FORUM
ACTION
FUND

CONFIDENTIAL

January 19, 2017

TO: Interested Parties

FROM: Ali Noorani, National Immigration Forum Action Fund

RE: Cultivate and Mobilize 1,000 Conservative Activists per Target District

Over the past five years, the National Immigration Forum Action Fund has charted new ground in building broad coalitions among conservative and moderate faith, law enforcement and business leaders. Our networks are broader and deeper than most any other immigration advocacy organization in the country. Yet, this is not enough.

The 2016 election demonstrated the ability of conservative media outlets to convey a powerful message directly to grassroots activists. Supported by a Republican nominee leading with an anti-immigrant message, their message overwhelmed grasstops messaging strategies, dramatically amplifying far right nativist voices. Which has serious implications for our work. To rebuild a constructive immigration narrative and, eventually, win immigration reforms we must bridge this gap between conservative grasstops leaders and conservative grassroots voters.

Therefore, we aim to take the next step: leverage our grasstops networks via a robust communications campaign to build grassroots conservative and moderate support for immigrants and immigration. A successful strategy will mitigate the cultural and economic anxieties that accompany immigration. And, most importantly, thousands of suburban and rural voters will be cultivated to take demonstrable action in support of public policies that value immigrants and immigration.

We are well-positioned to test a range of tactics given our existing networks and the lessons we have learned. There is no guarantee of success—this is new, groundbreaking, work. But the plan we lay out below is based on cognitive theory, polling data and best practices. Most importantly, this is a step we must take if we want to win.

What We Learned from the 2013 Christian Radio Campaign

In 2013, the Action Fund partnered with the Evangelical Immigration Table (EIT) to execute a groundbreaking Christian radio ad campaign in 65 target districts across 20 states. The ads featured an evangelical pastor reading a script outlining the biblical underpinnings behind the need for immigration reform. The overwhelming number of ads were recorded by pastors who led churches in the target region.

In short, we learned that the right message, from trusted messengers through mediums that matter, have a dramatic effect on the debate around immigration reform for white evangelicals.

At the beginning of our campaign in 2013, evangelical Republicans were more likely to oppose and less likely to support immigration reform than Republicans as a whole. At the end of our

campaign, the opposite was true. An independent academic review of this campaign, gives insight as to why.

In September 2014, Michelle Margolis, assistant professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, released an in-depth study examining the effectiveness of the work of the Evangelical Immigration Table at changing white evangelical opinions, actions and attitudes toward immigration reform.

In a controlled panel study of over 1,000 participants, Margolis discovered that the Evangelical Immigration Table ad **produced a 21-point increase in support for immigration reform** among its intended audience of white evangelical Christians. A similar control ad stripped of its religious language produced no effect on that population.

In addition, Margolis reviewed public opinion polling of white Republican evangelicals' views on immigration reform over the course of the Evangelical Immigration Tables campaign from February 2013 until September 2013. The initial wave of polling indicated that white evangelical conservatives were more likely to oppose and less likely to support immigration reform than Republicans in general.

However, over the course of the campaign, white evangelical Republicans opposition to reform dropped from 60% to 49% and support for reform increased from 22% to 29%. For Republicans in general over the same time period, opposition to reform rose from 51% to 57% and support decreased from 29% to 25%.

Furthermore, while 50% of respondents said they would be willing to sign a petition opposing immigration reform after hearing a secular ad SUPPORTING reform, only 30% said they would be willing to sign after hearing the EIT's ad.

The research also exposed where the campaign fell short: Respondents who heard our radio ad said they supported reform were not significantly more likely to take action with only a 4-point increase (22% to 26%).

We know we can change hearts and minds. The new challenge is to engage hearts and minds and create an active, politically and socially conservative, voice for immigration reform.

Why People do not take Action (see Appendix for further discussion)

What are the primary barriers between someone who has shifted in their opinion and the person who is ready to act?

Information Gap Fallacy
It is a mistake to assume that people will change their minds about immigrants and immigration policy based on simply providing them more information. Statistics about economic growth don't often change a person's personal concerns about providing for their family. Numbers on the relatively low incidences of violent crime in recent immigration populations will not allay fears of a parent wanting a safe neighborhood for their children to play in.

