

006 Why stories of trauma 痛苦经历，挫折；精神创伤，心理创伤 don't create change 为什么创伤的故事不能带来改变

Table of Contents

- [1. 本文核心观点](#)
 - [2. 释义](#)
 - [3. pure](#)
-

1. 本文核心观点

任何讲述真人的故事，都会让人不自觉的将自己代入这三种角色中：

- 1.我们进入了"受害者身份" (入戏了)，感同身受他们。
- 2.我们可怜他们，想要救助他们，进入了"救助者身份"。
- 3.我们开始追责，成为了"责备者身份"。

但事实上，你应该跳脱于仅仅这三者的身份，而应该成为"谋事者身份"，"专家身份"。即，你应该思考，并提出自己的建议"你如何解决这个问题？"

2. 释义

Growing up in the 80s, I was obsessed (a.) with 痴迷于；着迷于 the Superman movies. I just wanted to be Lois Lane so much. You can imagine **how excited** 激动的，兴奋的 **I was** when I got my first real job in the media 新闻媒体，传媒, working for a **national news program** 全国新闻节目 here in London. To be a good journalist, I knew I had to channel (v.)引导；把...导入 my inner 内心的 Lois. I had to work (v.) really fast, I had to work really well under intense 强烈的；紧张的 pressure 压力, and I had to be ruthless 无情的；残忍的 when chasing a story.

And I discovered that I was really bad at **all of those things**. So, I didn't last (v.) too long in the newsroom 新闻编辑部. But I did get a brilliant insight 洞察力；领悟 into how the media works (v.). When we would cover (v.)报道；电视报道 issues like poverty, 主 stories of pain and trauma 创伤；精神创伤系 were always more likely to make it on air 在广播中. That's because they grab 抓住；吸引 people's attention.

When I moved to campaigning 竞选活动 for journalism, I realized that we campaigners (n.) (尤指政治或社会变革的) 运动领导者，运动参加者 are just **as** hooked (a.) on 沉迷于；迷恋于 those stories **as** our journalists are, because they are very effective 有效的；有作用的 at creating awareness 意识；认识. But here's the catch 陷阱；隐藏的困难: as campaigners, we don't just want (v.) awareness 意识；认识, we want change. And although stories of pain move (v.) us, they **over time** 随着时间的过去,久而久之 leave us feeling hopeless and stuck.

And that's what I want to talk to you about today. Why is it that we communicators 沟通的人；交流者 are so hooked (a.) on 沉迷于；迷恋于 these stories? Is it because they drive (v.) engagement 参与；互动, or is it because there's something deeper **going on** with us 我们自身的某种心理? These are the questions that have really guided (v.) 引领；指导 my work over the last 20 years, as I've explored **different ways** of telling stories **that** don't just create (v.) awareness 意识；认识 but **that** inspire 激励；鼓舞 action and hope.

Example 1. 案例

这里的 "going on with us" 可以理解为 “在我们身上发生的事情” 或 “我们自身的某种心理或情感状态”。

在这句话中，演讲者在探讨：“我们传播者为什么如此沉迷于这些痛苦的故事？是因为它们能带来关注，还是因为在我们自身的某种更深层次的心理机制在起作用？”

Right now, in terms of 就...而言 all the media that we consume 消费；消耗, and I know you're going **to relate** (v.) 能够理解并同情；了解；体恤；涉及；与...相关；谈到 to this, we are swimming in what I think should be the F-word of communications. Can you guess? Fatalism 宿命论；听天由命. Fatalism 宿命论；听天由命 makes us **think (v.) like** nothing will change, and **there's no point** 没意义 even trying. 甚至尝试都没有意义。

In 2012, the NSPCC commissioned (v.) 委托；委任 some research —that's the UK's leading (a.) **child abuse prevention** charity 慈善组织，慈善机构—and it showed that 主 **the majority of us** in the UK 系 are aware of **how widespread** 广泛的；普遍的 and **horrific** 可怕的；令人震惊的 **child abuse is**, largely **due to** the way 后定 campaigns (有计划的) 活动，运动 have told stories over the years. But it showed that we are hopeless, we are overwhelmed (v.) 被...压倒；不堪重负 by the magnitude 大小；重要性 of the issue, and we don't really feel like anything can be done to change it.

And fatalism 宿命论；听天由命 is a big problem for us as campaigners because if the public feels (v.) hopeless about an issue, there just isn't the energy or the appetite 欲望；胃口 to push (v.) for change. And it was about 12 years ago that I realized, I think my work is actually a part of the problem.

I had set up a charity 慈善组织，慈善机构 called Here (机构名) in 2008, which now **takes an issue** like climate and **works (v.) with** TV producers and campaigners **to make sure** that stories **land (v.)** 终于到达（某位置）；最终落到（某种处境） **in** a way that audiences feel (v.) change is possible. But in the early days, one of our first projects was working with survivors of sexual abuse 性虐待.

