

LOCAL SOCIALITY
LENS: LECTURE V

We want to look at the methods by which we arrived at the content. If you have any questions about how we did that, this would be the appropriate time to raise them. Then that would allow us to move very directly to the most pressing question and that is what this means for Minneapolis/St. Paul. The practical applicability of what we have worked on is critical in terms of its implications for the communities that you represent, the constituency that you represent, the organizations that you represent. And to the degree that it has applicability, the benefit is there.

Let me begin this way. We have been working through three kinds of methods. They have been going on simultaneously, but with emphasis at various times. Those three methods, or methodologies are Corporate Action, Tactical Thinking, and Depth Motivity. We did not invent these methodologies; we simply put them together into a package. These have been around for some time. The think tank idea is not new, it is generally attributed to the Rand Corporation. There is a difference though. Where as the Rand Corporation would take a problem or a new development, bring in a series of experts, lock them up in a room, tell them to solve the problem or not to come out until they had a practical recommendation. We do it just the opposite. We take people who know the problems, people who are involved in the problems, people who have to live with the solutions. That is the difference between consultants and real life people who have to live with the solutions, and thereby have them do the think tank, have them solve the problem, have them work through practical possibilities, practical proposals. There is then a higher degree of effectiveness, a higher percentage of actualization of the proposals. We have found this to be true.

This is new for most of us. We are not used to think tanks, though probably we all admit to having been in pressure cookers from time to time. The kind of social methods that are available today are rather in the sense that we are in the midst of a new kind of civilizing process. We are in the midst of a new kind of civilization. It would be roughly analogous to the first time people started writing. Can you imagine the pain and struggle of teaching people to sit down and write. That was a great leap forward in terms of civilization but it caused hand cramps, and you'd rather be out hunting or something like that. Come on in for a while and write---and you'd said, no, no, I'd rather go out and chase deer. Civilization is built on making those kinds of sacrifices in which social methods, that is ways of communicating, ways of working together, ways of bringing about intensified sociality is present today. We have rehearsed those. We have walked through those, we've gone through them step by step. The task before us is to build a new civilization.

We've worked therefore in order to build an arena of consensus, that is to provide an area of agreement whereby we could all put our force behind it. This is a delicate matter, but it is a very simple matter, in that you want to, one assess the power of the group and assess where that power can be most effective. That is what you mean by consensus. You are not after every body agreeing with one another. You are after a decision that there is certain power latent within the group and that power can be exercised at certain leverage points and thereby bring about some kind of action. Therefore you work on those arenas of consensus. That was done this weekend mainly through what we call corporate methods. The crucial thing there is that the methodology for arriving at it is all laid out in that manual. The input of the think tank is done by following those steps. Therefore there is a structure. But the creativity and the input comes from the corporate group. Everybody's ideas are into the stew pot. Everybody has a way of participating. That is the main thing that you mean by corporate methods. If anybody has the skill to read and write they can do this methodology. That is a simple way of talking about corporateness.

But this is also done through corporate style. In other words, the effectiveness of any group depends upon what we call corporate style. Maybe the best way to talk about that is that we operate out of common images, we all used the triangle. We started there. We all used certain terms and decided on certain definitions. That kind of commonness or common models is what allows the consensus to take place. You have to have a starting point, you have to define your arena. Talking with some of you about these methodologies which you use in business and government, (and they are utilized there) the main difference is that there is not a common model of the overall picture. Everybody is operating out of a different model of the company. Everybody is operating out of a different model of the government. It is the same government, but a different picture, and therefore when you spot something wrong, when you spot something that needs to be done it can not be communicated to somebody else. You don't have to use a triangle, you could use a square, and divide it into the component parts of a company. You could use what ever you wanted to, but the point being that you work together out of a common model. And then allow that to build common symbols. That is a Van Gogh painting over there, you may have noticed that painting of Starry Night which we use a great deal, not only for its esthetic value, but if you look very carefully in there you'll see polar gestalts all over the place, you notice that? See those swirls and clusters? That's right, he was ahead of his time a hundred years. Common symbols therefore, communicate indirectly to the group at all times. It is like, what you have on these walls is what allows that consensus indirectly to be formed. You say, oh, you are manipulating us, right? There is nothing wrong with manipulation. The only question is, for what

purpose is the manipulation going on. Every body is being manipulated. When you started to kindergarten you were manipulated, and have been ever since. The point is for what purpose. The purpose is for allowing the group to build the arenas of consensus upon which it can creatively and particularly act. This is the point of corporate action.