Therefore, the information we provide through any of the above tactics must be localized, if not personalized, so the reader understands the personal impact of immigrants and immigration on their lives. Such messaging will lead the target audience to become more comfortable with the issue and how they might engage in the debate.

Culture Wars
As many organizations have realized fact-based arguments are not the leading edge of political persuasion so they have switched to "value-based" persuasion techniques. Unfortunately, these sometimes take an unintentionally antagonistic form by trying to reach populations with a values-based argument that does not resonate with the target audience's values.

A political persuasion campaign should not try to do the work of changing a person's core value set or the foundations of their self-perception. It should begin with how a person already views themselves and the world and demonstrate how that understanding should bring them to act on our issue.

It is critical to message in familiar terms that connect with the core audience. Margolis, in her 2014 study, demonstrated that exposure to a pro-reform ad in secular language actually increased the likelihood of an evangelical reporting that they would take action in opposition to immigration reform.

Four Theories
We have four primary theories that need to be tested and explored more thoroughly:
1. *These aren't my values.* Republican evangelicals don't resonate with comprehensive immigration reform in the value construct in which it is typically presented by proponents of immigrants and immigration. However, they become dramatically more supportive when the same policies are translated into values language that they feel familiar with.
2. *I'm afraid to act alone.* This is a person who has been convinced to change their attitude but feels that this shift is so far outside of their cultural and communal norm that they are hesitant to act on this new-found feeling.
3. *I don't believe it will make a difference.* This is a typical concern with activism in general. People understand that nothing will change if no action is taken but they also believe that their personal action is insignificant from a perspective of trying to change anything.
4. *I remain ambivalent.* This is the person who, for example, has been convinced that mass scale deportation is wrong but is still concerned about border security. Because of the popular narrative around these issues they don't feel there is a clear outlet for their opinion and remain on the sideline as a result.

We want to test our theories about specific subgroups of white evangelicals in a fashion that refines our understanding of the most effective behavioral signals. The following plan will allow us to explore these questions and develop an approach that leads conservatives to take action.

Moving Forward

Affirm and Redirect

Trump voters expressed a deep anxiety about the direction of the country. They fear for their own safety and economic security. Many Americans decided on Election Day that Trump understood both their concerns and values better than their other options.

Post-election polling by a partner organization has shown that Trump did not win *because* of his immigration rhetoric but *in spite of* it. While "the wall" has considerable support amongst conservative voters, they are split on mass deportation. In fact, in hypothetical policy proposals, nearly three-quarters of Trump voters support comprehensive immigration reform that includes an earned pathway to citizenship when paired with increased border security.

This does not mean Trump's immigration rhetoric needs to become policy. We need to understand and address the fears, concerns and values that voters expressed while redirecting them to better expressions of their best selves and policy solutions that will address the core of their concerns.

These lessons lead us to believe that an "affirm and redirect" approach will be the most effective:
> **Affirm the values and self-perception that people already hold and then redirect them to policies that will better reflect who they believe themselves to be.**

This approach will not work for all Republicans or Trump voters. But, as seen by the above evaluation of our radio campaign, we have demonstrated such an approach is effective with our target audience.

Address Multiple Identities and Concerns
Religious cues that are highly targeted to specific religious identities with trusted sources have shown to have a dramatic impact on white evangelicals views on immigration reform. However, we believe that while appealing to a religious identity is crucial, it is not sufficient for wider change and convincing our target population to take broad scale action.

People do not live their life or make decisions based solely upon religious identity. Class, educational attainment, gender, partisan affiliation, personal safety, neighborhood, family and many other factors all provide different lenses for attitudes and decision making.

While religious identity can deeply shape a person's attitudes and decisions, the religious consideration is often drowned out by concerns of safety and economic opportunity/stability.

Future messaging needs to integrate the faith leadership we have engaged along with the **law enforcement and business influencers** who are a part of our network.