I remember this moment so clearly. We were doing some media training 媒体培训, and we were working with a campaigner called Jane, who **was and is still pushing** (向某人) 反复要求，施压争取 **for** greater transparency 透明度；公开性 in how the church handles (v.) 处理，应付（局势、人、工作或感情） reporting (n.) of abuse. We were doing media training, and our media training did have a real focus on **pastoral** 牧师的；教士的 **care** 牧师关怀 and boundaries 边界；界限 and safety, but we relied on 依赖；依靠 the same approach that I

had learned in journalism, which was **to lead with** 把 (某條新聞) 放在 (新聞報導或報紙的) 最顯要位置 a focus on what happened, because we knew journalists would **lead with** that—that's what they'd want to ask.

Example 2. 案例

push for sth' | push sb for sth

to repeatedly ask for sth or try to make sth happen because you think it is very important
(向某人) 反复要求, 施压争取...

- The pressure group is pushing for a ban on GM foods. 压力集团正强烈要求取缔转基因食品。
- I'm going to have to push you for an answer. 我将不得不催促你答复了。

lead (v.) with something

to put a particular story first or in the most important position in a news report or newspaper 把 (某條新聞) 放在 (新聞報導或報紙的) 最顯要位置

- The Times **leads (v.) with** the coming mayoral elections. 《泰晤士報》以即將開始的市長選舉作為頭條新聞。

So, we asked that question of Jane, and she told her story, and it was incredibly 难以置信地 ; 非常地 powerful and moving. But by the time she got to her call (n.) for change 呼吁改变, she was feeling (v.) **emotionally (ad.) drained** 精疲力尽的 ; 耗尽的, and we were all feeling it with her. In terms of 就...而言 our emotional experience as her audience, it was **the detail of her trauma** 创伤 ; 精神创伤 that stuck with us, whereas (表示对比) 但是 , 然而 her insight 洞察力 ; 领悟 and her ideas and her solutions **sort of** 有点儿 **got lost**.

And I thought to myself, this is how we audiences feel all the time, you know, when we're scrolling (v.) 滚屏 ; 滚动 or we're watching the news. And so, it was a negative experience for Jane, but also, her message wasn't even **landing (v.) in** the way that she wanted to.

So, we tried something different, and we asked her, let's do this interview again, but this time, acknowledge (v.) 承认 ; 认可 your experience as you did before, but then **pivot (v.) 转向 ; 以...为中心 quickly to** the broader picture 更广泛的视角 to get the audience's focus (n.) on where you want this interview to go. And **I'm going to play you a short clip** to show you **what that initial response sounded (v.) like**.

"Could you tell us a little bit about what happened to you?"

Jane: "Well, I'm a survivor of abuse by a member of the clergy (总称) 神职人员. And 主 what I realized when I've met with other survivors of clerical abuse 系 is that it doesn't just affect you as a person, it affects your beliefs, and particularly your belief in God, and your trust in the church. And I think that's the same as 与...一样 with other institutions 机构 , 团体. You know, you go to the doctor and you expect (v.) that you will be helped and that they'll keep you safe, and you send your child to school and you expect (v.) that the teacher will look after them. And if something bad happens, then you **lose (v.) trust** in that institution. And we need to trust (v.) our institutions because they're there to look after us."

So, Jane does three things here which are really important. She acknowledges (v.)承认；认可 her experience, then she zooms out 拉远镜头；扩大视野 and **refers to** 提及 other survivors, so emotionally her audience can't dismiss (v.)驳回；不予考虑 this as a one-off (n.)偶然事件；一次性事件, which is what we do to protect ourselves. Then she makes it **relatable (a.)有关系的；可关联的；使产生共鸣；使人有认同感** to anyone listening by **referring to** schools and doctors. We still know and **care about** her suffering —this is not sugar-coating (涂层，覆盖层) 糖果塗層，糖衣，巧言粉飾；粉飾；掩盖, this is about focus. Jane now 使动 **has** our **focus (v.) on** where she wants us to go —in this case, this is about the steps that institutions **need to take** in order to regain (v.)重获；恢复 our trust. And it feels much better for Jane.

主 This shift **from leading with** 以.....开始 **pain to leading with universal relevance** 普遍相关性；普遍适用性 谓 made me rethink (v.)重新思考；重新考虑 our approach to storytelling and campaigning 参加竞选活动. And it also made me wonder (v.): why is it that, given 考虑到；如果，倘若 the research that's out there—like the NSPCC 英国全国防止虐待儿童学会 (=National Society 社团，协会 for the Prevention of Cruelty (n.)残酷，残忍；不公，虐待 to Children) report, and there are many other studies that show the same thing on **all sorts of** issues —that 主 **trauma-focused** 创伤聚焦的；以创伤为重点的 **campaigning** 谓 does not work (v.) in the way **that we think it does?** Why then do we keep focusing on trauma 创伤；精神创伤 in our communications 表达；交流；交际；传递? What's making us **pull** (v.)拉，拽；拖动 our campaigns, our campaigners like Jane, and our audiences **into** what's known as **the drama triangle?**

I think 主 understanding more about ourselves 系 is really key here. Cartman's drama triangle —some of you will be familiar with this—it's a very popular idea used in psychotherapy 心理疗法；心理治疗 to understand unhealthy communication dynamics 动态；动力 in our personal relationships and our work relationships. You know, we all do it, and there are three roles: victim 受害者，罹难者, rescuer 救助者, and persecutor 虐待者；迫害者；迫害人. I'm using an adapted 改编的；适应的 version that I think works (v.) better in this context.