Then along with that we proceeded to solve a series of problems. We do that through a method called tactical thinking. Now tactical thinking is not management by objectives, though it utilizes that. It is not a goal oriented methodology, and would like to say it is diametrically opposed to goal oriented methodology. It is built on problem analysis. It is built on contradiction discernment. That is a different focus than objectives and goals. Because you see, if you are focusing the group on some goal or some long range objectives, all the group can see are problems and blocks to reaching that objective. That is hard on morale after a while. If they have their eyes on contradictions, all they see are tactics, tactics, tactics. And therefore they never fail. That is the difference between goal oriented methodology and contradiction oriented methodology. Tactical action then becomes a state of being of the group. Tactical action then becomes incorporated into the individuals. And to the degree that those tactics are actualized you are always moving forward. You are always actualizing. You are always implementing. There has to be some kind of practical vision toward which the group is moving, but you aren't out to achieve some ideal. You are out to solve the fundamental contradiction. You keep your eye on the contradiction not the goal. Because you are out to solve problems, and not become some virtuous problem solver. You are out to have something changed in history. That is the purpose of dealing with contradictions.

This is done through pressure proposals. Not any proposals, not any good ideas, not things we ought to do, but pressure proposals. That is where the groups power can get underneath the problem areas and blow loose something in history. So that change begins to take place and the future can be ushered in. These pressure proposals have within them indicative tactics. That is, your proposals carry (because they are focused on contradictions) the solutions within themselves. Therefore indicative tactics. This is not something you would want to do. I've got an 8-5 job and I do my tactics after dinner. No, no, no. The job of living is tactics. The job of your 8-5 is tactics. Because you are focusing upon the contradictions within that job, or within that occupation that you have. Indicative tactics.

Now this must be put tactically into assignments and a timeline, and that has to do with where we will pick up this morning. Systematic implementation. So that whether there are 2 of you or 200 of you there is a plan that actualizes those tactics; that begins to carry off those proposals. You don't act on proposals. You act on tactics. You don't do proposals. Those great big things we had up here were the homework necessary to reveal the

tactics, but you don't do proposals. You do tactics. Therefore the tactics were built on the changes we want to see in society, and not the broad abstract statements that were in the proposals.

The systematic implementation brings about, therefore, clarified vision. You don't superimpose vision upon a group of people. It comes out of tactical actualization. You don't superimpose some kind of goal upon people, it comes out of systematic implementation of tactics. It is when you are hip deep, no---when you are arm pit deep in the contradiction that you have any idea of what needs to happen. Until you are standing in the midst of the major contradiction you have no place to even view the future from. Everything else your mother taught you from what ought to happen, or some moralistic understanding of what the future ought to be. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking about what actually needs to be. The only place that that can be seen from is in the midst of that major contradiction.

Now you have another arena here. Depth Motivity. It is not easy to stand arm pit deep in major contradiction. You've got to deal with the human element. You've got to deal with the human factor. And this is the most crucial factor. This is what it is all about. The point here being that you can not motivate somebody else. Have you noticed that? Because you cannot motivate yourself. Have you noticed that? Oh, you can "scrunch" up and get some things done, you know, you can make yourself do some things. But I'm talking about depth motivity that allows you to carry on for a period of time. You can not self induce motivation. Motivation does not exist. Motivation is a by-product. Motivation is a happening which occurs in the midst of a group and it is a by-product of tactical thinking and corporate action. You will never see this except on the other side of the group acting (which is always more than the sum of its parts) and the tactical action which comes from the realistic visions which come from tactical actualization. The motivation is a by-product. It comes, however, in terms of stating clearly the cause of the group. But the cause of the group is not superimposed. It comes out of the tactical thinking and through the consensus of the body. the motivation occurs in and through the community of which you are a part. Basically what this means is...is that membership has to be objectified. You're not after community for community's sake. You are not after forming a committee, you are after symbolizing membership in an inclusive group. You are after objectifying the group's relation to the larger community. That is where motivation finally is elicited. It has to be big enough to grab people's imagination. It has to be large enough to excite the imagination. Because finally what you are after is addressing the being of that individual. But the way the being of that individual is addressed is through significant engagement. Give him something that is worth while doing. That is worth his effort. A cause that is beyond himself and a cause that is beyond the community.