Expand Mediums
While the research cited above proved the effectiveness of the radio ads, our campaign lacked the strategy and resources to follow up with those who were exposed to our ads the opportunity to take action or stay connected with further information. Our message and messengers have shown that they can move the needle on opinion but we believe sustained contact and follow up will be needed to motivate action.

In the future, our campaign will be designed with **radio ads as only one part of a multi-pronged approach with similar messages reinforced through search engine**

marketing (SEM), banner display advertising, social media marketing and direct email outreach.

Non-Political Action
Through the work of the Forum's field organizers we discovered time and time again that most conservatives who were convinced of the need to support immigration reform were not ready to take political action. **Those who took action began with non-political activity inside their comfort zone, then moved to actions outside of their typical realm of experience.**

In the 2013 campaign, many evangelicals started off "praying for reform," reading related scripture, attending an event at their church or engaging in a small group discussion on the topic. Often, it was the affirmation of other friends and other members of their religious community also changing their minds that provided enough positive community support for political action to take place.

Our messaging and outreach will provide such opportunities for action outside of traditional advocacy tactics.

The Plan

Goals
- *Build a moderate and conservative grassroots base of activists in support of immigrant and immigration with 1,000 taking action (phone calls or emails) per targeted Congressional District (CD).*
    - Begin with a 250,000-person audience within a target CD.
    - Provide 100,000 with multiple points of exposure to ad campaign.
    - Identify 25,000 who meaningfully engage with the message (watched all or most of one or multiple videos, clicked through to website, etc).
    - Identify 5,000 who are highly engaged through downloading resources, multiple visits to the website or liking a Facebook page.
- *Reduce opposition to comprehensive reform through creating empathy for immigrants and refugees while alleviating core fears around safety and economic security.*
- *Bolster effectiveness of grass-tops lobbying efforts through correlated grassroots efforts, demonstrated constituency interest and local media coverage.*

Strategy
We initiate our plan by asking the question, "How do we add value to the lives of our target audience?" Before we ask a new audience to take action, we need to ask what we can give to them that will enrich their lives and serve them in a way that builds trust.

We believe there is a subset of white evangelicals, or, more broadly, white faith voters, who will actively be looking for ways to reconcile their support of Trump with their religious identity.

The core service we provide is to meet that need by connecting with their <u>values</u> through trusted religious leaders, alleviating <u>fears of safety</u> through the testimony of law enforcement officials and address <u>economic security</u> through connection to local business leaders.

Action they take will be a natural result of meeting that need and fulfilling that purpose in their lives.

Our strategy will be executed across three phases.

I. *Identify and connect.* The first stage in our process is to identify and connect. We have already developed a list of 30,000 evangelical Christians who support comprehensive immigration reform. We are taking these emails, matching them to social media accounts and gaining a deeper insight into demographic and behavioral profiles that will allow us to pinpoint likely additional supporters. These initial activists will serve as the basis for our modeling in new congressional districts.

Our large list of evangelical leaders who are in support of immigration reform will also allow us to target advertisements to people who already have connected with that leader and focus ads with quotes and interviews from them to that target audience.

Initial advertisements will be designed to be easy to digest and highly shareable. We will try to reach as many people as possible within our target congressional districts and observe behavioral patterns based on our audience's interaction with those ads.

This will simultaneously allow us to identify more demographic and behavioral characteristics to continue our ad refinement and allow us to test messages with a variety of sub-groups.

II. *Educate and engage.* Once we identify specific audiences who were most engaged by the initial message, we will follow up with more informational videos and advertisements. These ads will deepen the connection that our target audience feel with the cause and heighten their sense that this is an issue they should act on.

At this stage, we will begin to offer deeper resources for those we have engaged to further their education. This can take the form of religious, security and business related videos, "ebooks", devotional material or group study resources. This will encourage social sharing and exploration that will increase the likelihood of these audiences taking action in the future through the creation of small communities that mutually reinforce concern.

III. *Respond and Act.* By this point, we hope to have cultivated specific audiences that we can connect with through email, social media or through retargeting those who have watched our videos, interacted with our ads or visited our websites.

Based on what we have learned up to this point regarding issues/messages with deepest resonance, we will engage these audiences with opportunities to take action and continually monitor the top performing calls to action to develop and refine our approach.