Now, these roles —we can all assume (v.)承担；假定 them, usually at times of anxiety 焦虑；不安 and stress.

① When we are in **sufferer mode**, we are problem-focused —right? We feel like something is happening to us, and we can't **get out of** 逃避,改掉,摆脱 the situation.

② When we are in **rescuer mode**, we feel like other people are in need of our help, whether that's true or not, and we need **to go in and sort (v.)理顺；整理 everything out** —that's our job, that's our role. I can sense (v.)感觉到，觉察到 the nods 点头 in the room —I know this audience.

③ And the third role is **blamer** 责怪他人 **mode**. So, no judgment 判断，看法；判断力，识别力 —I'm pretty sure I was in blamer mode this morning because I couldn't find my charger 充电器 on the way here. And blamer mode is when you're mobilized by 动员；调动 anger —it's someone else's fault, and you want to control the situation.

Example 3. 案例

sort (v.) sth ↔ 'out

(1) (informal) to organize the contents of sth; to tidy sth 理顺 ; 整理

•The cupboards need **sorting out**. 柜橱该整理一下了。

(2) to organize sth successfully 把...安排好

•If you' re going to the bus station, can you sort out the tickets for tomorrow? 你要去汽车站的话, 能不能把明天的车票买好?

sort (v.) itself 'out

(of a problem 问题) to stop being a problem without anyone having to take action 自行化解

•It will all **sort itself out** in the end. 问题最后都会自行解决。

So, none of 任何一个都不 these roles —they' re not inherently 本质上 ; 固有地 bad. We all bounce (v.) between 往返于 ; 交替于 them, even in the same conversation. But the thing is, if we' re consistently 始终如一地 ; 一贯地 having (v.) conversations (非正式) 交谈 , 谈话 in the drama triangle, we' re trapped in 被困于 ; 陷入 anxiety 焦虑 ; 不安, and we can' t get out.

Now, this is helpful to understand more about ourselves, but I think it' s really interesting if we look at our communication strategies 交流策略 through this lens. And here' s why: when we create a campaign —whether we' re a journalist or a fundraiser 资金筹集人 or a campaigner —and when we work with a campaigner like Jane, and when we **lead with** 以.....开始 a focus on what happened to her —the detail of her trauma 创伤 ; 精神创伤—we are essentially 本质上 ; 基本上 casting (v.) 扮演 ; 选派 Jane and her message in the sufferer role, even though she wants to be talking about solutions. You know, *sufferer role* is problem-focused.

The same applies (v.) 应用 , 运用 if we create a message about how bad the climate crisis is, and we **lead with** the focus on how awful things are —it' s in the sufferer role. And so, I think our audiences —we are dragging them into 把...拖入 ; 强行拉入 the drama triangle too by **leading with** this information. We do it intentionally 有意地 ; 故意地 because we think it' s going to move (v.) people —you know, we have good intentions 目的 , 意向 , 意图 ; 打算. But faced with 面对 ; 面临 a message that makes you feel fearful or anxious 焦虑的 ; 不安的, as the audience, you' ve got limited options here. You might **feel like** a rescuer —like, “Oh, how awful, those poor people, how terrible” —so pity 怜悯 ; 同情 —that' s in *rescuer mode*. Or you might feel angry and overwhelmed 被...压倒 ; 不堪重负 by what you' re hearing —like, “Whose fault 错误 ; 责任 , 过错 is this?” or “That wouldn' t happen to me —you know, I wouldn' t have done that.” You' re mobilized by 动员 ; 调动 anger.

But what if we could escape (v.) *the drama triangle* in our communications? David Emerald designed the *empowerment* 许可 , 授权 *dynamic* (n.a.) —in his words, 作为 as a **place to go** if you want to get out of 摆脱 drama in your relationships. And I think this is interesting. Instead of 代替 , 而不是 the sufferer role, he has *the creator role*. This is where Jane was in the clip that I just showed you. When we are in creator —and this is Jane —you acknowledge (v.) 承认 ; 认可 the problem —yeah, we' re not sugar-coating 粉饰 ; 掩盖 anything, we acknowledge (v.) it—but we **lead with** solutions.

When we're in creator, we know how to speak in a way that people can hear us—not necessarily 不一定；未必 that they'll agree with our solutions, this isn't about consensus 一致意见；共识, this is about dialogue 对话；交流. And so, **in response to** a creator in a conversation, you might respond creatively (ad.) 创造性地；有创造力地 too, or you might respond (v.) as 以.....身份；当作；像, 如同 coach 教练—so not rescuer 救助者, you're not **swooping (v.) in** 突然袭击；猛扑 to solve things. Coach, Emerald describes (v.) as supportive 支持的；鼓励的 and curious 好奇的；求知的. Or we might respond (v.) as challenger 挑战者—not mobilized by 动员；调动 anger like blamer, challenger is analytical 分析的；善于分析的, open-minded 思想开明的；乐于接受新思想的, inquisitive 好奇的；爱钻研的. Challenger can push, but it's constructive 建设性的；有益的. There is positive energy here in the empowerment 挑战者 dynamic.