Now this is handled basically two ways. Experientially you can work at it in terms of creating internal space. This is that capacity to grasp that while you are working in a particular neighborhood, while you are involved in a particular company, it is intimately related to a much larger geographical impact. That the problems of your neighborhood are the problems also of most major urban areas of the world today. That the problems in your company are the problems of society. A company is like a small microcosm in society. To solve the problems of your organization is to solve the problems of society. Those are two sides of the same coin. And you begin to see that practically, as you work through the contradictions. And then you put that in the context of historical time. I'm not talking about 8-5, or punching the clock. I'm talking about perspective. Somebody mentioned this this morning. You begin to see the challenges and you begin to see the job, the projects you are working on as significant only as they are put into the context of the 20th Century. Only as they are in the context of the transition that we are going through. They have meaning only to the degree that we see them within the 70's which is a unique decade, over against the 60's and in preparation for the 80's. 1984 is not too far away, right? That kind of urgency is freighted through the historical time. Now this cause business here, is usually freighted through some kind of a story. You know, however inadequate today this may seem, World War I was built on the story that we were going to make the world safe for democracy. Now you say, that should not have been. That motivated people. That motivated your father, and it motivated my father.

This inclusive community is again, through objectifying membership, done in order to intensify the engagement of that individual, to intensify his capacity to participate in the tactical thinking and to participate in the corporate action. This is a by-product, but once it happens you deal with it intentionally. Once it occurs you deal with it objectively. But you don't set out to motivate people, except in and through the power of the group, and in and through the power of addressing oneself to the tactical thinking. I think you have had enough experience with groups to know what I'm talking about.

Now, come back here (the plotting triangle of clusters), the most crucial thing that you came up with during the weekend in one sense up to this point, is that you have built a social vision. We know that there is no generation of activity, without that vision, and yet that vision can not be superimposed, it has to be constructed. That is what you did last night. When you put those proposals back on the social process you created the new society. That is you located the pressure points, where those dots occur, which if activated through tactical action, you would occasion a rebalance of the total social process. That is, you would have moved toward a balanced society, of economic, political, and cultural life. You have done now your homework. You know what needs to be done. You want to know what proposals HEW is funding at this point? They are where those dots are... you just check me out on this. You want to know what programs

are coming out of Washington right now? They are in those processes right there. If you want to write a proposal, and I know that proposal writing that you do is different than what we do here, but what I'm talking about is, you have designated the trends. Any sensitive and awake person would know what you are talking about here. You have put your finger on the pressure points of society. Now these change, because society changes. Obviously this kind of analysis and this kind of homework would have to be done periodically. So you would begin to see where the breakdowns had occurred, where the pressure points in society would be. The function of this seminar is to allow the time to do that overall analysis.

Now, let me come at it something like this. This not only designated your pressure points, it also designates your social strategy. Your social theory changes literally decade to decade. Latent within this model is your social theory. Somebody pointed it out last night. There is only one economic proposal over here (in the economic triangle) because these processes are going very well. That is not the problem. They are very active in society. This one is in distribution and futuristic planning of food distribution. Here is a genuine breakdown. And sometimes you'll have some down here in resource conservation. But we've got the technology to do that. We know how to do distribution, that is not the problem in the first instance. Guess where the problem is? Yes, you guessed it, cultural and political. In other words the regulation or the control of this process (political) which is its function is not going on. And then the guidelines or the directions, which is the cultural function, to deal with this economic is not going on. This is what has got to be activated (cultural), this is what has got to be re-empowered (political) if there is to be some balance to be brought back in here. You have already delineated this for any specific situation, whether you are talking about a middle class community or whether you are talking about an inner city community. The same strategy would be applicable. Now this strategy may change in six months. Then you have to do your analysis over again to recreate your approach, to recreate your programs, to recreate your proposals for funding, to recreate the training that would be necessary for your staff. This is what determines then what way to go. This is what gives you the guidelines of what to do Monday morning. The other thing here, because this is the dominant process (economic), it is very easy to see that you don't come head on at the dominant process. That makes good sense, doesn't it? You don't try to destroy or confront that process which is going at 90 miles an hour. It is like trying to catch on to a freight train with your arm, you know what happens when it goes by....you lose an arm. You don't come at this head on. You move indirectly upon it. You always come at it tangentially.

