

April 16 - 18 1982

## THE GUILD

I have it on very good authority that the art form which is in the middle of the table before you is called a "Dyptych Highrise." You have to be a little careful how you say that, but it means something very simple: the coming together of two things. You can decide yourself whether that means, thereby, creating one thing or maintaining the complementary aspects of those two things. At any rate, it is a fine symbol for this 10th anniversary, as the Guardians celebrate the coming together of the past 10 years and the challenges of the next decade. Certainly it represents the point of tension between our work in the villages over the past 10 years and the work that is emerging in the work place.

Awhile back I was in an Airport Men's Room which had an electric hand-dryer. This one had five instructions on it. 1) adjust nozzle, 2) wash hands, 3) shake off excess water (I don't know what the water that remains is supposed to be if the other is excess), 4) press button and 5) rub hands in front of flow of air. Somebody had decided that five steps were still short of what was needed, and very carefully had etched number 6: "Wipe hands on pants". I think this is relevant to the discussion of the guild at this gathering because for me it, represents the experience of having completed all one's detailed critical analysis, and finding that one still hovers quite a bit above the ground. Then someone from a different perspective comes in and says, "your hands are still wet. There really is one more necessary step before anything can happen."

Since the early 70s, the whole idea of a Guild has had continuing fascination for this group, in the abstract at times, in concrete direct experiments at others. At points there have been romantic images of collegial pursuits of common calling, with some elements of social benefits. These have been persistently attractive to us. So here we are again after 10 years and thousands of pages of research work, trying to talk about the Guild again. I did go back and look at some of the 1972-73 research on the Guild and found this statement captured our thinking about the guild in relationship to social renewal and social change. "I have spent the last two weeks figuring out research procedures for the form of the guild. We decided last Tuesday was the day the form of the guild would emerge. We said that we were orchestrating a miracle and worked out exactly where the groups would meet. We even planned special food." You can see now after 10 years of practical experience that our work on the Guild in those days was abstract and probably incomplete. We were talking about a Guild Project, and had developed a whole tactical system. In a very real sense although that project as such never occurred, it was a significant catalyst behind the drive to go to 40 nations, to launch 24, 50, then 300 Human Development Projects, and to begin five thousand Town Meetings. If just thinking about the Guild can catalyze those kinds of results we should put it on the agenda more often.

What I want to talk about today is not that kind of paravocation, although that is a very important part of our image as guardians. I want to concentrate on another aspect of paravocation more intimately related to one's occupation. It is the dimension of paravocation that exists within the social structure that you find yourself connected to, within your primary occupational location. I think there is a dimension of paravocation on the job, whatever that might be. Within every healthy company, for example, there exists a core group of people who are concerned with its external mission and the direction of its mission. They are also concerned with its internal sensitivity to people who are part of that company (or state agency, or community, or private volunteer organization). That may be an official function. The occupation and the paravocation may come together in a particularly enlightened, sensitive manager, or president, or someone whose job description involves responsibility for all of those things. Often the one who happens to hold that job has not decided to be the paravocated one who takes responsibility for the total scope. Very often the core is much less official. In our office it is most likely to be one of the secretaries than one of the attorneys. Or it's more likely to be one of the newer attorneys than someone who has an administrative task assigned on some organization chart. Whether officially or unofficially, there is a core group of people who have decided to take on that responsibility, and that is the kind of paravocation that I would like to use as the context for the particular aspect of the Guild.

We have seen in our own research and experience that paravocation like that is the essential link that connects a structure to the past and the future, that holds it to both the practical and the profound, and that connects it to the local and global. Without that kind of a core group there is no possibility of revitalisation or vitality for that organization.

In your packet of materials there are two articles to which I intended to refer. One of them from Business Week, indicates that there is, in fact, in society core groups operating. The article described the emergence in the private sector "the facilitators movement" through the use of team structures by business and quality circle programs. "Murphy's Laws suggest that any given solution to a problem brings with it a host of new problems. But once in a while management gets lucky and discovers that a solution to one problem has a serendipitous effect on others. This has been the case with corporations training specialists to help run participatory management programs. They have found that the new "facilitators"--usually managers taken from their regular jobs for a year or so of special assignment--not only are keeping the quality circles on track but also are getting a type of on-the-job training that prepares them to become exceptionally effective managers."

"Until recently U.S. Managers assumed that they would have to give up too much control if lower level employees were actually involved in decision making but having stints as a facilitator can quickly change that attitude. As one of them said, "When successful managers play the

a means of livelihood. Historically thus there are three ideas involved in a profession: organization, a learned art, and a spirit of public service. This spirit of public service is central. The other two--organization and a learned art--have their justification only in that they secure and maintain that spirit of public service."

Now if I may return to the topic of the Guild. The guild in this light, is the dyptych of profession and paravocation, if you recall that earlier symbol. It is the coming together of profession and paravocation. It is the professionalising of paravocation. A guild occurs when some organization, is given to the pursuit of a public service in a way that involves a common art, or a commonly developed art. In terms of a structural auxiliary, a guild exists when some organization is given to the public drive for participation, through the role of the facilitator. The organization pole is our concern in this arena, because obviously with organization there comes bureaucracy and often subjectivity, and those issues need to be treated very seriously as we look more practically and concretely at guild formation.