We will track behavior of the most highly engaged people on our lists and our team of organizers will conduct personal outreach to promising leads and encourage or support them through the process of organizing their own communities or setting up meeting with their member of congress.

Tactics

A. *Informing the Audience.* Fake news spreads dis-information about immigrants themselves, legislative initiatives and enforcement policies. The same tools and technological developments that allow for the spread of fake news are the tools we need to use to combat it.

We will monitor trending fake news stories on social media and be able to provide rapid response rebuttals that are then served directly into the new streams of the audiences we are trying to reach. Our efforts will repurpose content written by the National Immigration Forum to address the values and concerns of our target audience.

This will also include making use of the Forum's current $10,000 a month Google AdGrant and create both content and ads that will be served to those who are search for more information on immigrants and immigration reform. We believe that within 12 months the Forum will be able to access an even larger AdGrant and begin making use of nearly $500,000 a year in search engine marketing.

B. *Defining the Policy.* In line with our strategy to "affirm and redirect" we plan to make use of Trump's lack of policy definition by putting forth our own policy proposals under similar moral frameworks as has been used throughout the election. This means we will affirm that "we need an immigration system that keeps our country and communities safe" and then serve people messages of law enforcement officers who argue that a pathway to legal status is essential to make our communities safe. This tactic will repurpose content generated by the National Immigration Forum to address the values and concerns of our target audience.

C. *Social Video.* People now upload and consume more hours of native video on Facebook than they do on YouTube. This has given rise to new styles of short and highly shareable videos. While a truly "viral" video is rare, creating a compelling video that can be distributed for under $.01 a view is an achievable goal.

D. *Search Engine Marketing.* Thousands of people search for information on immigration every day. We'll monitor key search terms as well as trending topic on Facebook and Twitter to create content and relevant ads so that when people search for information about those topics, they'll be directed to our site.

E. *Retargeting.* We will refine audiences through the commonly used marketing tool of "retargeting". This will allow us to follow up with visitors to our website on Facebook and other popular websites and encourage them to connect with our campaign and learn even more. We will also use tools from Facebook released last year to follow up with our target audiences who were most engaged with our video ads.

F. *Christian Radio.* This has already proven a successful tactic to reach our target audience. Through our refined targeting techniques, we will ensure that more people who hear our radio ads are served with additional opportunities to learn, connect and act.

G. *Banner Prospecting.* Social, radio and search engine marketing are all complimented when your target audience shows up at one of their favorite websites to see more information

about your campaign there. It is also another highly effective form of "retargeting" for those who have visited your site previously.

H. *Geo-Targeting*. Many of our top leaders have, in the case of mega church pastors, the opportunity to address thousands or tens of thousands of people each week. Others, regularly speak at conferences with thousand or tens of thousands in attendance. However, pastors or conference organizers are often hesitant to allow speakers to give specific political asks. New geo-targeting capabilities will allow us to identify people who were at a particular location at the time of the event and serve them with ads afterwards with opportunities to connect and take action.

I. *Mobile Action Ads*. The challenge in getting many people to take action is not that they are not interested, it is that they aren't asked at the right time. Someone with moderate concern about immigration reform is likely to forget that they saw an email early that morning about calling their legislator. While they thought about following through, it quickly escaped their attention. Now, after that initial email we'll be able to follow up with ads delivered to their mobile device through multiple mediums that make it easy for them to make phone calls to Congress when they find they have a few minutes of downtime and are scrolling through their phones looking at photos or catching up on reading articles.

J. *Earned Media*. Instead of targeting major national publications or cable news shows, this earned media work will focus on placing op-eds in local and mid-tier papers from local leaders as well as interviews and stories on local news programs. These will be amplified by paid social advertising. This has the dual benefit of connecting with our target audience from locally trusted sources and the increased traffic will encourage editors and producers to give more time and space to other immigration related stories in the future.

K. *Twitter*. Twitter has not often been the highest ROI for building social cause campaigns. But with Trump's investment into the medium it is a platform worth considering significant investment in. Many of the BBB leaders are already active on Twitter which means we can quickly mobilize an organic twitter reach around key issues and also develop core potential audiences for paid marketing.