You move at that process indirectly. That is, you come at it through the political and the cultural.

I think that if you go back through history you will discover what we call the effectivity of indirection. There have been violent revolutions in history which have brought about social change. And this has occurred even in our time. I think that if you go back and look at the social revolutions that have occurred the violent ones do not bring about long lasting social change. That it is the quiet revolutions, if you will, the indirect revolutions that bring about the basis of civilization; that build the basis upon which society can be reconstructed. What do you mean by quiet revolution? I mean, like ancient China, I'm talking about the Confucian Revolution which took, I suppose, in terms of actualizing the proposals that Confucius had in mind, three hundred years. You remember that his first tactic was to attach himself to the Emperor as an advisor. He spent twenty years in the Imperial Court in China. He made a series of good suggestions to the Emperor for twenty years and nothing happened. He decided that what needed to occur was a different strategy. He went out into the provinces of China and gathered together a small group of angry young men. Young men means anybody under sixty. He gathered together all the disgruntled young men and set them down and began to have seminars...a...schools, and said that we are going to do three things men. We first of all have got to redefine what it means to be Chinese. The first thing we have got to do is set down a philosophy. They call it the yin-yang. The next thing that we've got to do is get us some methodologies. The first social methodologies were the bureaucratic ones. They were the only guys who could write. They were the ones who made out the deeds. They were the ones who served the provincial chiefs with legal documents. They were the bookkeepers. They were the tax collectors for the provinces, and therefore began to systematically move to the provinces, and then come back at the Emperors indirectly. That is, they set up the finest civil service system that the world has ever seen, and probably the greatest cultural gift that ancient China has contributed to the world. That is what I mean by a quiet revolution. That is what I mean by an indirect revolution. Where you are altering the foundational basis of what it means to be a human being. Where you are dealing with the basic methodologies that allow people to participate in civilization. Where you are dealing with the basic dynamics of society.

This happened in our country. That is, if you look at the Jeffersonian decade of political life. You know that he is associated with "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But you also remember that he is associated with liberal education. Isn't that interesting? In order to bring off government by the people, of the people, and

for the people, you also have to have a public school system which also equips people to participate in government by the people, of the people, and for the people. And therefore liberal education is a major contribution of Thomas Jefferson. You come at that political system, or the establishment of that political system indirectly. You come at it through the educational arm, you come at it indirectly that allows the populace to participate in the ideals of the constitution. This is the effectivity of indirection. It is built on a basic understanding of how society is changed. It is built on a basic picture of the way social change occurs, both in the past and, I believe, also today.

If you look at the world in which we live, at the social situation you show up in there are two dynamics. There is what is usually referred to as the disestablishment and there is what is generally referred to as the establishment or pro-establishment. Now at any given time those are defined by your dominant and recessive processes. Your disestablishment are those which are collapsed or those in less power. The proestablishment is identified with the dominant process in general. The relationship or the interaction between the disestablishment (that is those who are not participating directly in the dominant social process) and the proestablishment (those who are in charge, those who are in positions within the dominant process) define the direction that society is going to go. This tension in here is what generates the direction. The tension between the disestablishment and the proestablishment (I'm using the word tension here in a creative sense). You are not after destroying one or the other, you are not after confronting one with the other, you are out to bring about the creative tension between them. You see, it is this group of people (disestablishment) who know the needs, this group of people know where the short comings in the society are. These are the people who are sensitive to the sufferings, however innocent, or un-innocent, that suffering is going on. This is where that sensitivity lies. Here (proestablishment) are your resources for dealing with that. Here are the structural possibilities for alleviating that suffering. Lets face it.... they have the troops and the money right now. This is where then, the resources are going to have to come from to deal with this problem. Therefore what you need is somebody who has one foot here (disestablishment) and has one foot here (proestablishment) and therefore can enable that dialog or that creative interaction to go on. I don't mean anything abstract by this. What I'm talking about are people, but they have to come from one group or the other. Now this dynamic changes. That is...I want to use the term (I know it is abstract, but I'm going to define it) the transestablishment. I'm not interested in the disestablishment, I'm not interested in the proestablishment. I'm interested in the transestablishment. That is, those people who have the capacity to see the needs and at the same time mobilize the resources to meet the needs. That is a particular kind of attitude, or particular

