

RETURN TO EDITORIAL FILES

Social Methods School
Corporate Action Lecture # 18

Maureen Jenkins
3/14/74

I don't know how this past year's moved so slowly but for me the initial Watergate particularly has just seemed to stand out everywhere I've looked, although for me that is the fleshing out of an incredible tragedy in midst of the world today - a tragedy that has to do with the way in which the individual in his concern for the world in his vision of what needs to happen gets stuck, has no way of adequately engaging with integrity and with creativity that concern, that vision, relative to the future. In going over the testimonies, all of the fellows who were indicted of the Nixon staff were people with unbelievable vision, ~~were people~~ of unbelievable fidelity to the kind of vision that they saw projected in ~~that~~ administration, fidelity to the possibility that was there and people who are now broken ~~men~~ men in that there was no way ~~power~~ for that vision to be effective relative to this society and more than that relative to the world. For me this Social Methods school is raising the question

of how the individual in the midst of a community, and individual on the other side of ~~the world~~ all of the results of the 60's and ^{of} all the results of the century of the individual who finds himself in the midst of ^{the} a local situation has a way to engage with effectiveness and power in the midst of history today, in the midst of a time ^{that is} ~~which~~ obviously is a crucial time. The ^{whole first} ~~time for a~~ section on theory for me is not telling you anything you don't already know. It's pure rehearsal of the kind of vision that I guess ^{is} in all of us today, the kind of ^{vision} that has not really been some fine ^{creative} articulation that has happened to us in this century. It has sort of been dumped upon us like a load almost you might say sometimes on the other side of that rehearsal of theory and ^{some} added to that is what I consider anyway as sort of crucial part of this school, the hashing out the kind of issues in terms of the ~~kind of~~ practices of problem solving, ~~the kind of~~ practices of corporate action and the practices of human motivity that are needed to focus that in-

dividual vision relative to a task to make effective one's individual concern, and then finally the image of the guild there, ^{at the end} or the kind of practical and theoretical vehicle that focus's the whole school, and I guess if anything these labs are exactly that, just a kind of polishing of one's skill with problem-solving with corporate action with motivity in the midst of people from the ^{odd ones} ~~albums~~ of the situation that provides muscle, that provides finnesse, in ones daily operation. Well, today I'm talking here in session 8 about corporate action or what I call the TEAM and for me what is at crosses in our society today. ^{is} It's simply that the team, we can no longer ^{can} operate the way we did in the past whereas during the time of the ^{political} ~~local~~ revolution and political change in the 18th and early 19th century, and 17th , people partivipated as part of the corporate body by stating individual positions, by representation, by vote. We were not at that time significant, ^{visionary}, effective individuals in order to get said for the sake of the whole body the consensus. Nowadays the issues are simply to^o complex, the kind of red tape you have to cut through

is pretty thick. The kind of ~~thought-through~~ ^{grass-root} concern and self-consciousness too intense for that sort of individualism to work anymore, a great leader with a ~~great~~ bunch of followers ^(is) simply not effective

When you look over the 60's and you just watch the saga of great leaders with a lot of followers that were not able to create effective grass - roots

action. What's the kind of form in the team ^{that} allows I guess for me, the way- I'd talk about would be it allows the individual to meet history, allows personal care to participate in formulating the whole ~~entire~~ future

rather than get wasted on a little concern here, a little concern there, or ^{turned in} get wasted on a kind of apathy that says I can't do anything by myself

^{I guess} so I'm just stuck. How do you formulate that? For me there are five arena's

in which the team, five pillars that the team is based on, or five

dynamics of corporate ^{major} ~~action~~ ^{foundational}. The ~~fundamental~~ one of those, I guess pretty

obviously is the task of the team. Who cares to relate to anyone

else where it is in the future out of anything other than your common

concern, your common task that you ^{all} needed. Why would you bother to relate to

another individual rather than the community, a community renewal, but that they share with you a sense of the task that was needed to be done there.