Target Demographics and Districts

Eighteen percent of voters, according to exit polls, held a negative view of both major candidates. That number is double what it was in 2012 and 4 times larger than the Bush-Kerry matchup of 2004 (in 2008 the question wasn't asked). Nearly 1 in 5 voters showed up to the polls with a negative view of both candidates and 49% of that group voted for Donald Trump.

Opinion of presidential candidate you voted for...

	Clinton	Trump	Other/No Answer
Strongly favor **41%**	53%	41%	6%
Have reservations **32%**	49%	48%	3%
Dislike opponents **25%**	39%	50%	11

Trump voters were [far more likely to express](#) that they voted for Trump because they "dislike opponents" and were much less likely to say that they "strongly favor" their candidate. Millions of Americans did not vote for Trump and his policies but against Clinton and their perception of her policies.

Our strategy will focus on targeting moderate to conservative voters who fit certain demographic similarities to typical Trump voters (high rates of church attendance and self-identification as evangelical) with other characteristics that might indicate conflicted feelings about their president elect (gender and educational attainment).

Potential Audience: Beth Moore Women

White, college educated, church attending evangelical women under the age of 55 are likely to experience significant cognitive dissonance between their membership in conflicting social and cultural groups. We believe that they are primed to resolve that dissonance through changing other attitudes and behaviors to distinguish themselves from other conservatives and Trump voters.

We call them "Beth Moore Women".

Beth Moore is one of the most popular evangelical women authors in America today. Millions of evangelical women use her Bible studies every year. After years of staying out of the political arena, she came out in opposition to Donald Trump. Her words, and the admonitions from other evangelical leaders, were not enough to change many white evangelical votes but it did reveal a deep level of concern with the candidate.

While these voters are not likely to switch partisan affiliation, many of these voters could still be persuadable to oppose their candidate on key issues, or help build a coalition that can redirect Trump's policy on immigration. This demographic regularly self organizes for Bible studies, pot luck dinners, child care responsibilities and educational activities for their children.

Potential Audience: International Aid Donors and Travelers

The presences of "child sponsorship programs" is nearly ubiquitous in the evangelical world. Most major Christian bands, tours and concert festivals are sponsored by international aid groups and asks to "sponsor a child" occur regularly in churches, Christian magazines and conference of any size.

In addition, it is almost seen as a "rite of passage" for a middle class young adult from an evangelical family to go on a "mission trip" to developing countries in Central and South America, Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe.

Unfortunately, the identity with which an evangelical shows concern for those in another country does not often translate to their concern for refugees from that country.

We believe a well targeted campaign to followers of major child sponsorship organizations and events will draw out this dissonance and help create a pool of activists who see the connection

between their child sponsorship work and immigration related crises like unaccompanied minors entering the United States.

Potential Audience: Rural Christians

These Christians are distinct from the categories above. Living in rural areas, they are less likely to be college educated and are lower income. Interests would likely be hunting and fishing, they drive pick-up trucks, own their own homes and think of Duck Dynasty as a show that displays Christian values.

They are more likely to attend smaller churches that may be associated with more progressive denominations and be served by moderate to progressive pastors even if most of the congregation is conservative.

This audience is less likely to become pro-reform advocates but it will be very possible to neutralize their opposition to reform and increase support. They are tuned to respond to similar religious messages and would be primed to shift their opinion through hearing the stories of farmers who rely on immigrants to sustain their family businesses.

Potential Audience: Mormons

Leadership within the LDS church, and many Mormons more generally, expressed a deep affinity for immigrants and refugees, along with a profound discomfort with Trump's immigration message. This population shares many of the same values and concerns as do white evangelicals. While similar messaging is highly effective, it is important to ensure that the messengers reflect the target audience.

<u>Open Questions</u>

Brand
When the end goal is action, the action page that people come to once they've been reached by the message is just as important as the initial message itself. It is essential to create a consistent and trust building brand experience throughout.