kind of posture. Yet it is defined by people from either this group or this group.

To illustrate this, if you look back to the social change of the 60's, there was a great deal of upheaval that occurred. There were certain kinds of tactics that were used. Whether you talk about the non-protest efforts of the civil rights movement, or whether you talk about the confrontation tactics of men like Alinsky, there were a great many people who were a part of the disestablishment who began a systematic, head-on effort to change the structure of this country. This resulted in two amendments being passed to the Constitution. That kind of effective social change was a part of the 60's and the people who for the most part motivated that came from here (disestablishment). They were black people, they were students, they were even a minority called clergy, there were women in the midst of this. And these people were on the front lines between Montgomery and Selma. Now today, we are in the 70's. There is a different dynamic present. All of those students, and women and clergy and black people who were leading this...guess what happened? They got promoted into OEO. Yes, that is what we did. They got positions in the Social Welfare Department. They got positions in the United Street Ministries, or what ever. Guess where they are today? Those same people now are over here (proestablishment). The transestablishment has got to come from within the establishment itself. The people who know the needs are in these positions now. The people who have the decisional power are sitting in this room in established structures already. The focus of the revolution has shifted. The revolution is still the same. The needs are still the same, but strategy and tactics have changed. And therefore the posture, the efforts, and the action of the transestablishment has changed.

What is needed today is somebody who has access to those resources, somebody who has access to those kinds of possibilities. Somebody who will restructure the very structures that are the foundations of society so that the innocent suffering, or to put it another way, so that the rebalancing of the social process takes place.

We can not continue with thirty percent of the population participating in the decision making. We can not continue with the kind of breakdown of our neighborhoods that is going on. If you look at the trends within the churches, in organized religion today, it is crumbling around our ears. I'm not pushing any particular church, all I'm saying is that when you look where we are headed if the current trends continue with this acceleration here then what the environmentalists say is true. But you and I occupy a particular perspective. We stand in a certain posture, and it has to do with this understanding of transestablishment. Now, what do you do about this kind of thing? How do you begin to make a difference once you have seen that sort of possibility?

If you take what you put on here (plotting triangle) as

actually what needs to happen....then we have a picture of the direction we are going to go in the four clusters. The first cluster is the one that dealt with knowledge that enabled the resources to be utilized and the consumption plans. Almost every seminar that we are in today recognizes that we've got to deal with a global economy. Globalized economics is the wave of the future. It already exists in the international business community, and any thing that is realistic has got to move in that direction. Number two, these are the ones that occurred under final meanings. We've got to make some changes in education. It is the most medieval institution alive today. Humanized education...in which we stop teaching people what to think and teach them how to think. That is the basic change that has got to come. Methodologies, methodologies, methodologies. That is the clue that is in your proposals here in terms of education. Cluster number three...social structures and basic roles. We've got to recover primal community. We've got to put together a new understanding of what it means to be a neighborhood. You are already working on that. And then cluster number four. That was all those in significant engagement and secure existence. This has to do with local polity. Localized decision making. I'm not pushing revenue sharing or anything else. I am pushing involvement of people in the decision making process more often than every two years in a voting machine. Voting is fine, but it is not adequate for the Twentieth Century. Voting either has to take place more often so we've got some options besides petition, referendum, and impeachment for getting the will of the people into the elected officials more often than every four years. Need I reiterate our recent experience? You had a mandate four years ago completely altered within six months after the election and the people who were elected didn't have the foggiest of what was going on. We're in the same situation today. Localized polity....in which the input of the insights and the needs go directly from the local person. You can't write a letter to your congressman today. Though I suppose those congressmen read those letters, but the point being that the only thing that is going to make a difference is when you write a proposal to your congressman. Now you don't just write a proposal, they've seen a lot of those. You also write the tactics for the proposal. That would be a little bit more help. Then you put in there a systematic implementation plan of how you are going to get it done. That would be helpful. What if....you sat down with them and wrote the proposals. A little bit of accountability built in. This is the way you are going to vote in the future. You aren't going to go to a machine and pull a lever. You are going to sit down like this. Once every three months? How often? And write the necessary plans for this society with the elected officials, with the people. This is the way voting will go on in the next decade, something like this. Localized polity.