And when we look at our communication strategies through this lens, I think that audiences can receive messages like climate that they don't feel like this unstoppable 不可阻挡的；无法遏制的 disaster 灾难；灾祸 that we have no control over 控制；支配；征服, but instead, we can see them as challenges. I mean, these are big challenges, but we can engage with 参与；从事 them because we can actually hear what's required.

And I also think that 主 campaigners like Jane—and I've met hundreds of them—campaigners like Jane 谓 are no longer seen solely 唯一地；单独地 through the lens of 通过... 的视角 injustice 不公正；不公平. They're seen for the experts that they are—with insight 洞察力；领悟, ideas, solutions, creativity 创造力；创意. Their trauma 创伤；精神创伤 isn't mined (v.) for 挖掘；开采 clicks, and the emotions of our audiences aren't being manipulated 操纵；控制 for clicks. Instead, we're able to engage and feel a sense of what's possible.

And I've seen this approach work (v.) again and again. 主 A recent example that I absolutely love 系 is *Breast Cancer* 乳腺癌 Now's *Gallery* 美术馆, 画廊 of *Hope* campaign. In this campaign, they show beautiful photography of women with incurable 无法治愈的；不治的 cancer, and generated by AI, they show (v.) future photographs of *them in the future* that they hope (v.) to have (因为她们得了乳腺癌, 活不到未来, 所以她们希望看到自己未来的模样, 这些照片就用AI来生成了)/because of the research that's happening right now (这里的 research 可能指乳腺癌研究). And these interviews 访谈；面试；面谈 with these women—these are still personal stories, they still **get the hairs on the back of your neck standing up** 让你脖子后面的汗毛都竖起来 and *the tears in your eyes*, but this time, it's not because you're so overwhelmed (v.) 情感) 难以禁受；被...压倒；不堪重负 with how awful it is—it's because you are moved by 被...感动；受...影响 what's possible, by the future *that we all want* (v.).

主 Another example of escape (v.) from *the drama triangle* that **resulted in** 导致；造成 a **change** in legislation 立法；法律 系 was Ireland's *equal* 相同的；平等的 *marriage* campaign. I met the campaigners there—they got together 相聚在一起, and they made a conscious (a.) 有意识的；自觉的 decision that **instead of** 代替, 而不是 spotlighting (v.) 突出显示；强调

trauma 创伤；精神创伤 and injustice 不公正；不公平, they would focus on sharing (v.) stories of acceptance 接受；认可.

For example, they 使动 **had** grannies 奶奶；外婆 and grandads 爷爷；外公 across the country **share** (v.) videos about their grandchildren 孙子；孙（女），外孙（女）—they 爷爷奶奶们 just wanted them 孙辈们 to have **the same rights** to marriage (v.) **that** they 爷爷奶奶们 had.

这些爷爷奶奶们只是希望他们的孙辈能够拥有与他们自己一样的婚姻权利。

The NSPCC 英国全国防止虐待儿童学会 research, and many other studies like it, show that stories of pain —whether they’ re personal stories or whether they’ re vivid 生动的；逼真的 depictions 描述；描绘 of a problem —they’ re very good at creating awareness 意识；认识, but they’ re highly likely to 极有可能 leave (v.) audiences emotionally reaching for their coats 伸手去拿大衣, even if they donate 捐赠；捐献, even if they’ re now **more aware of** the problem than they were before.

But when we treat (v.)以...态度对待；以...方式对待 our audiences and don’ t traumatize (v.)使受创伤；使精神受到严重打击 them, we leave them engaged 参与的；投入的, leaning (v.) in 倾身向前；专心听讲, ready to learn. So, here’ s my invitation （口头或书面的）邀请 to you: the next time you craft (v.)精心制作；设计 a campaign or a newsletter （机构定期寄发给成员的）通讯，简报, or the next time you have a **challenging conversation** with a loved one or a colleague 同事，同僚, ask yourself, “Which triangle am I in —drama or empowerment 权利赋予？ Am I leaving my **intended audience** 目标受众 feeling defensive 防御的；戒备的 and anxious 焦虑的；不安的, or am I leaving them feeling curious 好奇的；求知的 and engaged 参与的；投入的？”

Because if you, like me, are passionate (a.) about 热衷于；对...有强烈感情 creating a healthier and more just (a.)正义的，公平的；应得的，合理的 future, we can’ t just be **in the business of** 从事...的业务；以...为主要目的（业务） awareness 意识；认识—we have to be **in the business of** change. Thank you so much.

在80年代长大的我，对《超人》电影非常着迷。我多么想成为露易丝·莱恩。你可以想象，当我在伦敦得到第一份真正的工作，为一家全国新闻节目工作时，我有多兴奋。为了成为一名好记者，我知道我必须激发内心的露易丝。我必须工作得非常快，必须在巨大的压力下表现出色，并且在追逐新闻时必须无情。

然而，我发现我在所有这些方面都非常糟糕。所以，我在新闻编辑室没待多久。但我确实对媒体的运作方式有了深刻的洞察。当我们报道贫困等问题时，痛苦和创伤的故事，总是更有可能被播出。这是因为它们能吸引人们的注意力。

