Citation: ICPA (2024) Safeguarding Civic Space: Harnessing Narrative Change to restore public trust in CSOs. URL:https:// www.narrativechange.org/toolkit/safeguarding-civic-spaceharnessing-narrative-change-restore-public-trust-csos

Narrative	Explanation and Illustration
'Threat to stability' Present in 72% of cases analysed Examples: Nepal, Kazakhstan, Bahrain, Guatemala	This narrative builds on old Cold War/imperialism frames to claim that some Western countries have a plan to meddle, control or even overthrow the state through foreign funding. Following this logic, these foreign actors and their local CSO partners are accused of representing a threat to stability. In Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the so-called 'Colour Revolutions' are often cited as evidence for this narrative. It is commonly used in combination with the 'Undermining Traditions', 'Foreign Agent' and 'Ties to Terrorism' frames.
'Wasteful & Corrupt' Present in 61% of cases analysed Examples: Ecuador, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Nepal	In this narrative, CSOs are portrayed as inefficient, wasters of money who take funding from the 'real' people and are not contributing to national plans or priorities. In addition, the frame accuses CSOs of not being transparent about what they do with funds, and are thereby, portrayed as corrupt. In Kazakhstan, this frame is captured in the accusation that CSOs are "grant eaters" and this is used to justify heavily increased government oversight under the guise of holding CSOs accountable. It is commonly used in combination with the 'Threat to Stability' and 'Undermining Traditions' frames.
'Foreign Agent' Present in 44% of cases analysed Examples: Hungary, Kenya, Malaysia	In this narrative, CSOs are portrayed and vilified as corrupt, entitled elite who act as partners of meddling foreign entities. This 'traitor' motif often builds on ideas of a big globalist conspiracy at play. Depending on the culture, this narrative often links to antisemitism (e.g. how George Soros is depicted by many states) or other figures who have become historical bogeymen. Not surprisingly, this narrative is directly tied to so-called 'foreign agent' laws which force CSOs to mark themselves in public as traitors, which serves to undermine their reputation. This often leads to intimidation, hate speech and even violence against CSOs. It is commonly used in combination with the 'Threat to Stability' and 'Undermining Traditions' frames.

Narrative	Explanation and Illustration
'Ties to terrorism' Present in 39%	In this narrative, CSOs are framed as a conduit for extremism and terrorism, especially in the accusation of facilitating criminality and corruption through money laundering Post 9/11, this narrative has led to many restrictions on
of cases analysed Examples: Mexico, Nigeria, Kyrgyzstan	banking and access to funding for CSOs, especially from foreign sources ²⁵ . It is commonly used in combination with the 'Threat to Stability' frame.
'Undermining Traditions' Present in 28% of cases analysed Examples: Nepal, Kazakhstan, Uganda	This narrative frames the work of CSOs as a threat to the state-defined fabric of societal traditions — often focused on the family - and involves heavy criticism of LGBT+ and gender issues, human rights, secularism, and even democracy agendas.
	This narrative finds resonance among traditionalists and has driven a global right-wing religious coalition seeking to protect "the family" 26.
	It is commonly used in combination with the 'Threat to Stability' and 'Foreign Agent' frames.
'Good' vs 'Bad' CSOs Present in 11% of cases analysed Examples: Kazakhstan, Hungary	This frame seeks to define and marginalise human rights groups, watchdogs and certain think tanks (often focused on tackling corruption and violation of rights, and monitoring elections) as 'bad' . It also contrasts them with the perceived 'good' CSOs, such as community groups, football associations, unions, churches, and those who toe the political line — often GONGOs ²⁷ . This frame is commonly used to justify funding of CSOs who are more in line with government, i.e. GONGOs.
	While the good/bad wording is not literally used in many cases, it is often implied behind the vilification of CSOs as traitors, undermining stability and not supporting the national project.
	It is often used in combination with any of the other frames used to explain and portray the "bad" CSOs.

Table 1_ Dominant Civic Space Attack Narratives in Detail (ICPA 2024)

²⁵ Including international banking oversight procedures like The Financial Action Task Force (2024) What we do?

²⁶ For example, World Congress of Families (2019) Verona - The Wind of Change: Europe and the Global Pro-Family Movement About the Congress

^{27 &}quot;A government-organized non-governmental organization (GONGO) is a non-governmental organization that was set up or sponsored by a government in order to further its political interests and mimic the civic groups and civil society at home, or promote its international or geopolitical interests abroad", Wikipedia (2024).