Now the only thing you left out is secular story...some kind of articulation of the future...some kind of articulation of our past. We're coming up to the bicentennial year and everybody is talking about having a celebration that deals with the great events of the past. What are we going to do in terms of planning the future of this country in 1976? This is the opportunity to create America's role all over again. This is the time in which we have the most propitious moment to create once again the future of this country in world development. That is only going to come about when we recreate the story of the revolution; when we recreate the mythology out of which we live; when we rearticulate the story and the purpose of this nation.

This is where the seminar would end if we were all liberals. That's right you know...you look at the charter of the United Nations...you look at the Populace Party in the 30's...you'll find these things. They've all been written out...all been spelled out. They've even got them in the Constitution. These are your strategy. This is not what you do. What you do are tactics. What you do are indirect actions which catalyze these objectives. Somebody explained it to me like this. These are what you want to have happen (Globalized Economics, etc.) but these are the pressure points where you activate the social process in order to catalyze these. It is like standing on two mountain peaks in the Alps and you know there is enough snow on the other peak to start an avalanche. They say if you whistle the right tune in the right key and right tone the whole thing will come down at once. The key is to be standing on the other peak. What we want to find are the whistle points....where you stand to whistle that begins this avalanche, that begins to activate this kind of possibility. The way this has been initially experimented with and worked out is basically through four methods or efforts. The first one has to do with (you read these tactics over here you'll see what I'm talking about) some way to impact the people. Not that you have to bring about some kind of confrontation or that people are stupid. People are more aware of the problems today than they ever have been. The impact has to do with the fact that they are so busy that you have to sit them down long enough to think through what they already know. Impact has to do with revealing to people the care that they already have. That is the difference between confrontation impact and this kind of impact. You are not telling anybody anything new. You are not out to offend anybody. You are out to reveal to them the drive for care that is already existent within the group. That is what you mean by impact.

Now this cannot go on without some kind of research. But I don't mean ivory tower research, no...I mean problem solving units. I mean groups of people who know the problems, who know what needs to be done, who know where the real problems are. Therefore that makes up the content of your impact. Whether that be communicated through tv, whether that be communicated through seminar. The research is necessary in order to contemporize the

impact. To make sure that the impact has relevance to it. And obviously you are not going to bring this off in a community, in an organization without training. That is, social methods is the name of the game. There has got to be a way in which people can avail themselves of social methods. What if you had in your neighborhood a social methods school? Adults could come on weeknights once a week and participate in this kind of methodology. Where they could be trained in tactical thinking, they could do their homework in terms of analyzing the total social process, they could be oriented to the issues around the country, around the world. That's what I'm talking about. Training, training, training.

And then because some of us are from Missouri, you've got to show them. A demonstration has to be brought about, not in the sense of a protest march, but in the sense of showing people how it will work. How will these methods work with a faculty of a local school? What if the Rotary Club used these? Wouldn't that be something. They might achieve their original purpose, service to the community. The programs of the Rotary Club...dealing with the needs of the community, and not some traditional idea of the President. You hear the difference in that? You build a program for the Rotary Club that deals with the problems. You build a program for the public school that doesn't perpetuate some rigid curriculum, but deals with the problems of the community. Those kids are smart enough.....I'd drop out too. Unless what is going on in that class room is directly related to what is going on outside that door, it is just whistling in the wind. What if the faculty got together and built a curriculum on the social needs of society. You'd have to lock the doors to keep them out of school. They want to be involved, they want to deal with the real problems, and they are very clear about what those problems are.