当我转向新闻倡导时，我意识到我们“倡导者”和记者一样，对这些故事上瘾，因为它们非常有效地创造了意识。但问题是：作为倡导者，我们不仅仅想要意识，我们想要改变。虽然痛苦的故事感动了我们，但随着时间的推移，它们让我们感到绝望和停滞。

这就是我今天想和大家讨论的问题。为什么我们这些传播者如此迷恋这些故事？是因为它们能推动参与，还是因为我们内心深处有些更深层次的东西在作祟？这些问题在过去20年里一直指导着我的工作，我探索了不同的讲故事方式，这些方式不仅能创造意识，还能激发行动和希望。

现在，就我们所消费的所有媒体而言，我知道你们也会有同感，我们正沉浸在我认为是传播中的“F词”中。你能猜到吗？宿命论。**宿命论让我们认为什么都不会改变，甚至尝试都没有意义。**

2012年，NSPCC委托进行了一项研究——这是英国领先的“防止儿童虐待”的慈善机构——研究表明，我们大多数人都意识到儿童虐待的普遍性和可怕性，这主要归功于多年来宣传活动讲述故事的方式。但它也表明，我们感到绝望，被问题的巨大性所压倒，并且我们真的觉得无法改变它。

宿命论对我们倡导者来说是一个大问题，因为如果公众对某个问题感到绝望，那么就没有动力或兴趣去推动改变。大约12年前，我意识到，我认为我的工作，实际上也是问题的一部分。

我在2008年成立了一个名为“Here”的慈善机构，它现在处理诸如气候等问题，并与电视制片人和倡导者合作，确保故事以让观众感到改变可能的方式呈现。但在早期，我们的第一个项目之一是与性虐待的幸存者合作。

我清楚地记得那一刻。我们正在进行一些媒体培训，与一位名叫简的倡导者合作，她一直在推动教会如何处理虐待报告的更大透明度。我们进行了媒体培训，我们的培训确实非常注重教牧关怀、界限和安全，但我们依赖于我在新闻学中学到的相同方法，即关注发生了什么，因为我们知道记者会首先关注这一点——这是他们想问的。

所以，我们问了简这个问题，她讲述了她的故事，非常有力且感人。但当她谈到呼吁改变时，她感到情感上筋疲力尽，我们也和她一样感同身受。作为她的观众，我们的情感体验是，**她的创伤细节让我们印象深刻，而她的见解、想法和解决方案，却被忽视了。**

我心想，这就是我们作为观众的感受，你知道，当我们滚动浏览或观看新闻时。所以，**这对简来说是一次负面体验，而且她的信息，甚至没有以她想要的方式传达。**

于是，我们尝试了不同的方法，我们让她重新做一次采访，但这次先承认她的经历，然后迅速转向更广泛的画面，让观众的注意力集中在她希望采访去的地方。我接下来会播放一段简的采访片段，展示这种转变的效果。

我：“你能告诉我们一些关于你经历的事情吗？”

简：“嗯，我是一名遭到神职人员性虐待的幸存者。当我与其他遭神职人员性虐待的幸存者见面时，我意识到这不仅影响了我个人，还影响了我的信仰，尤其是对上帝的信仰，以及对教会的信任。我认为这与其他机构的情况是一样的。你知道，你去医院时，你期望得到帮助并确保安全，你送孩子去学校时，你期望老师会照顾好他们。如果发生不好的事情，你就会失去对这些机构的信任。我们需要信任这些机构，因为它们的存在是为了保护我们。”

简在这里做了三件非常重要的事情。她首先承认了自己的经历，然后扩大视野，提到了其他幸存者，这样，她的观众在情感上，无法将这件事视为个例，从而保护自己。接着，她通过提到学校和医生，让她的故事与任何人产生共鸣。我们仍然知道并关心她的痛苦——这不是粉饰，而是关于聚焦。简现在将我们的注意力集中在她希望我们去的地方——在这种情况下，这是关于机构需要采取的步骤，以重新获得我们的信任。这对简来说感觉好多了。

这种**从“以个人痛苦为主导”，转向“以普遍相关性为主导”的转变**，让我重新思考了我们在讲故事和倡导中的方法。这也让我不禁思考：既然有像NSPCC报告这样的研究，还有许多其他研究在各种问题上都表明，“以创伤为中心的倡导”并不像我们想象的那样有效，为什么我们仍然在传播中专注于创伤？是什么让我们将我们的活动、像简这样的倡导者，以及我们的观众，拉入了所谓的“戏剧三角”？

我认为，更深入地了解自己是这里的关键。卡普曼的戏剧三角——你们中的一些人可能熟悉这个概念——它是一种非常流行的心理学理论，用于理解“个人关系”和“工作关系”中不健康的沟通动态。你知道，我们都会这样做，其中**有三个角色：受害者、救助者和迫害者**。我使用了一个更适合这个语境的改编版本。

现在，**这些角色——我们都会在焦虑和压力时，扮演它们。**

→ **当我们处于“受害者模式”时**，我们是问题导向的——对吧？我们觉得有些事情发生在我们身上，我们无法摆脱这种局面。

→ **当我们处于救“助者模式”时**，我们觉得其他人需要我们的帮助，无论这是否属实，我们需要介入并解决一切——这是我们的工作，这是我们的角色。我能感觉到房间里的点头——我知道这个观众。

→ **第三个角色是“责备者模式”**。所以，不做评判——我很确定我今天早上因为找不到充电器，而处于责备者模式。“责备者模式”是你被愤怒驱动——将错误归于别人，你想控制局面。

所以，这些角色——它们本质上并不坏。我们都会在同一个对话中，在不同的角色之间切换。但问题是，如果我们持续在“戏剧三角”中进行对话，我们就会陷入焦虑，无法摆脱。

现在，这对理解我们自己很有帮助，但我觉得，如果通过这个视角来看我们的传播策略，会非常有趣。原因如下：**当我们创建一个活动——无论我们是记者、筹款人还是倡导者——当我们与像简这样的倡导者合作，当我们专注于她身上发生的事情——她的创伤细节——我们本质上，是在将简和她的信息，置于受害者角色。即使她想要的，是“谈论解决方案”。**你知道，受害者角色是“问题导向”的。

同样的情况，也适用于我们创建一个关于“气候危机有多糟糕”的信息，并专注于事情有多可怕——它处于受害者角色。因此，我认为我们的观众——我们通过传递这些信息，也将他们拉入了戏剧三角。我们这样做是

有意的，因为我们认为这会感动人们——你知道，我们的意图是好的。但面对让你感到恐惧或焦虑的信息，作为观众，你的选择是有限的。你可能会感到像“救助者”——比如，“哦，太糟糕了，那些可怜的人，太可怕了”——所以怜悯——这是“救助者模式”。或者你可能会感到愤怒（即处在“责备者模式”），并被你所听到的内容所压倒——比如，“这是谁的错？”或“这不会发生在我身上——你知道，我不会那样做。”你被愤怒驱动。

但如果我们可以摆脱传播中的“戏剧三角色”呢？大卫·埃默里德设计了“赋能动态”——用他的话说，这是一个如果你想摆脱关系中的戏剧，可以去的地方。我觉得这很有趣。他并没有使用“受害者角色”，而是使用了“创造者角色”（即专家模式，谋事者模式）。这就是简在我刚才展示的片段中所处的角色。当我们处于“创造者模式”时——这就是简——你承认问题——是的，我们不是在粉饰任何事情，我们承认它——但我们以“解决方案”为主导（我们的目的不是在诉苦，而是在探讨解决方案）。

当我们处于“创造者模式”时，我们知道如何以一种人们可以听到我们声音的方式说话——不一定是他们会同意我们的解决方案，这不是关于“共识”，这是关于“对话”。因此，在回应“创造者”的对话中，你可能会以创造性的方式回应，或者你可能会以教练的身份回应——所以不是救助者，你不是突然介入解决问题。埃默里德将“教练”描述为支持和好奇的。或者我们可能会以“挑战者”的身份回应——不像“责备者”那样被愤怒驱动，挑战者是分析的、开放的、好奇的。挑战者可以推动，但它是建设性的。赋能动态中有积极的能量。

当我们通过这个视角，来看我们的传播策略时，我认为观众可以接收到像“气候”这样的信息，他们不会觉得这是一个无法阻止的灾难，我们无法控制，而是我们可以将它们视为挑战。我的意思是，这些都是巨大的挑战，但我们可以参与其中，因为我们实际上可以听到需要做什么。

我也认为，像简这样的倡导者——我见过数百个——他们不再仅仅通过不公正的视角被看待。他们被视为专家——拥有洞察力、想法、解决方案和创造力。他们的创伤不再被挖掘来获取点击，我们观众的情绪也不再被操纵来获取点击。相反，我们能够参与并感受到解决问题的可能性。

我已经看到这种方法一次又一次地奏效。一个我绝对喜欢的最近的例子是“乳腺癌现在”的“希望画廊”活动。在这个活动中，他们展示了患有无法治愈的癌症的女性的美丽照片，并通过AI生成了她们未来希望拥有的照片，因为现在正在进行的研究。这些女性的采访——这些仍然是个人故事，它们仍然会让你毛骨悚然，眼泪在眼眶中打转，但这一次，不是你被事情的可怕所压倒，而是因为你被“能解决问题的可能性”所感动，被我们所有人都想要的未来所感动。

另一个摆脱戏剧三角，并导致立法改变的例子，是爱尔兰的“平等婚姻”活动。我遇到了那里的倡导者——他们聚在一起，做出了一个明确的决定，即不再聚焦创伤和不公正，而是专注于分享“接受的故事”。例如，他们让全国各地的爷爷奶奶，分享关于他们孙辈的视频——他们只是希望他们拥有与自己相同的婚姻权利。

NSPCC的研究，以及许多类似的研究表明，痛苦的故事——无论是个人故事，还是对问题的生动描述——它们非常善于创造意识，但它们很可能会让观众在情感上想要逃离，即使他们捐款，即使他们现在比之前更了解这个问题。

但当我们善待观众，而不是让他们受到创伤时，我们会让他们保持参与，愿意倾听，并准备好学习。所以，我在这里邀请你们：下次你们策划一个活动或撰写新闻稿时，或者下次你们与亲人或同事进行一场艰难的对话时，问问自己，“我处于哪个三角——戏剧还是赋能？我是否让我的目标观众感到防御和焦虑，还是让他们感到好奇和参与？”

因为如果你们像我一样，热衷于创造一个更健康、更公正的未来，我们不能仅仅停留在仅情感意识的层面——我们必须致力于改变。非常感谢。

3. pure

Growing up in the 80s, I was obsessed with the Superman movies. I just wanted to be Lois Lane so much. You can imagine how excited I was when I got my first real job in the media, working for a national news program here in London. To be a good journalist, I knew I had to channel my inner Lois. I had to work really fast, I had to work really well under intense pressure, and I had to be ruthless when chasing a story.