That's the only authentic -point at which you've got any reason for

working together. And then in the midst of that task the story, the mind,

the symbol and the style. I suppose in a way those have always been true

but today in particularity that task shows up in the social and the story

is common while the mind of the group is common, the symbol is common

and the style is common. A team is never at any point an answer. There's a

propensity in the task out of our political images ~~that individualism~~ to

understand a team as a group of social task images in the world, minds and

stories where we've sort of agreed on a few things and if we work together

on those few things we can scratch each other's back to operate. Today in

order to be effective a team is out after one common thrust and shares a

kind of commonality about that that's necessary to carry it forth.

f

For instance, there's a picture in the life magazine that came out at the end

of 1973 of Kissinger, and I was fascinated. Kissinger for one reason or another decided to ~~become~~ ^{be} photographed with his staff. - that's another four letter word. 4

↳
It's another word I suspect for team. Here's Kissinger in this rather silly-4

looking flowered chair in the front, sitting there and then behind him were 4

about 10 people, and it was unbelievable the characters on that team. There

was this young lady who couldn't have been more than 22 with owl glasses, there

was this matronly figure of about 65 who had her hands on the back of the chair

there was two sharp looking young buisness men types, there was a guy who looked-

like he spent his whole life in the library with big thick glasses and so

forth, he had on a sweater, the rest had on suits. You've got a feel that when yo

see Kissinger striving around with his briefcase, all you see is the public manif

estation of that incredible team, the woman holding onto the chair from behind

you know, who was probably translating in the library so he can say something

intelligible. Just the kind of power that was there seems to me that an

individual, even when you see a great individual today, what you're seeing

... of a group of people what you're seeing is the public

face of probably a great deal of tension. I expect that creativity like you see embodied in Kissinger or in many places today does not take place in the midst of one ^{being} ~~genius~~. It takes place in the encounter with the other. Can you imagine that old matron when she takes off after that guy in the sweater who spends his time in the library - can you imagine the kind of conflict that must take place just between the kind of woman she is and the kind of fellow he is? Can you imagine the kind of conflict between the 22 year old young lady and those 40 year old business ^{men} types on that team? It's in the midst in that kind of encounter that conflict, that creativity, emerges today. Or just the story as far as I can tell is a group of people who in the face of a social task are able to encounter each other with integrity, with passion over the future, and out of that encounter comes creativity, and you think of the encounter of sexes in the midst of a team, you think of the encounter of phases in the midst of a team, you think of just the encounter of different ways of organizing the universe in the midst of a team, and you begin to get a feel for what it is to have tension that is creati

engaged relative to history, and effectiveness in that sort of engagement has something to do with inclusiveness. Dealing with one little issue here, another little focus there - we just decide to deal with education on our team or we just decide to deal with politics on our team - simply does not allow the team the kind of range by which it can effectively engage people's care, nor does it allow the team a way of adequately playing its role relative to the community. For me somehow, a team's social task needs to be an inclusive kind of a task. We'll deal with every single problem in ^{this} the situation. Just to be able to use all the kinds of gifts that are there, and be able to focus them. A team is organized in a way that has structures in it so that the old matron is not over against the young fellow except relative to ^{this} the task. She could take him on for 50 things, I sure and would probably like to most of the time, but how do you create the kind of structures that hold that tension over against the task, rather than the millions of little things you could be in tension over. In the midst of a group which you probably already ^{well} acquainted with. Then that task is rationally defined

it holds together the entire situation of which those people are a part.

The reason for instance that you do a brainstorm and include in your contradictions and later in the rest of your battleplanning every single bit of that

data is so that that team can grasp that every single concern they have ^{is} ~~is~~

dealt that community is being ~~xxxx~~ with in the midst of the team and is organized

in a way that I can hold in my mind what the task is, Gandhi for me, one of

his greatest gifts was when you'd ask him what was needed in India, he had 5

for the 5 fingers and could just rattle them off, what his vision was. That

kind of rationality allows the team without consulting its battleplan, you know,

20 pages of it to say just what they are about. 1-2-3-4-5. That kind of rational

in the task is crucial. And I guess the greatest danger of the team shows up in

our propensity for instance to grasp a team as strong leadership and a lot of

rank and file, or as experts in leadership and a rank and file. It's just

incredibly dangerous to show up where people are ^{operating} ~~operati~~ out of a stance of

duty. Well, they said we've got to do it this way so we just hand out these

brochures the way we're told to do. Young man, there's nobody at home... just leave them right here - you know that kind of stance of duty just a danger there

The other that that kind of heirarchical form is where I'm understand that since the leadership of the team or the expertise on the team is so far up *apfield* ~~here~~ to anything that I could do that I can do whatever I want, and I show up as as a kind of and independent , irresponsible, genius along going and doing what-ever ~~ixwantx~~ kind of thing I do. The danger of both of those is that the team does not *commonly* get it's job done. It's focused on either the sort of duty that is ~~common~~ ineffective or the sort of individual creativity that is ineffective and I guess the danger finally in that is that you find yourself refusing to be in covenant, or refusing to be 100% engaged with your care in the world.

