

Conclusion: Replenishing the Commons

This book¹ began by asking how advocates could be effective in convincing individuals, businesses, and governments to change their behavior in proenvironmental ways. In order to answer this question, it has investigated the strategies that environmental advocates are using to generate successful outcomes in East Asia. East Asia is a difficult place to be an environmental advocate. Compared with those in North America and Europe, East Asia's advocacy sectors are smaller, their green parties weaker, their probusiness governments stronger, and their democratic experience shorter or nonexistent.

And yet China leads the world in producing and using renewable energy. Japan has long had very high emission standards and is a leader in developing green technology. South Korea has reoriented its national industrial policy around green growth and has expanded its public and protected green spaces. And Taiwan boasts some of the highest recycling rates in the world and is active in helping other countries do the same.

Clearly, East Asia's environmentalists must be doing something right. This book has engaged in a process of discovery to find out what these advocates were doing that was effective and why. The research presented here demonstrates that advocates across the region were using a remarkably similar set of strategies in their efforts to generate proenvironmental changes in their societies, despite their very different political systems:

- 1) Education—Help individuals and policymakers understand environmental problems and why they matter, and provide solutions.
- 2) Make friends on the inside—Cultivate and empower allies with policy influence.
- 3) Make it work locally—Successfully implement an environmental solution locally and then disseminate that success to other places.

- 4) Make it work for business—Identify and support the development of products, services, and markets where proenvironmental behavior can also generate economic profit.
- 5) Engage the heart and inspire the imagination—Use art to attract attention, emotionally connect people with the environment, and inspire them to act.
- 6) Be a game changer—Change the context in which other advocates are working by transforming culture and markets in ways that generate positive cycles where the individual consumption of private goods is contributing to the expansion and enrichment of public and ecological resources rather than their degradation.

This book has further shown that these strategies are not just common and effective in East Asia, they are common and effective all over the world. These findings are surprising because they go against two common assumptions that pervade environmental politics and advocacy literatures: (1) East Asia is different—it has an unusual cultural and political history that makes advocacy in the region different from that found in the other parts of the world.² (2) Regime type significantly affects advocacy success—advocates in democracies will have a larger and more diverse set of strategies to choose from, and they will generally be more effective than their counterparts in nondemocracies.³

In contrast, *Effective Advocacy* has revealed that while societies in East Asia have unique cultural histories and political contexts that affect the precise way that advocacy strategies are implemented, the strategies found to be most common and effective in East Asia are also common and effective around the world. Educating small children about the natural world and instilling in them a sense of responsibility to care for it is as important in Jakarta and Rio de Janeiro as it is in Taipei. Appointing a former Ministry of the Environment official to the board of directors of your environmental nongovernmental organization (NGO) is as useful in Buenos Aires and Moscow as it is in Seoul. While the specific method for developing, implementing, and disseminating a solution to a community's stinky solid waste problem is going to be different according to local conditions, the overall strategy of "making it work locally" is likely to be effective for advocates operating in any community with a functioning government. Essentially, the strategies highlighted as successful by East Asian environmental advocates are effective everywhere.

Why? Why were these strategies the ones that proved to be especially effective? The Connected Stakeholder Model (CSM) offers a new conceptual framework for understanding the process of policymaking that helps explain why these strategies are effective, and why they are effective across such diverse political contexts. Derived from the findings in this book, the model asserts that policymakers' networks—their number, size, and especially their diversity—are the most important factor in determining both the form and the efficacy of policy. Individuals make policy, and those individuals are each connected to multiple personal and professional networks that influence their perspective on the policies they develop. The strategies discussed in *Effective Advocacy* enable advocates to (a) build new networks that connect diverse stakeholders in new ways, (b) link different networks together, (c) strengthen and expand networks, and (d) energize networks, inspiring the individuals, policymakers, companies, and organizations that are part of them to take action.

Scholars have long recognized that decision makers do not make policy in a vacuum but rather have their ideas about problems and solutions shaped by the networks to which they belong. The new insight that the CSM offers is to recognize that these networks are not just a channel through which information can travel; they can exert an independent influence on policymaking. The number, size, and diversity of networks connected to policymakers will influence not just the type of policy that they develop but also its quality.