And I discovered that I was really bad at all of those things. So, I didn't last too long in the newsroom. But I did get a brilliant insight into how the media works. When we would cover issues like poverty, stories of pain and trauma were always more likely to make it on air. That's because they grab people's attention.

When I moved to campaigning for journalism, I realized that we campaigners are just as hooked on those stories as our journalists are, because they are very effective at creating awareness. But here's the catch: as campaigners, we don't just want awareness, we want change. And although stories of pain move us, they over time leave us feeling hopeless and stuck.

And that's what I want to talk to you about today. Why is it that we communicators are so hooked on these stories? Is it because they drive engagement, or is it because there's something deeper going on with us? These are the questions that have really guided my work over the last 20 years, as I've explored different ways of telling stories that don't just create awareness but that inspire action and hope.

Right now, in terms of all the media that we consume, and I know you're going to relate to this, we are swimming in what I think should be the F-word of communications. Can you guess? Fatalism. Fatalism makes us think like nothing will change, and there's no point even trying.

In 2012, the NSPCC commissioned some research—that's the UK's leading child abuse prevention charity—and it showed that the majority of us in the UK are aware of how widespread and horrific child abuse is, largely due to the way campaigns have told stories over the years. But it showed that we are hopeless, we are overwhelmed by the magnitude of the issue, and we don't really feel like anything can be done to change it.

And fatalism is a big problem for us as campaigners because if the public feels hopeless about an issue, there just isn't the energy or the appetite to push for change. And it was about 12 years ago that I realized, I think my work is actually a part of the problem.

I had set up a charity called Here in 2008, which now takes an issue like climate and works with TV producers and campaigners to make sure that stories land in a way that audiences feel change is possible. But in the early days, one of our first projects was working with survivors of sexual abuse.

I remember this moment so clearly. We were doing some media training, and we were working with a campaigner called Jane, who was and is still pushing for greater transparency in how the church handles reporting of abuse. We were doing media training, and our media training did have a real focus on pastoral care and boundaries and safety, but we relied on the same approach that I had learned in journalism, which was to lead with a focus on what happened, because we knew journalists would lead with that—that's what they'd want to ask.

So, we asked that question of Jane, and she told her story, and it was incredibly powerful and moving. But by the time she got to her call for change, she was feeling emotionally drained, and we were all feeling it with her. In terms of our emotional experience as her audience, it was the detail of her trauma that stuck with us, whereas her insight and her ideas and her solutions sort of got lost.

And I thought to myself, this is how we audiences feel all the time, you know, when we're scrolling or we're watching the news. And so, it was a negative experience for Jane, but also, her message wasn't even landing in the way that she wanted to.

So, we tried something different, and we asked her, let's do this interview again, but this time, acknowledge your experience as you did before, but then pivot quickly to the broader picture to get the audience's focus on where you want this interview to go. And I'm going to play you a short clip to show you what that initial response sounded like.

Jane: "Could you tell us a little bit about what happened to you?" Jane: "Well, I'm a survivor of abuse by a member of the clergy. And what I realized when I've met with other survivors of clerical abuse is that it doesn't just affect you as a person, it affects your beliefs, and particularly your belief in God, and your trust in the church. And I think that's the same as with other institutions. You know, you go to the doctor and you expect that you will be helped and that they'll keep you safe, and you send your child to school and you expect that the teacher will look after them. And if something bad happens, then you lose trust in that institution. And we need to trust our institutions because they're there to look after us."

So, Jane does three things here which are really important. She acknowledges her experience, then she zooms out and refers to other survivors, so emotionally her audience can't dismiss this as a one-off, which is what we do to protect ourselves. Then she makes it relatable to anyone listening by referring to schools and doctors. We still know and care about her suffering—this is not sugar-coating, this is about focus. Jane now has our focus on where she wants us to go—in this case, this is about the steps that institutions need to take in order to regain our trust. And it feels much better for Jane.

This shift from leading with pain to leading with universal relevance made me rethink our approach to storytelling and campaigning. And it also made me wonder: why is it that, given the research that's out there—like the NSPCC report, and there are many other studies that show the same thing on all sorts of issues—that trauma-focused campaigning does not work in the way that we think it does? Why then do we keep focusing on trauma in our communications? What's making us pull our campaigns, our campaigners like Jane, and our audiences into what's known as the drama triangle?

I think understanding more about ourselves is really key here. Cartman's drama triangle—some of you will be familiar with this—it's a very popular idea used in psychotherapy to understand unhealthy communication dynamics in our personal relationships and our work

relationships. You know, we all do it, and there are three roles: victim, rescuer, and persecutor. I' m using an adapted version that I think works better in this context.