You know sometimes someone will say Oh that may be where the team's going, but *really* I can't play a very important role in that, I'm ~~not~~ really very important in this group so if you guys go ahead and do that and I'll go along and carry on

What's been broken there is the common trust or the common covenant by which ~~er~~

every single person on the team is equally responsible for what takes place in t

that team - or you have a team leader that goes off and says I'm going to

stay over here and pout until you guys shape up and do the job right - I

call that the Achilles syndrome, where the fine warrior goes off and sits in

his tent and pouts until the rest of his colleagues show up and operate

like he'd have them operate. Both of those are a place in which the commonness

of that team is broken and the danger of ~~that~~ it is that when there ^{is a crisis the} are only 2

or 3 people that you can rely upon to do the job. And when 1 or 2 or 3 people

out of a group are doing a job, generally they are doing it either because they

are moralists who are standing there heroically being martyrs and enjoying

every minute of it, or because they have some kind of personal engzgement

in that task, that that's the only thing they were interested in all along.. In

In either of those cases, you finally don't get the job done with the three

you have left. You either move with everyone 100 % responsible for that task

or finally you don't move, finally you find yourself collapsing. Well I guess

under all²⁷ that is that the task is the focus of the team. When one says that's

the task that I'll spend my life on then you can trust him to do absolutely

anything. That's the only criteria you ask of somebody who comes along and wants

wants to participate in the team, and when I join up with some group of

people and their task is a task that I'm interested in seeing done in history.

I can trust them to do whatever I see ~~needs~~ needing to be done relative

to history. That's the only basis of trust in the midst of the team. You say

well I'm not sure I like the way he relates to his wife in the midst of this.

~~I like the way he relates~~ I'm not sure we can really rely on ~~sox~~ and so

to do the job, and who cares what he does with his wife except whether that

shows up ~~in~~ as something that might negate his decision to be that task.

That's the only point at which the team trusts each other and that's the

point at which the team absolutely trusts each other. Well in the midst of that

how do you remind yourself perpetually that that's the case, the issue

of that kind of trust in the midst of the team is not a one-time thing. It's

something that requires perpetually recreating. You recreate it in ~~some~~ *just* instances

with a common story or a common way of talking about what it is the team's after.

If the Dolphins out in the field change their story about what ~~it is~~ they're out to do midpoint, ^{if} ~~or~~ one of them decides that he doesn't altogether agree with what they are trying to do relative to the other team, you would have just an absolute joke out there on the field, and you'd probably lose a few of the Dolphins in the midst of it. The team is as long as they are out on the field of action in the community or wherever common front, there is a common story about what they're after. Now they may argue like cats and dogs in the back room, as for instance what the grid is of the community, they may argue over what ~~is~~ it is that gets said about a particular tactic or whether they go with it but once they're out of the back room you hear one story and that story gets articulated in such a way that the last character bumbling along on the team can rehearse it just as well as the one on the team who made it up, that that's the story about what's going on. And ~~then~~ I suppose the way that kind of common ~~trust~~ ^{front} takes place is devising ways that every opinion in that body gets into the common stew in

the back room, not on the field, by which the common story -is formulated out of th
wisdom of the entire group although it might be discontinuous of anybody's
particular wisdom. The story is that the team is effective, that the team
wins in the midst of its situation. Now you may need from time to time to
adjust the story a little bit in order to be winning, in order to be going at
the vision the way that you saw fit, but you never show up with a common front
that says well whatever it was that happenèd we tried, and we really didn't get
X done. The story is that we win in the afena, we tried , not that we are somehow
statistically improving relative to how we did last month or last year, but
- and that also ⁴has deeply to do with battleplanning; the common mind I
suppose is under that or its where you provide the methods for that ~~XXXX~~
whole team ^{to be} is able to get their wisdom into the story. If I didn't know that I
had a storm for instance and if I've never participated in some kind of
common social analysis, I don't have the tools to get my opinion in relevant
to the story.. Its almost like those news conversations ^{that get done} at breakfast these days