Previous research on networks connected to policymakers—whether they are called policy networks, advocacy networks, advocacy coalitions, or some other name—have tended to describe the policymaking process as a game with teams. In these models, one set of policymakers, who are connected to their team via one set of networks, competes with another team (or multiple teams) that has its own networks. Based on the team's resources (financial, political, social, informational), one team will triumph over the other.⁴

As chapter 3 describes in more detail, the CSM conceptualizes the process of policymaking and the role of networks differently. Rather than being perceived as a group of political actors who have a clearly defined set of hierarchically organized interests for which they are fighting, policymakers are viewed as individuals connected through a variety of personal and professional networks to multiple stakeholders who have diverse interests. The

policymaking process is conceptualized as one in which multidimensional individuals linked to diverse networks seek to collaborate on developing policy solutions to complex problems. Advocates who are not “at the table” with policymakers can change outcomes by influencing the networks of those who are “at the table.” To the extent that advocates’ ideas reach more decision makers, the more likely it is that they will be heard, their perspective understood, and their recommendations followed. To the extent that more stakeholders are connected to the policymaking process through diverse networks, the better the policy will be.

Advocates—in civil society, in business, and in government—can use the strategies discussed in this book to change the networks to which decision makers are connected. They might do this by targeting particular individuals who act as “network nodes.” Those influential people are at the nexus of several networks and have the capacity to transmit ideas to multiple networks simultaneously. Advocates might build new networks, connecting stakeholders who might not have been connected to the policymaking process before. They can act in ways that increase the size (more people connected to the network) or influence (connected to more people in positions of power) of networks by supporting allies who are network members, by introducing more people to the network, or by linking one network to another.

The critical shift in conceptual orientation is from a focus on individual decision makers who are thought to have a single “stake” in the outcome to a focus on the networks connected to those decision makers and the multiple, connected stakeholders contained in those networks. When we think about policymaking as a process where individual people connected to multiple stakeholders make thoughtful decisions together, it becomes easier to understand it as a creative, collaborative process that can produce positive-sum outcomes rather than as a game in which one team wins and another loses. When we understand advocacy to be a process of engagement and connection, it becomes easier for people to know that anyone has the capacity to participate and make a difference. Finally, by focusing on networks rather than individuals or institutions, we are able to expand our vision of policy from a narrow range of options framed by formal institutions and specific individuals with a finite set of job titles to a much wider array of possibilities for creative action that, coordinated or not, can generate positive change that addresses serious public issues.

Implications for Policymakers

What are the implications of the CSM for policymakers? The CSM offers a new conceptualization about the process of policymaking, so there are several concrete recommendations that the model suggests should help policymakers make good policy. Since this model was developed inductively, it is likely that many of the most innovative and effective policymakers are already engaging in policymaking that reflects these recommendations.

1. Select policy advisers connected to diverse networks.

The primary takeaway of the CSM for policymakers is that policy advisers included in the policymaking process should be conceptualized as “nodes” connected to different networks. The primary value of these participants will be to lend insights into the interests, perspectives, and experiences of the many people in their networks. Having diverse perspectives included in the process increases the capacity of policymakers to anticipate problems, find win-win solutions, and generate buy-in from the people most affected by the proposed policy.

While this method of choosing policy advisers is somewhat consistent with a multistakeholder approach, it does have some key differences. The stakeholder approach was originally developed as a business concept to help organizations “manage the relationships with [their] specific stakeholder groups in an action-oriented way.”⁵ An organization that does this well is one “which understands its stakeholder map and the stakes of each group, which has organizational processes to take these groups and their stakes into account routinely as part of the standard operating procedures of the organization and which implements a set of transactions or bargains to balance the interests of these stakeholders to achieve the organization’s purpose.”⁶

Consistent with this idea, the CSM suggests that policymakers should do their best to identify all the communities that might have some kind of stake in the policy. However, rather than picking one person to represent each of the identified stakes, the CSM recommends that a constellation of people known to be connected to diverse communities related to the policy area be gathered together. These advisers would not be fighting for their stake but rather collaborating using their diverse experience and expertise to try to generate a policy that is most likely to be successful in achieving the policy objective.

To give a hypothetical example, when trying to develop a new clean water management system, the relevant policymaker is likely to recognize that local environmental groups, local residents, and the local polluting corporation all have a stake in the outcome. The policymaker is likely to invite at least one person from each of these stakeholder groups be part of the policymaking process. However, while the stakeholder approach would suggest that it should not matter which environmental group, community resident, or corporate representative is invited, the CSM suggests that it is critically important that the people selected to be part of the process be those with multiple connections, not just one. Representatives from designated stakeholder groups should not just be fighting for their group's narrow interests but should bring a wealth of experience and perspectives to the table.

To the extent possible, the policymaking process should not be a battle for the relative position of one's stake but rather a collaborative enterprise that involves sharing interests and perspectives and generating creative win-win outcomes for everyone involved. Experienced policymakers understand this very well, especially when it isn't practiced. During a 2019 interview with me, Kim Sungwoo, a senior environment and energy consultant based in Seoul, described a committee he had served on that had been formed using the multistakeholder logic rather than CSM logic.

There are two problems [in the way the committee was formed]. First, the person who represents the business sector had a science background, but he only represented one part of the business sector. The committee didn't have other business representatives, or even the main voice from that sector, but everyone seemed to think that he represented everyone in the sector. That was a huge problem.

Second, in [this policy case] the government was the referee, while the NGO wanted more, the industry wanted less, and the professors were in the middle. The problem is that while the committee had representation from industry, it was only from part of the industrial sector—the environmental team—so, those folks didn't have investment decision-making authority and didn't really understand how the environmental policy options impacted the balance sheet. As a result, [even though there was a representative from the business sector,] there wasn't anyone on the committee who really understood the perspective of the finance people. All of the committee members were looking at the options only from their own narrow perspective. The policy discussions didn't go very well.

Not everyone who cares about a policy can be in the room making policy. The stakeholder approach assumes that all relevant stakeholders can be included in the process. The CSM recognizes that this is usually impossible.

There may be power brokers who are not physically present who are exercising influence over people in the room. There may be minor stakeholders who are excluded because of space or other concerns. There may be major stakeholders who have very different perspectives from those in the room who are supposedly representing the entire group. There may be stakeholders who were not identified but who can affect or will be affected by the policy. Inviting individuals who are part of many networks that connect them to diverse stakeholders will be the best way to ensure that the people in the room making policy are knowledgeable about the concerns and interests of as many stakeholders as possible, the known and unknown.

2. Recognize that everyone is a political actor.

The CSM recognizes that no one is neutral in policymaking—everyone is acting to benefit their own networks and their own position in those networks, whether they are bureaucrats, activists, businesspeople, or academics. Even if someone is invited to take part as a technical expert, it is important to remember that any given individual will be connected to his or her own networks. The person's perspective will be influenced by his or her connections to unique networks, and he or she can be used as a source of information about diverse stakeholder perspectives, not just as a source of technical expertise.⁷

Presumably, everyone who is invited to participate in the policymaking process is asked to do so because they have some kind of knowledge and experience. Their expertise on the matter at hand will require that they be connected to communities related to that policy area. Even an academic who is brought in as a technical expert will also be a political actor when sharing knowledge. The person should care about the policy and want it to be a good one. Just as stakeholder participants should be selected for their access to diverse networks of people related to the policy, technical experts should also be selected not just for their specific knowledge but also for their connections to others with knowledge and perspectives that might be relevant. Everyone should recognize that all participants are political actors and no one is neutral.

Although the CSM recognizes that “conflicts of interest” can be a problem—it is inappropriate and harmful for those at the table making policy to be able to tailor that policy in ways that can garner them personal benefit—having an interest, indeed several interests, in the outcome of the policy will make those involved in the process more vested in the outcome. Being

connected to multiple communities with a stake in the outcome should help the committee care more about crafting a good policy and give its members a broader and more diverse perspective than would be possible if members were truly neutral technical advisers.

3. Recognize institutional constraints and use networks to bridge them.

Institutions, both formal and informal, create constraints and opportunities for policymakers. Working within these constraints is one of the key challenges that policymakers face as they seek to develop effective policy. Some organizations and not others are selected to implement policy. Specific bureaucratic processes are designed to encourage efficient workflow, gather relevant feedback, and ensure accountability. In order to be effective, policies must be designed to conform with these constraints and others.

However, the CSM encourages policymakers to recognize the institutional constraints and identify networks that may have developed to overcome those constraints. Indeed, if networks have not yet formed to overcome known institutional constraints, policymakers may want to use policy to create new networks that help overcome barriers that are hindering policy development and implementation. Network creation and activation can be an important outcome of policy and should be thoughtfully considered as part of the policymaking process.⁸

4. Design policy for flexibility and further innovation.

The CSM recognizes that policy is created and refined through an iterated process. Policies designed by focusing on a fixed set of stakeholders operating within a particular set of institutions can lead to rigid policy outcomes that hinder adaptation to changing circumstances.⁹ Especially at the municipal level, we can see that effective policies are frequently designed through a collaborative process that brings the public, private, and non-profit sectors together in ways that enable experimentation, innovation, and adaptation as policy learning takes place and as circumstances evolve. Key to the flexibility of the policies are large and diverse networks connected both formally and informally to the policymaking process.¹⁰

5. Recognize clients as cocreators of policy.

The CSM shares with other stakeholder models the idea that clients should be cocreators of policy. In some contexts, it may be difficult to have those most directly influenced by the policy sitting at the table to help

craft it, but it should always be possible to have people connected to those affected sitting at the table. Indeed, in contrast to other stakeholder models, which recommend that every community of stakeholders have a representative to fight for their stake, the CSM makes it possible for several of the people directly involved in making policy to be voicing the concerns of affected communities.

Selecting policy advisers because they have multiple connections rather than a single interest or identity has several benefits in terms of representing clients in the process. First, if there are multiple people representing the views of a particular affected community, the policymaking process runs less risk of being hijacked by a single, nonshared view. Similarly, because there should be multiple people in the policymaking process who are connected through their networks to affected and vulnerable communities, those speaking on behalf of the vulnerable are less likely to be viewed as token representatives who are expected to represent some kind of unified perspective on behalf of an entire community of diverse individuals.

Having multiple people in the policymaking process offers multiple perspectives on how a community might be affected by a policy and creates a fuller picture for decision makers as they weigh options. Finally, with multiple people connected to affected communities involved in the policymaking process, implementation should improve, since there will be greater buy-in at the beginning and more channels through which policymakers can communicate the policy change and adjust it as needed.¹¹

Implications for Advocates

Most of this book has been concerned with strategies that advocates can use to be effective in their advocacy for change. This section is less concerned with particular strategies for effective advocacy and more focused on the implications that the CSM has for advocates. In particular, to the extent that the CSM accurately describes how policy is made, the following offer some implications for advocates in terms of the way they can think about approaching effective advocacy.

1. Use multiple, diverse networks to gain policy access.

As common sense and much policy analysis has shown, policy access is the most important factor in gaining influence over policy.¹² The easiest

way to do this is for a policymaker to invite the advocate to be part of the group of people in the room when policy is being formulated. Short of being in the room themselves, the best option for advocates is to try to access other people who are in the room.

The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) and multistakeholder models suggest that there is likely to be a small set of people in the room with whom an organization shares similar beliefs and goals. Those models recommend connecting with these like-minded people and trying to grow their number to expand their influence when they are sitting at the table and negotiating behind the scenes.

The CSM does not disagree with this recommendation, but it goes a step further. In addition to being connected to like-minded people, one of the most important implications of the CSM for advocates is that any and all connections to policymakers matter—even and maybe even especially those with whom the organization may not share beliefs and goals. Multiple connections to many people who are in the room are better than a single connection to a lone “stakeholder representative.”

To the extent that advocates have diverse networks that can enable them to connect to multiple people in the room, their capacity to ensure that their perspectives are considered will increase. This means that advocates should not just attend conferences where they keep running into the same set of people; they should also be seeking to make connections with potential detractors, as well as those whose interests are compatible with but perhaps not central to the missions of the advocates’ own organizations. Furthermore, cultivating social, and not just professional, connections can also be very valuable to gaining access. This means that while professional conferences are important networking events, neighborhood festivals, PTA meetings, college reunions, and other events also serve as valuable opportunities to expand an advocate’s networks in ways that may prove useful when trying to influence policy.

2. Cultivate long-term relationships.

While access to the people with decision-making authority is important, advocates should not focus exclusively on top leadership. Advocacy usually takes a long time to be effective, and relationships take a long time to form. Ideally, advocates should not be seeking to build new relationships with decision makers. By the time someone has risen to a top decision-making

level, it would be best if the advocate already had a deep and multiyear relationship with that person. This means that the relationship-forming process should start when policymakers are still fairly junior, when they are middle managers or heading up small projects. Relationships with decision makers do matter, but advocates seeking long-term effectiveness should be cultivating potential decision makers as well as those already in positions of power.

Indeed, as highlighted in chapter 5 advocates are often in very good positions to help the careers of these lower-level bureaucrats and local politicians. NGOs and others can provide professional opportunities, good publicity, and sometimes resources to bureaucrats and politicians who are just starting out. To the extent that the advocate can be helpful to the policymaker before the latter has decision-making authority, it will make it easier for the advocate to approach that person later. Policymakers are much more likely to take a phone call from someone whom they have known for ten or fifteen years, who has proved to be a supportive, trustworthy person, who was helpful when they needed help, than from someone who is calling for the first time.

Relatedly, people who hold high levels of decision-making authority can be influential allies even after they step down or are removed from a position of power. As discussed in chapters 5, 6, and 9, people have long careers and move around, and the longer and more successful their career, the more networks they are likely to join. It is quite common for retirees to step down from high positions in government and business and spend another decade or two in the advocacy sector, or to move from national-level politics to local-level politics. These individuals have numerous connections that can enhance the efficacy of advocacy. Essentially, advocacy can be a lifelong process, and individuals in all sectors and in all stages of a career can be important allies.

3. Prioritize people and organizations that are network nodes.

The CSM offers a network-based framework for understanding the policymaking process in which the individuals involved in policymaking form a matrix of networks. As advocates attempt to gain influence in this matrix, they should prioritize people and organizations that form nodes in the network. Nodes have connections to multiple other nodes and networks.

It is likely that the most powerful actors will also be nodes in a network, but this is not necessarily the case. There may be individuals or organizations that exert significant power (e.g., they control high levels of funding

resources, have decision-making authority) but may have only limited connections to other organizations. Similarly, there may be some organizations (often NGOs or government-organized NGOs) that are involved in forming and supporting numerous networks but may not exert direct decision-making authority or control significant financial resources. However, their capacity to help connect advocates to those with power is a vital asset. When making strategic decisions about which people to cultivate, advocates should not just think about the decision-making power of the individual, or his or her future decision-making power (points number 1 and 2 in this section), but also the capacity of the person to connect the advocate to others—the person's location and role in multiple policy-related networks.

The CSM posits that an advocate's most important resource is his or her network, and growing that network, connecting to new networks, and becoming more influential and important within those networks should be key priorities when advocates make decisions about how to allocate their time and resources.

4. Use networks to overcome and work around institutional barriers.

One of the most difficult aspects of policymaking, for both governmental officials and advocates seeking to influence policy, is that bureaucracies are required to follow specific processes and often have a very narrowly defined scope for their authority, making innovation and change difficult. The CSM helps reveal that bureaucratic barriers are frequently not as insurmountable as they might appear. Any given policymaking process has multiple people involved, and any given person has multiple networks to which he or she is connected. Advocates can use their own networks to connect to multiple policymakers, enhancing the chances that their views are heard by decision makers.

Furthermore, advocates working outside government are frequently able to see the institutional barriers and design networks to work around them. Perhaps the most obvious example of this was the China-US Energy Efficiency Alliance discussed in chapter 5. Local government officials in China and the US would ordinarily never have a chance to meet each other. Additionally, since China is so large, it is also frequently difficult for local government officials to get the attention of Beijing. By facilitating face-to-face meetings between local government officials from Jiangsu and California and connecting them to relevant utility and technology companies,

the advocates at the Natural Resources Defense Council were able to work around the institutional barriers that inhibited those communications. Once all the relevant people were able to meet and identify areas of common interest, they were able to design a new network that could enable them to pursue these productive collaborations. Advocates did not remove or even challenge the preexisting institutional barriers; they just networked around them.

5. Network with others to amplify impact.

Perhaps the best examples of how networks can be used to amplify impact can be found in the examples used in chapter 6 to discuss the “make it work locally” strategy. Sheri Liao of Global Village in Beijing had only a handful of volunteers in her organization when she and her fellow environmental activists began discussing their ideas for the 26 Degree Campaign. There was no way that any one group would have enough people to measure the indoor temperatures of any more than a few hotels and offices in the city. By working together, the activists were able to mobilize hundreds of people to carry out “inspections” of indoor air temperature, and now the number of people involved is in the thousands, and their local initiative has become national policy and spread to other countries as well. Especially for small, local groups, working with other groups is an important way of amplifying impact.

Even for large, well-resourced organizations, networking with others can be an important way to amplify the impact of advocacy efforts. The Institute for Global Environmental Strategies did this by forming the KitaQ Composting Network (featured in chapter 6). While it was nice that they were able to help the city of Surabaya address its solid waste problem by developing a new method of household composting and finding a neighborhood-based way to disseminate the new method and support its continued use, it was the international network that was formed that enabled more than thirty cities to adapt the system for use in their own communities. While it is difficult for good public policy to “go viral” in the manner of posts shared over social media, networks formed by advocates can enable good ideas and policies to spread much farther and faster than they would if they were championed by only a single advocate.

6. Do things that matter, and then form networks to support them.

Advocates can spend all their time schmoozing and networking, but it will be a complete waste of time if they are not doing anything that matters. Networks, especially informal, ad hoc networks, will dissolve if they

are not useful. The CSM reveals how important it is to the policymaking process to have many diverse networks. *Effective Advocacy* offers examples of strategies that advocates can utilize to influence policymaking. In all cases discussed in this book, the good idea, the innovative person, and the positive outcome came first, and the network to disseminate and amplify that positive outcome followed.

Advocates should not become so enamored of creating networks that connect to people with power that they lose sight of why they are seeking to influence policy. Networks of the kind described in this book are generally organic, and they form and are designed for specific purposes, to engage and connect the people who are relevant for a specific policy goal or task. Therefore, advocates should focus on doing something that matters first, and worry about growing the network later.

It is not uncommon for a network to form around a good idea, but then to have the networked people identify new ideas and form new networks around them or shift and expand the original network to accommodate the new ideas and projects. The increasing number of international networks of cities, such as the C40 Cities Climate Leadership Group, are one example of how this can happen. City mayors first gathered to find ways to support each other in their common challenges related to climate change and formed C40. Once they gathered, they discovered a whole range of issues for which collaboration could be useful—including disaster management, housing, immigration, and public safety. Some of those issue areas were incorporated into C40's activities, and others spun off and formed new networks. Often individuals who help organize new networks remain connected to the original one, even if they are no longer as involved. This is one of the key processes through which networks grow and diversify.

Implications for Scholars

The CSM has several implications for the way that scholars examine actors, institutions, and the policymaking process. The CSM challenges researchers to examine a wider diversity of actors who may be involved in influencing policy. Rather than focusing only on the actors whose institutional affiliations would identify them as active stakeholders, scholars should include all actors in a network matrix who are seeking to influence the policy process, including academics, journalists, artists, and others. No actor should be

assumed to be serving purely a technical or cultural role; everyone involved should be assumed to be a political actor in their own right.

Furthermore, this study suggests that scholars should reconceptualize the role of policy actors. Rather than trying to identify an actor's most salient interests and trying to score a competition among divergent interests, scholars should be examining the multitude of interests and perspectives that any given actor brings to the table through his or her networks as a way to determine how those interests are combined to create policy. This perspective will draw scholars' attention to marginal interests that may have low-level salience for multiple actors across different networks. It may also help explain the unexpected policy outcomes that emerge when policies are crafted to support minor interests that no actor was willing to fight for but that many actors were willing to support.

The CSM also conceptualizes a new analogy for the policymaking process and a different role for institutions in the process. It rejects the common analogy of competitive sports. Instead, it adopts computer networks or social networks as its base analogy. Institutions function to provide "rules of the game," guiding participants toward behavior that will facilitate the growth rather than the death of the network (e.g., friending is good, spamming is bad). Some of these rules are formal (e.g., no child pornography), and some of them are informal (e.g., avoid ultra-long posts). Some of the actors are actively trying to expand their influence (e.g., raise their Muckety or Klout score), and there are big players and small players constantly trying to change the rules of the game (e.g., rewriting privacy laws). However, most actors in the system are not actively engaged in trying to change, break, or maintain rules. Furthermore, new technology can open up brand-new ways for actors to interact with each other and the policymaking process itself (e.g., the introduction of the smartphone, the creation of Facebook).

Most importantly, there are no fixed "teams." Individuals and groups are connected to each other in complex ways. Actors might be working together on one policy issue but working against each other on another. There are numerous ways that actors can engage with each other outside the channels provided by formal institutions. In this conceptualization, the primary function of institutions is to create opportunities for actors to connect with one another, to encourage the creation of multiple nodes, and to facilitate innovation—not constrain behavior. In fact, even if the

institutions do constrain behavior, it is common for actors to find work-arounds to those constraints. Finally, there is no single “referee” who is ultimately responsible for policing. All actors involved in the network are responsible for employing enforcement mechanisms, with informal, social, and market-based methods of enforcement being utilized far more frequently than formal legal sanctions.¹³

To reiterate, the CSM conceptualization does not deny that institutions create constraints or that actors compete and have conflicting interests. What this network-based conceptualization accomplishes is that it moves us away from models that assume that actors are required to be in competition with one another because they belong to particular teams and that assume that the competitors can be clearly distinguished from teammates or referees. Instead, the model allows for more dynamic and complex interactions among a wide variety of actors seeking to influence policy.

Thus far, policy scholars have given considerable attention to policy actors, the institutions where they reside, and the interests they represent. More attention should now be paid to the networks that these actors form with one another. Scholars utilizing the ACF have begun to do this, but more research is needed to understand the cross-subsystem and cross-sector connections and to tease out the nature and function of these policy-relevant networks. How do they form? How are they maintained? Which kinds of networks are most influential? How do networks work to strengthen or undermine one another in a policy dialogue? Do they strengthen or undermine the policy itself? Do decision makers prioritize one type of network over another? How do policy actors activate their networks for information gathering? How do policymakers identify the nodes of a network and invite those people to take part in decision-making? How do advocates work to create new networks that might increase their influence in policymaking?

Placing networks at the center of policy analysis offers a new perspective on the policymaking process. Rather than a competition between actors on opposing teams fighting for their interests, policymaking is conceptualized as a negotiation among actors who all have multiple interests that they are promoting. This new conceptualization allows for competition and conflict as well as a wide range of other forms of interactions in which different actors work together to craft policies that benefit diverse constituencies.

This view that networks are central to policymaking is in line with the ACF. Where the CSM departs most significantly from the ACF is in the

recognition that the networks that form are not necessarily formed by people with similar belief systems and common interests. For the CSM, individuals need only be connected to each other in some way; it can even be a purely social connection. Their beliefs and interests do not need to be aligned for the network to be relevant. Indeed, the more diverse and dynamic the networks to which a decision maker is connected, the more useful it will be for the individual within the network, and the more useful it will be to the policymakers seeking to develop effective policy.

Another important implication of this model is that democracy matters less for the policymaking process than would be expected by pluralist models. Relevant actors might include political parties, but they also might not. It is assumed that relevant exchanges among actors are likely to occur in locations and manners that are hidden from public view. It allows for different actors to have different levels of power in the system. It does not require that actors be clearly defined as public, private, or nonprofit sector—it allows for individual actors to hold multiple identities that may cross sectoral or ideological lines.

It is likely that policymaking in democratic societies will consist of a broader array of actors who are engaged in larger networks that are more horizontally organized, since democratic societies tend to have larger and more independent civil societies.¹⁴ However, the model should still work in societies where the networks are fewer, smaller, and more asymmetric. Therefore, although the model will not apply to societies without sufficient state and societal capacity to implement policies, it should have broader applicability than pluralist-based models that generally assume democratic or democratic-like political contexts.

Examining a different dimension of politics, a network-based approach to policymaking has the potential to improve our understanding of gender politics. Previous approaches to policy have erroneously suggested that women need to gain greater expertise or occupy leadership positions in institutions to gain influence.¹⁵ However, as numerous popular culture writings and more scholarly research attest, it is not primarily the level of expertise but rather access to the right networks, which often requires off-hours commitments (e.g., going out for drinks after work, meeting with constituents on the weekends), that makes it particularly difficult for women to gain leadership positions in business and politics.¹⁶ On the other hand, the CSM offers a strategy and a path for women to gain more influence and a solid

justification for their inclusion in policymaking even if their job title does not warrant selection based on a stakeholder model. Women are frequently network nodes, and they are often connected to different networks from men. Including more women in male-dominated policy decision-making and more men in women-dominated policy decision-making should increase the number and diversity of networks connected to decision-making, which should improve the quality of the policy.