Now, these roles—we can all assume them, usually at times of anxiety and stress. When we are in sufferer mode, we are problem-focused—right? We feel like something is happening to us, and we can' t get out of the situation. When we are in rescuer mode, we feel like other people are in need of our help, whether that' s true or not, and we need to go in and sort everything out—that' s our job, that' s our role. I can sense the nods in the room—I know this audience. And the third role is blamer mode. So, no judgment—I' m pretty sure I was in blamer mode this morning because I couldn' t find my charger on the way here. And blamer mode is when you' re mobilized by anger—it' s someone else' s fault, and you want to control the situation.

So, none of these roles—they' re not inherently bad. We all bounce between them, even in the same conversation. But the thing is, if we' re consistently having conversations in the drama triangle, we' re trapped in anxiety, and we can' t get out.

Now, this is helpful to understand more about ourselves, but I think it' s really interesting if we look at our communication strategies through this lens. And here' s why: when we create a campaign—whether we' re a journalist or a fundraiser or a campaigner—and when we work with a campaigner like Jane, and when we lead with a focus on what happened to her—the detail of her trauma—we are essentially casting Jane and her message in the sufferer role, even though she wants to be talking about solutions. You know, sufferer role is problem-focused.

The same applies if we create a message about how bad the climate crisis is, and we lead with the focus on how awful things are—it' s in the sufferer role. And so, I think our audiences—we are dragging them into the drama triangle too by leading with this information. We do it intentionally because we think it' s going to move people—you know, we have good intentions. But faced with a message that makes you feel fearful or anxious, as the audience, you' ve got limited options here. You might feel like a rescuer—like, “Oh, how awful, those poor people, how terrible” —so pity—that' s in rescuer mode. Or you might feel angry and overwhelmed by what you' re hearing—like, “Whose fault is this?” or “That wouldn' t happen to me—you know, I wouldn' t have done that.” You' re mobilized by anger.

But what if we could escape the drama triangle in our communications? David Emerald designed the empowerment dynamic—in his words, as a place to go if you want to get out of drama in your relationships. And I think this is interesting. Instead of the sufferer role, he has the creator role. This is where Jane was in the clip that I just showed you. When we are in creator—and this is Jane—you acknowledge the problem—yeah, we' re not sugar-coating anything, we acknowledge it—but we lead with solutions.

When we' re in creator, we know how to speak in a way that people can hear us—not necessarily that they' ll agree with our solutions, this isn' t about consensus, this is about

dialogue. And so, in response to a creator in a conversation, you might respond creatively too, or you might respond as coach—so not rescuer, you’ re not swooping in to solve things. Coach, Emerald describes as supportive and curious. Or we might respond as challenger—not mobilized by anger like blamer, challenger is analytical, open-minded, inquisitive. Challenger can push, but it’ s constructive. There is positive energy here in the empowerment dynamic.

And when we look at our communication strategies through this lens, I think that audiences can receive messages like climate that they don’ t feel like this unstoppable disaster that we have no control over, but instead, we can see them as challenges. I mean, these are big challenges, but we can engage with them because we can actually hear what’ s required.

And I also think that campaigners like Jane—and I’ ve met hundreds of them—campaigners like Jane are no longer seen solely through the lens of injustice. They’ re seen for the experts that they are—with insight, ideas, solutions, creativity. Their trauma isn’ t mined for clicks, and the emotions of our audiences aren’ t being manipulated for clicks. Instead, we’ re able to engage and feel a sense of what’ s possible.

And I’ ve seen this approach work again and again. A recent example that I absolutely love is Breast Cancer Now’ s Gallery of Hope campaign. In this campaign, they show beautiful photography of women with incurable cancer, and generated by AI, they show future photographs of them in the future that they hope to have because of the research that’ s happening right now. And these interviews with these women—these are still personal stories, they still get the hairs on the back of your neck standing up and the tears in your eyes, but this time, it’ s not because you’ re so overwhelmed with how awful it is—it’ s because you are moved by what’ s possible, by the future that we all want.

Another example of escape from the drama triangle that resulted in a change in legislation was Ireland’ s equal marriage campaign. I met the campaigners there—they got together, and they made a conscious decision that instead of spotlighting trauma and injustice, they would focus on sharing stories of acceptance. For example, they had grannies and grandads across the country share videos about their grandchildren—they just wanted them to have the same rights to marriage that they had.

The NSPCC research, and many other studies like it, show that stories of pain—whether they’ re personal stories or whether they’ re vivid depictions of a problem—they’ re very good at creating awareness, but they’ re highly likely to leave audiences emotionally reaching for their coats, even if they donate, even if they’ re now more aware of the problem than they were before.

But when we treat our audiences and don’ t traumatize them, we leave them engaged, leaning in, ready to learn. So, here’ s my invitation to you: the next time you craft a campaign or a newsletter, or the next time you have a challenging conversation with a loved one or a colleague, ask yourself, “Which triangle am I in—drama or empowerment?

Am I leaving my intended audience feeling defensive and anxious, or am I leaving them feeling curious and engaged?"

Because if you, like me, are passionate about creating a healthier and more just future, we can't just be in the business of awareness—we have to be in the business of change. Thank you so much.
