission of the Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs is to debate and discuss important issues of public policy and to propose solutions to contemporary problems. In this spirit, the assessments made about what moves people to take social action sheds light on the challenges facing leaders who seek to mobilize and harness their followers' passion. Although a wide variety of viewpoints were expressed, the following themes emerged from the colloquium dialogue.

- Get people connected. There must be a connection for there to be a reaction. Human beings are fundamentally relational. As such, when an individual touches a person, they are moved to take action. Being part of a group helps keep us connected and civically engaged, thus increasing opportunities for social action. Therefore, individuals should be encouraged to be a part of various civic, political, recreational, and religious communities.
- Make it personal. Statistics do not move people to take action. Having a personal connection or being directly asked to assist one identifiable individual is far more powerful than trying to save the masses of nameless and faceless crowds. Therefore, strive to make appeals for action personal.
- Collaboration and working together towards a common goal is key. A variety of academic disciplines have important findings to contribute to the question of what motivates individuals to make the choices they do, but there is no single conclusive answer. Rather, each field can gain through a collaborative exploration of the complex motivations that elicit such passion in some people that it leads to social action at both the local and global level. Therefore, efforts should include interdisciplinary collaboration.
- Action begins at home. No matter how small the first step, being moved to action has to start somewhere before it can take hold of an individual and become a passion. Issues of social conscience, morality, religion, enlightened self-interest, politics, economics, and psychology all lead people to move beyond cognitive awareness of a problem to taking actual steps to provide assistance to those in need.
- Moving people to take action and preparing them for service should be the mission of every institution of higher education. Today, the world is in need of social action on a variety of levels; individuals must feel empowered and emboldened to make a difference. Institutions like Princeton University and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs must prepare a new generation of service-minded citizens moved to address the problems facing their countries and the wider world.

The Executive Summary of the 2007 Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs was written by Joshua W. Walker and edited by Terry B. Murphy. The report is available online as a PDF at <http://www.princeton.edu/~pcpia/2007/2007Report.pdf>

*Princeton Colloquium on Public and International Affairs
Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs
Princeton University
Robertson Hall
Princeton, New Jersey 08544-1013*

*For more information please contact:
Steven Barnes
Assistant Dean of Public Affairs
(609) 258-5988
sbarnes@princeton.edu*



PRINTED ON 100% POST-CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER