





- A systems view helps show the difference between organization-centric leaders who try to lead movements from the top down, and networked-leadership structures led from the middle.
  - Movements can be thought of as systems made up of interdependent parts that collectively achieve a specific function or purpose.
  - Each part individually is powerless to achieve the end goal; but collectively, the parts add up to a whole greater than the sum of the parts.
- The unifying thread of successful movements was that their leaders saw their rightful place as *central* though equal part of a network, rather than at the top of a rigid hierarchy. And they recognized that their path to victory would be achieved by coordinating with and empowering people and groups around them to align around a 10/10/10/20 = 50 vision.
- So why doesn't every movement adopt a state-by-state approach?
  - Lack of resources to effectively compete in all 50 states, and divergent levels of interest and support for the issue across states are two major reasons.
  - The most important reason lies within movement leaders themselves. The protagonists of winning causes recognize that they must first win at local and state levels, before going for any big federal changes.
  - With that knowledge in hand, leaders then act—either by empowering and emboldening grassroots
    efforts already in place, or by seeding and supporting state-based grassroots campaigns where none
    previously existed.
- Success movements keep the big picture in sight and provide support at the local and state levels to advance the cause in ways that made sense for each of those communities.
- Effective movements have the key building blocks in place: a robust grassroots base and a networked leadership structure with leaders who see their place as at the center of networks, rather than as commanding from above.
- Private funding to support state and local advocacy is the oxygen grassroots groups and coalitions need to survive.