The research Margolis conducted demonstrated that a secular message to a religious audience can have a backlash effect. It is possible that a messaging campaign targeted at evangelicals would be less effective if associated with a secular brand. Being recruited by a religious message to a secular organization could be experienced by our target audience as a "bait and switch". These negative effects could be mitigated or eliminated by:
- Separate social media accounts and a different websites that deemphasizes the Forum's brand without eliminating it.
- Creating a related but separate brand like the Evangelical Immigration Table.
- Housing the campaign within a brand that already has trust and equity with the target audience.

Additional Research

Targeting moderate income, college educated evangelical women makes intuitive sense as these seem to be conflicting categories. However, we do not yet have the polling data to back up this hypothesis. Additional research on reported behaviors and attitudes of this demographic should be conducted and followed up with message testing to gauge willingness to take action.

While the Forum can feel confident in the general message developed by the EIT, there has not yet been the research done to determine which specific aspects of the message are most effective or phrasings resonate most with our target audiences. The Forum is in early discussions with Lifeway Research, a highly trusted research organization within the evangelical community.

Scalability
The effort will be most successful with robust and varied content to reach and then engage potential activists. However, it is also likely that the campaign will need to begin on a smaller scale (3 to 5 congressional districts) in order to prove effectiveness. Determining the level of initial investment into resource creation will be an important decision point.

Staffing
At a low level, it is possible to accomplish much of this work within the current staffing structure of the Forum while engaging outside help to add capacity and expertise over the short term. A longer project would likely need new internal staff capacity as well as substantial outside engagement.

One decision point will be whether or not the Forum engages and manages multiple contractors to run various aspects of the campaign or engages a larger firm that has internal capacity to run most aspects of the campaign themselves.

Conclusion

Republicans at-large, and Trump supporters in particular, are worried about the direction of the United States. They feel their children will not do better than them, that competition for jobs makes success harder to come by, that their personal security is at risk. Even though these voters remain in support of some sort of immigration reform, the fact is immigrants and immigration are a significant factor underlying these concerns.

Instead of ignoring their concerns, or just communicating with and through their grasstops leadership, we must develop strategies to communicate directly with these voters. Moving forward, our plan aims to engage this community based on their culture and values, methodically and respectfully dispel myths, and create opportunities for action.

Experience and data have shown that we can change hearts and minds. But we haven't moved these hearts and minds to take action. The cultivation and mobilization strategy we outline above is a conservative approach that we anticipate will take at least a year to fully implement; particularly in this unpredictable environment. Along the way, we are committed to a metrics-based, accountable, approach where we act on the lessons we have learned and share with our funders the experience we have gained.

In the end, whether it is to pass constructive reforms, defeat harmful measures or help Americans once again understand the value of immigrants and immigration to the nation, this approach is absolutely critical.

National Immigration Forum Action Fund
Budget Proposal for Grassroots Strategy
January 1, 2017 - December 31, 2017

Expense category	Budget for 5 Congressional Districts	Budget for 10 Congressional Districts	Budget for 50 Congressional Districts
Salaries[a]	67,963.53	102,183.67	159,894.09
Benefits[b]	18,350.15	27,589.59	43,171.40
Consultants[c]	164,400.00	300,500.00	760,500.00
Advertising and Media[d]	250,000.00	500,000.00	2,850,000.00
Travel & Conferences[e]	3,000.00	8,500.00	22,000.00
Editing & Printing[f]	0.00	0.00	2,000.00
Other Direct Costs[g]	300.00	500.00	37,040.00
Subtotal	**504,013.69**	**939,273.26**	**3,874,605.49**
Indirect Costs[h]	75,602.05	140,890.99	581,190.82
TOTAL	**$ 579,615.74**	**$ 1,080,164.25**	**$ 4,455,796.31**

a.	Salary for the National Immigration Forum staff.
b.	Fringe benefits for Forum staff.
c.	Costs associated with Forum consultants.
d.	Costs associated with radio and digital advertising.
e.	Travel and conference-related costs including participant travel and conference facilities, meals, A/V equipment, and other related expenses.
f.	Includes costs associated with layout, design, printing, and dissemination for online and print products and activities.
g.	Includes other miscellaneous costs directly related to the project including legal fees, postage and courier services.
h.	General and administrative charges allocated across the organization for costs incurred for its management and administration and calculated at 15% for this funder.