one of the most valuable things you can do not relevant necessarily to getting people on top of the news or making up for people who didn't get a newspaper - but relative to creating a sort of common mind out of which a story can be formulated commonly and allowing opinions to get into the stew of the whole group. Anything you say for instance about a social issue contributes to the story of what the team's about in the world, that that kind of seriousness I think is in the midst of that sort of providing the methods. It's like the only reason a nurse is part of a surgery team is part of that team without whom you can't operate and a doctor is part of that team without whom you can't operate is that they have both been trained in the sort of methods by which if the one doesn't know what to do ~~to save~~ the other very well might in terms of saving that person. The doctor doesn't worry walking out for a minute that that nurse will not be able to step in and do what's needed. That kind of providing of methods is there. that ~~isn't~~ possible for every single person on the team to be able to do the job that any one person can do. That kind of providing pf methods is there

in order for that kind of story to be enacted. And then, behind that I suppose, &

less articulate than the common mind and yet in a way more crucial is the common symbol. Almost as a team ~~one of the most~~ ^{for me} one of the most crucial things you

do is rehearse what the task is that you came together about and your ^{peculiar} ~~particular~~

relationship and that has to do not simply with the story but with the kind

of visual images that hold that task, that symbol that there after the first

time I ever saw ^{that} a LENS course held for me an image of what I'm about. When I

see ^f that on my lapell, when I see that in a room, I may not even be thinking

about it but I'm reminded of just the kind of decision I've made. I'd have a

harder time rejecting that in my life, in the way that it's become a part of

my being than a whole lot of things that I may or may not like, but that has

become a part of my fabric as it were, and then ^{how do} you create the kind of symbols

not only relative to the broad task but a symbol of any of those that holds the

particularity ^{by} of that task. Almost for me part of that symbol is how do you con-

tinue to remind yourself of the relationship between peeling potatoes or handing

out brochures seems to be by the bushel or recruiting ^{people} ~~for~~ some event and they

say no all the time. How do you remind yourself of the relationship between that :
seemingly ~~just~~ silly stuff that you show up doing and the kind of vision that
got you into that situation in the first place, the kind of vision that is
underneath your understanding there. The team is the place at which that kind
of rehearsal ~~t~~akes place, its the rehearsal not only of the particular and *the*
broad vision of the task but crucial to the relationship between these two. How
is it that peeling potatoes on a Tuesday evening has to do with creating a new
society in such and such a length of time. That kind of particularity there
seems to me is just crucial. *John's know* And the places you see that kind of thing happening
are fascinating When they finished the Sears Tower down here downtown a bunch
of hardhats got up at the end of it and sang a song that they had composed -
I believe it was called the "Ode to the ~~Great~~ Tower" - and it was a great
song that these guys *had* composed on the job and it said to me that the team has that
kind of power that has force to it, and somebody told me that the construction
work ~~that was~~ done on that tower, was done with fewer slipups than the great

majority of buildings that have been built in Chicago in the last 5 years. I suspect that that did not have to do with particular skills and gifts of those construction guys. I suspect that it had something to do with the fact that they looked upon that tower as something to sing about, the fact that they looked upon building that building as a crucial job relative to Chicago and ^{that} that relative to the world. The kinds of images that they put out in that song just said to me that what had been done there was a team that had decided to commonly symbolize its engagement and the significance of it. Someth~~ing~~ like the Chicago Picasso I suppose does that in a different kind of way. Just the sort of language you use when you talk to each other does that. Sometimes people say its a lot of jargon that this group or that group or some other group uses they are always saying things that you can't understand. That is stupid relative to an uninitiate or a non-member of your team, but relative to your own team that's precisely what you would do, relative to creating the sort of common mind, the sort of common ways of articulating of what's going on, that you can commun-

missed a pg. Number (OK)

icate

with each other, and I suspect that recovers language in an in-

credible kind of way, but that's not what I'm talking about here. In the midst

of that ~~kind of~~ common symbol there's a common style. For me the style is

perhaps the most ~~pro~~ profound of ~~them~~ ^{the} of ~~these~~ dynamics of teaming, or whatever

you call it. It's the place at which you formulate ^{just those} structures that allow somebody

to be his care 24 hours a day, to be his care 7 days a week., to be the team that

he is not matter where he is He may wear one of those in his lapell, and

people just ask him what is that thing you have in your lapell and he rehearses

his story. ^{again} He may set up the kind of time design by which every tuesday night

~~there~~ ^{when} is the team get together, or every Saturday morning or whatever by

which the whole flow of the week gets regularly transformed by the fact that ..