In sum, CSM offers scholars a new method for studying policymaking around the world. It incorporates more actors into its model and allows for a new conceptualization of the role of institutions in constraining and enabling those actors to craft policies for their societies. A network-based model is more descriptively accurate and more analytically applicable to policymaking processes found around the world than current models based on interests and institutions. It offers a breakthrough in our attempts to understand and analyze policymaking in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

Effective Advocacy and Replenishing the Commons

Ultimately, effective environmental advocacy is about fundamentally transforming the political, economic, and social dynamics in our societies that have resulted in a “tragedy of the commons,”¹⁷ where individual and collective use of environmental resources has led to their degradation and disappearance. Elinor Ostrom won the Nobel Prize in Economics for a career that was devoted to developing design principles that can help regulators and communities manage the use of these common pool resources such that their destruction can be avoided and mitigated.¹⁸ As showcased perhaps most dramatically by the game changers profiled in the previous chapter, East Asia’s environmental advocates have gone a step further. They are not just slowing the depletion of our planet’s resources, they’re enhancing them.

East Asia’s environmentalists have found ways to incentivize individuals, companies, and governments to engage in proenvironmental behavior, not just mitigate their environmental harm. As the examples of Toyota, Walmart, and Tree Planet (discussed in chapters 7 and 9) show, they have created and supported new markets where greener products, renewable energy, and less waste promotes not just a cleaner planet and happier and healthier people but also wealthier investors. The KitaQ network, discussed in chapter 6, and

Taiwan's Rainbow Village, highlighted in chapter 8, demonstrate how East Asia's environmental solutions often don't just solve a single, narrow environmental problem like solid waste management (KitaQ network) or overdevelopment (Rainbow Village); they can contribute positively to the social, economic, ecological, and aesthetic conditions of their communities.

East Asia's political systems—Japan's mature democracy, South Korea's and Taiwan's newer democracies, and China's authoritarian state—are all rewarding leaders with good environmental records and extensive experience by electing and appointing them to powerful political positions with the authority to integrate environmental concerns into broader policy-making. Tokyo's Koike Yuriko and Taipei's Hau Lung-pin were both elected mayor of their capital cities after demonstrating their commitment and effectiveness when serving as their country's environmental minister, and now their cities regularly rank among the greenest cities in the world. Lee Myung-bak was elected president of South Korea largely as the result of the success of the Cheonggyecheon River restoration project he conducted while mayor of Seoul, and once he became president he championed South Korea's new "green growth" policy. Chinese president Xi Jinping developed Fujian as an "ecological province" while he was governor, and he now promotes the expansion of an "ecological civilization" to all of China.

East Asia is a region that is hostile to political advocacy, and yet its environmentalists have found ways to replenish our common environmental resources. They are teaching their children and leaders about the importance of our planet and how to care for it. They are networking around institutional barriers to influence policymakers. They are implementing solutions locally and then spreading them to other communities. They are directing the power of the market toward healing and enhancing the planet rather than destroying it. They are helping us to imagine a world that we want to live in and then inspiring us to create that world. They are changing a planet-killing competition in which we all lose into a creative, collaborative process in which individuals, companies, governments, and ecosystems can all win. They have many lessons to teach us. If we are lucky and work hard, perhaps we can learn them before it is too late.

This is a section of [doi:10.7551/mitpress/13475.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/13475.001.0001)

Effective Advocacy

Lessons from East Asia's Environmentalists

By: Mary Alice Haddad

Citation:

Effective Advocacy: Lessons from East Asia's Environmentalists

By: Mary Alice Haddad

DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/13475.001.0001

ISBN (electronic): 9780262363426

Publisher: The MIT Press

Published: 2021

The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding and support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Arcadia – a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin



The MIT Press

© 2021 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND license.
Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The open access edition of this book was made possible by generous funding from Arcadia—a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin.



Open access edition funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this book do not necessarily represent those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.



**NATIONAL
ENDOWMENT
FOR THE
HUMANITIES**

The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Haddad, Mary Alice, 1973- author.

Title: Effective advocacy : lessons from East Asia's environmentalists / Mary Alice Haddad.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2021] | Series: American and comparative environmental policy | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020027086 | ISBN 9780262542357 (paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Environmentalism--East Asia. | Environmental policy--East Asia.

Classification: LCC GE199.E17 H34 2021 | DDC 333.7095--dc23

LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2020027086>