Appendix

Our Message and Why it Works

Immigration for many evangelicals has been an issue of "law and order", national security and immigrants who are subverting authority. The EIT message, however, reframes immigration as a problem of a bloated federal bureaucracy that restricts liberty, rips apart families and is a fundamental attack on the authoritative precepts of the Bible.

The research cited at the beginning of this plan didn't just show that the EIT messaging works, it demonstrated that secular messaging can create a backlash and unintentionally create opposition to immigration reform.

Messaging for the EIT was developed over the course of several years and combined a mix of feedback from evangelical leaders, organizers anecdotal reports on effectiveness and filtered through an understanding of moral psychology.

Liberal communications specialists, like Drew Westen, have long acknowledged that liberals and conservatives tend to respond to very different kinds of messages that resonate with different views on morality. Conservative social psychologist, Jonathan Haidt, created a useful framework in demonstrating these differences, especially when it comes to conservative audiences.

He predicates his work on the idea that **most moral decision making is not a process of logical argumentation. Rather, it begins with basic moral intuitions that are subconscious and then are justified by rational thought after a judgment has already been made.**

Haidt argues that every person has six areas of general moral intuitions but they tend to focus on different ones based partly on genetics, culture and personal experience.

Liberals, he argues, tend to focus on arguments around care/harm and fairness/cheating. Conservatives, rely more heavily on all 6 of these foundations. However, in working with evangelicals we have found that they tend to rely disproportionately on ideas of loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation.

In addition, we have found that people process moral arguments differently if they are primarily in the mindset of hearing a religious argument that appeals to their faith identity vs a political argument appealing to their partisan identity. While their partisan self may have already settled into a position of opposition, their religious self is likely neutral. Persuading the religious self can then change (or at least mute) the stance of the partisan self.

Once a framework of trust has been established through appealing to these basic moral intuitions, it is then possible to bolster this way of thinking through providing additional fact and policy based information.

How does this work?
A typical secular message focuses on how unfair the current immigration system is and the harm it causes to immigrants and legitimacy is given to the message through giving voice to immigrants themselves.

A standard EIT message often begins with credentialing of a shared faith (whether or not the person is an immigrant), tells the story of immigrant families trying to survive and stay together and always includes references to scripture as morally authoritative.

The EIT message starts by shifting the primary locus of authority from the federal government to religious beliefs and understanding of the Bible. It switches understanding of loyalty from being based in sharing a country of origin to sharing a common faith. It emphasizes the sanctity of the family and importance of maintaining that basic institution.

Once connection has been established with these core moral intuitions, we have found white evangelicals far more receptive to other fact based, policy oriented and even "fairness" and "harm" messaging.

As another example, arguments for immigrant "rights" don't often resonate with conservatives. Many liberals believe in an idea of "universal human rights". Governments should be evaluated for their legitimacy based upon their effectiveness of attaining and protecting these rights. However, many conservatives believe that "rights" are a construct of a nation state and when the sovereignty of that nation state is challenged or threatened than the very basis of being able to provide for any rights at all is also under attack.

So when a conservative hears talk of "rights" they immediately think of one of the foundational aspects of the nation that provides them with rights, the border. Talking about "rights" can often make a conservative feel more deeply about the need to protect the border in order to maintain their own rights.

However, many conservatives hold correlated ideas. They might not resonate with universal human rights but they do with the idea of the "image of God" being present in every human being and ensuring that every person is treated with dignity. For conservatives, the institution of marriage and their religious tradition also pre-exist the state. In areas where they feel the state fails to uphold and protect those institutions, they question the states legitimacy.

Grassroots change doesn't happen without grasstops leaders. But grasstop leaders aren't enough for grassroots change. Translating from grasstops support to grassroots action requires careful analysis of the most effective messaging, broad distribution of that message to shift consensus and an invitation to action that has clear and measurable results.

We have the leaders, the plan and the expertise. All we need are the resources. n