is always in a certain place.. That kind of common force can allow one's whole

life to be cared for by the fact of his being in the midst of his engagement

in the community. And I guess that has also to do with the kind of relationship

that take place among the team. I don't know if you watch Kojak, I never had

before a few nights ago and Kojak is a cop, and there's a fellow in the department who was killed, and they found \$10,000 in his pocket when he was killed, and there was great suspicion as to how to go about solving the case, and the department is convinced he was innocent.. And he said the department will now stop all other cases and we're going to examine what happened here. We're all on this assignment. And somebody came up to Kojak " I'm ~~not~~ not part of h-is unit" I never worked with the guy.. And Kojak turns around and said when one guy in this department is killed, this is everybody's assignment" That kind of grasp that any one particular relationship in that team is the relationship of the whole team came to me as just profoundly helpful in the sort of style was equip in that team. Well, how do you map out these sort of dynamics. I suppose they have to do with what comes to me as a series of sort of strange practices, or maybe sort of basic tactics. The first one has to do with cultivating objective fellowhood, and I don't mean - I guess the emphasis there is on the objective ^{more} rather than ~~the~~ fellowhood but those are crucial. ^{that} The trust that I mentioned in the midst of the team is some-

thing~~that~~ does not just naturally occur. I've got no reason to trust a
grop of people, simply because they're engaged in the same job I am, how is it
~~that~~
you create the kind of events in which that trust is rehearsed, is grounded,
is given form, and dynamism to it. It's something like providing instances in
which members of that team have a chance to care for the whole team, providing
situations in which we show up having to move ~~in a~~ way that we might not care
to move with each other. I think of people on teams that I have been on that
have been rather effective when it seemed like from time to time you showed
up those of us who most despised each other, working together. And not work-
ing together everyday so much as working together relative to ^{crucial} an issue
I guess I'd say I've experienced trust of ~~more~~ people that I despise~~d~~ on teams,
when I discovered that they were willing to work shoulder to shoulder with me
when we had to produce, and generally in other words I got to despise them but
never despised ~~them~~ ^{with} ~~in~~ the same way. It was despising in the midst of the kind
of love you have for somebody that you know is 100% where their concern, where

your concern is. That's a love that can take a lot of despising in the midst of it, but that's a love. This kind of fellowhood I suppose has to do with honoring the individual but the team most needs honor. The team that's struggling with nitty, gritty ness - to honor the one who sits around and does the nitty gritty. The team is struggling with mystery. They can't seem to deal with all the wild things that are breaking in, maybe you picked the wierd one on the team and see that that one gets honored, gets ~~ph~~held up, just the given maybe that one gets up and reads a poem that night. Maybe that's the one that reads the song that time. How is it that you create the kind of honoring the individual not because people really like that character, but because that individual's contribution to that team is that without which that team would not be able to carry on effectively relative to the job. That sort of objective fellowhood is there. And then just the arena of indirect^c consensus.. I find one of the easiest things that takes place ~~in~~ one of the easiest places where ~~a~~ teams particularly in a situation that could seem at all political show up committing suicide in an way is that they've got to formalize their decision right off. I sat in a meeting

one afternoon (not here but somewhere else I was at) and this meeting was
among a great number of my colleagues and the person leading had decided that what
the consensus of that group meant was that everyone in the group said "oh yes I
definitely ~~con~~se^{under} with that issue. And then they had all said that when you
could come back and say, now do we have a consensus and this lasted from about
11:30 in the morning until about 5:00 in the afternoon. It was pretty evident by
11:00 that people in the group agreed with each other. By 2:00 in the afternoon ~~ha~~
half the group just went home., they were bored stiff and ^{they} knew pretty well what
was going to happen. I wonder if what finally came out was the consensus that had
been there at 11:30 in the morning? Consensus is something that is always evi-
dent in the midst of the body long before everybody said Yes, I ^{ag}reed with that, or
you raise some formal kind of thing. Consensus is what's evident. It's where ~~them~~
things are likely to move. It's ^{what} ~~what~~ people are assuming Now how do you begin
to raise a particular issue in such a way that ^{those} ~~the~~ assumptions can be in ferment?
It's almost like you put up a balloon and see what happens in the midst of that