Putting those issues aside for a moment, why would you push for professionalisation of this form of paravocation? It seems to me that what we have called often the invisible college, those who care in the world, is a very nice force in history. Without it you would not begin to talk of Guild formation. But I would suggest also that without Guild formation, those who care do not change history. Without there being change in the patterns of life and the social structures in which people live during their waking hours, sufficient to create a visible sign, history has not been bent. And all of the good intentions remain as that. Take, for example, the medical profession, and think of its rather short life. In terms of all civilization, its a rather infant profession. Without the organization of the profession of medical practitioners, however narrow or broad you might define that, there would be absolutely no common trust in the delivery of medical services. There would be no consistency, standardization or quality demanded in the training and delivery systems of medical services. There would be no avenue for participation in that occupation except by those who were extremely rich or eccentric, and who did it as a hobby. Until there was professionalization--with all of its dangers--there really was not in society effective delivery of medical care, and could not have been, as long as it remained the individual interest of well-meaning people. It was only the coming together of organization and the practice of a particular art for the public good that made "medicine" effective.

I refer now to another of the articles in your packet depicting a management consultant who is talking about the decade of the 80s, and the revolution that occurred in that decade. But at the very end he talks about the management revolution, and I think gives us a very profound statement of the public service, and foundation of the structural auxiliary guilds relating to any structure in society. He says every age is driven, a predominate idea which he calls the "axial principle" of the age.

Relative to style, it is the positive, inclusive approach. This wouldn't be evident on the product line, but any of you have participated in any guild know that it is laced with issues and demonstrations of style that are positive and inclusive. By positive I refer to a problem solving activity, and not a problem identification activity. It is an activity that looks for the possibility, the strategy, the proposal that is going to be the future, rather than rehearses the obstacles that are the present. By inclusive I refer to the foundational premise that the more people involved, the more minds, the more data contributed, the better the product. There is a way because of the method, to allow all of those people who are involved and affected by the implementation of any plan to be part of its creation.

Thirdly is what I have called the loyal representational stance. By loyal I refer to a structural auxilliary as one who is not an infiltrator of an organization, with another agenda. The structural auxilliary is one with the organization. I am one with my law firm. I don't even have the choice about whether I am one with my law firm. I spend most of my life there. And I am so identified with it that I could rebel to the greatest extent and yet not separate myself from that law firm. It is part of my identity. The structural auxiliaries stand in the posture of those intensely loyal to the structure in which they operate. If not, they'd better figure out another life quest because they are spending their time in the wrong place. And so they are deeply concerned with the direction and the success of that organization, under its agenda and in the enterprise that has defined it. Yet they are representational-- they stand beyond that identity because they are sensitive to the fact that the renewal of any one organization in these times is but a drop in the bucket and that it is not worth a life time to be engaged in that activity save you do it from the context that this organization revitalised can become a sign to the world, to every other structure, and will address the delivery of products and services. It will even address such seemingly different issues as how people operate in a community, in a family, in a church, or other community organizations.

Now most of what I said up to now sounds like it would confine this concept of guild to organizational development, and that has been the focus of my illustration but not really the intent. If you look at the structural auxilliary from the standpoint of any structure you would find it equally applicable to village development work, for example. If the village is the primary reality for people in the place where their life is engaged, and is the reality from which they cannot escape, and therefore must face life and redecide about it, then that is the place where the structural auxilliary operates. That is the place where our project auxiliaries operate. If the work place is the dominant context within which a person creates the future, then that is the structure to which they are the auxilliary, and that is the place where there is the possibility for changing lives, structures, and society. Even the structure of international village development organizations can very excitingly be involved in the formation of the guild through an event like the Exposition on rural development in India. It's the guild not

strategy, beyond the everyday mire of their problems. There is still the need for the presence of the other in designing and tinkering with the various applications of methodology. It's that which finally, I think, will be the clue to how you avoid the perversions of bureaucracy and subjectivity in the professionalisation of paravocation.

It would only be through the standing apart--the being in but not of, and maintaining the larger context that it is possible to give form to these guilds in a way that would not become a perversion. That would be the profound role, I think, of our regional offices and our regional teams. If they spend the next 10 years doing that, it would not be time wasted. If in every one of our regions, for example, we had one depth consulting relationship with one multi-national company, one major government agency, one edge volunteer organization and one local cluster of communities, that would be in North America. 100 critical pressure points of social revitalization. We are in a position to do a whole lot more than that, but 100 would revolutionize this continent, I would think.

Well, I hesitate to close by saying we are the Dyptychs of this decade. It is true that we the Guardians, more than any others of this movement, stand at the junction between the village and the work place, between the occupation and the paravocation that I have talked about, and are already the structural auxiliaries. And so this challenge is everyone's, but it is uniquely ours, and I would call on us to rise to it.

Sam Hanson