What if you began to hook this up. What if you began to take local communities who were doing this research and compile it and therefore exchange it? What if you had a training program that would on a highly intensified basis, on a crash basis, get your local community together. What if you began to have a series of demonstration schools around the country? What if you began to have a series of demonstration Lions Clubs? What if you began to have the opportunity within two hours of anybody in the country of Social Methods Schools which they could attend? Then you begin to catalyze, then you begin to indirectly build toward this.

There are two things left out. You have to have the story. People aren't going to come for nothing. People aren't going to participate in some little piddling effort. They've seen too much collapse, they've been frustrated too long. The only story that we have found that makes any sense to anybody is this thing about resurgence. If what I'm doing in my company is not related

to the total global process it just doesn't interest me any more. If I can't see what I'm doing is related to the totality of society, it just is not intriguing enough. It just won't move.

But finally what we're talking about is action. Finally what we're talking about is a way to get this done. We're talking about people who are ready to move. We're talking about motivating people to work on something. This idea, that I've put up here, is called the Guild Network. We've taken an old medieval word called "guild" which I know had an economic base in the past. If you go back to the early middle ages when guilds first came into being, and not the high middle ages. That is when guilds became the economic establishment. Look at the role that the guilds played in the transition from the feudal estate to the nation state, which is the basic transition that occurred in the middle ages. Here you have the catalytic force that brought that about. I'm talking now about social change. I'm talking about recreating the idea of local guilds in the community; not a formal organization, not a vocational organization, not in any sense a public relations organization. Rather, people who get together in problem solving units, let's say on one night a week and do their homework relative to their community. That is what a problem solving unit does. I'm then talking about task forces on the basis of the tactics that they come up with. Task forces organized to deal with the application of these in their local neighborhood. In other words, a guild works on the problems of the globe right here in River City. I have done the total analysis of the social process, I'm starting to work, but I'm not working on just some little problem. I'm working on the tactics which will activate the total objectives of resurgence. That is what motivates, and allows a task force to move.

Then thirdly, obviously there has to be somebody in there who knows what's going on. A core of people who are trained to lead those troops. This is indirect leadership, but there has to be somebody who finds a place for the PSU to meet, and gets the paper and pencils out for the task forces. That's all the core does. That is the function of a group of people then, who don't call attention to themselves. Quite the contrary, for the most part they are invisible. The guild is an invisible dynamic which catalyzes the social process. Their job is to do tactical thinking. It is their job to enable people to see that what they are working on in their local community are precisely the pressure points. The way you decide the projects for your community depends on the pressure points within the total social process. You are exactly right on this elder citizens program....who in the world would take two nights out of the week to work on an elder citizens program. Until there is a hard headed social strategy that says the key to basic roles is to get that elder citizens dynamic moving throughout the world, then I'm going to stay home and watch Gunsmoke. You have got to convince me that what is going on in my neighborhood is related to the total social process and that by spending my time down at the highrise something is going to happen in history. Now the way you do that is through the tactics of the process over against the total social process. You are

out to be an invisible college, not call attention to yourself. What I'm talking about is not a Zorro tactic, where you whip out one time and go around in disguise. No, I'm talking about the fact that you are not out to be somebody in the community. You are out to enable the structures that are already there to do the job that they were originally designed to do. This is the effectivity of indirection. It is different than protest or confrontation. It is catalytic and supportive action. Most of the time it is a highly tangential approach which results in more effective structural operation. It is a positive action to excite the imagination of the people involved and therefore futuristic possibilities.

Then people begin thinking about the genuine fulfillment and fruition of their concerns, the real possibilities for their life, and concrete expressions of their hopes. People are concerned about happiness. But happiness is a dynamic that changes. Happiness is not a superficial matter. One decides his happiness or builds happiness. This weekend you have been about the task of constructing your happiness and fulfillment by addressing the contradictions in society. But this is not only a future idea, we have rehearsed the dynamics of the resurgence of civilization. In other words, happiness is not an abstraction, but rather a present realization or else it is not happiness. The fulfillment of the new society is at hand, not only for us but for all people. And now you have the eyes to see, the lens to view, and the tools for engagement. You have created this new society. Welcome to living effectively in the new society.

Rick Loudermilk