

## Dimensions of Constraint and Expansiveness

	"Temperature"—Style, Tone, Relationship to Ethical Evaluation	"Issue Links"—Relations among Political Issues	"Civil-Societal Links"—Connections between Politics and Civil-Societal Cultural Traditions
<i>Extremely expansive</i>	All judgments ethical, based on assertedly universal standards. Sacredness, passion, transcendence asserted constantly. <i>E.g., some utopian or sectarian groups, CCV at times</i>	All issues merged; organization has position on all. <i>E.g., Leninist parties</i>	Politics derived directly from general-purpose cultural traditions (i.e., ones that are not specifically political). <i>E.g., some in CCV, a little in faith-based organizing</i>
<i>Extremely constrained</i>	All talk about means, technique. Cool, instrumentalist. Less extreme form: relativism, where no standards claimed to be universal. <i>E.g., antiwar coalition at times</i>	All issues separate; organization excludes all discourse—internal and external—except on one issue. <i>E.g., antiwar coalition, Amnesty at times</i>	No connections made between political issues and civil-societal cultural traditions. <i>E.g., antiwar coalition, Amnesty at times</i>
<i>Synthesis or compromise</i>	Both kinds of talk happen; topics can be in one context questions of means and in another questions of ends. <i>E.g., faith-based organizing, Amnesty, Greens, CCV at times</i>	Integrated: people work on focused set of issues, don't expect others to have sane view on everything, but talk about connections to broader visions. <i>E.g., Greens, faith-based organizing and CCV at times</i>	Integrated: group creates political language and does social analysis but talks about connections to civil-societal traditions. <i>E.g., faith-based organizing, Amnesty at times</i>
<i>Dangers of extremely expansive discourse</i>	No good analysis of effective means. Politics easily becomes pure witness. Intolerance, absolutism possible. Hard to cooperate with cultural others	No focus, loss of efficacy; or else issues combined in totalizing way (as in sectarian groups)	Can violate tolerance required in multicultural society. Narrows potential constituency. Hard to do political analysis so proposals may be unrealistic
<i>Dangers of extremely constrained discourse</i>	Passion and energy reduced. Issues of purpose black-boxed. Easy to lose sight of implicit ultimate ends, become opportunist. Only narrow appeals possible outside the group	Reduces available passion and energy. May help achieve organization's immediate goals while not advancing broader social change purposes of participants	No way to draw in now-yet-political people. Nonindividualistic strands of civil-societal traditions don't help progressive politics. Black-boxes why people really care about political issues