group. You put out a little trial comment What would you think if we did such and such next month? Wouldn't it be wild if we put on a circus in the spring around here? And the first ~~thing you know~~ time you try it the balloon would go up, and that's a balloon you might not put out for a while. People have said no their brooding wasn't there. Or maybe you just do a brainstorm on something way off in the future and by that brainstorm the group gets a feel for ^{it} the common bond about the future. As we look toward the fall, for instance what do I feel that the Fall needs to look like? And you get a feel. Maybe 3 weeks later as you look to the fall and what kind of signal events do we need to have in mind? And that first one, that first raising of that question, have influenced The second raising of that question, people whether even whether they knew it or not, but people usually know about it. Whether they knew it or not, that first brainstorm left their minds stew a little bit on an issue that they ^{just} hadn't thought about. On the wisdom of ^{that} the entire group. Then on the other side of that, for me when a consensus is arrived at, it is shared, ^{it} is articulated. Perhaps the

most tragic thing that happened in Watergate was that you had a team that was

operating in an inarticulate consensus. People were assuming as individuals

what the consensus of the body was, what the tactic was that they were operating

out of and therefore were using their individual integrity, their individual

operation ^{to carry out} doing a tactic that was not agreed upon. And you hear in testimony

that I assumed, it ~~seemed~~ seemed to me that was the way we were going. That sort of

inarticulate consensus, shows up as tragedy. I suppose because it handstrings

the individual's ability to act out of ^{the} consensus. It leaves him wondering whether

you, X or Y is responsible in a particular situation. In the midst of that the

team operates out of rational contexts or constructs that hold together in a ~~s~~

simple and elegant, ^{maybe appropriate} is the word, pleasing - a form that you can

participate in. The whole wisdom of the team, for instance, you make a time design

for the quarter ~~for the quarter~~ or for the week - how do you hold ~~in~~ every

single kind of time that is going to be used, during that week or that quarter?

And can hold it ~~in~~ such a way that I can look at it and immediately grasp where

this kind of time is or that kind of time ^{is} ~~immediately~~ immediately going to be used. An

assignment construct how do you hold in the assignment construct every single bit of mission, every single bit of engagement that our team is involved in?

Every single person on the team? And in a rational relationship to it? You

go ahead and
~~have got to~~ put the people who are on sick leave or something in the first

column and that pretty well tells you your rational picture of what the task of the

team is. You ought to get sick first. If you are not sick you need to engage

in some of these other things that you are doing here this week. How do you get ~~the~~

that kind of relationship of the story of that team and the picture that that team

has of what they are doing at any moment one picture, one picture. And I guess

even simple things - putting a line around the border of a sheet of paper, does

a kind of rationality on the total picture. Those grids, and I guess I talked

about this yesterday, putting a line, a black line around the edge of that grid

you might say its a waste of tape, there's an awful lot of yards of tape used

on that wall taht we could have saved, but decided that for each of those grids

to demonstrate that that parish is in the midst of the world, which is what you *the grid*

have to draw a border around it. Its not just some circles that you dropped off on

geography which our community shows up, its a circle represents the world in which
our community show up. Just that kind of drama in the midst of every construct
does more relative to my grasping my relationship in what I do from day to day to
history more than you can imagine. Have you gotten a time design that is an agenda
and there is a type over here that says nine o'clock, 9:05, 9:10, 9:15 and
then when you get to late afternoon it goes to a second page and somewhere around
~~form~~ 4:00 - 7:00 is on the second page. When you look at that you have no way,
at least very difficult, to get a picture of what is that day about? Or some-
one says what was that day about and there is equal status given to the
coffee breaks at 8:14 and the major presentation at 9:02 How do you distinguish
which events are crucial and which events are coffee breaks? In the design.
That kind of rationality there. And I guess that is as true of the format of the
meeting as it is about anything that is printed. In the midst of the team. Then a
team assignment, and I guess I talked a bit about that this morning for
rationality, The key I suppose to the assignments is that they are equitable

rather than equal. You are out after a rational rotation where each person understands that he participates in that task with equibality relative to every other person on the teams. participation in the task. He doesn't always show up giving the lecture, he doesn't always show up clearing the table, he doesn't always show up leading ~~the~~ meetings but knows that his participation will hold. And yet we're not out after some kind of democracy where so and so even though they have more particular passion for or interest in ^{or} ability to do X so they do X, or they ought to ^{do because we ought to} give them a change. The question is relative to the task that we have ahead where do we need each one of our people engaged It may be that somebody not at all skilled at leading a meeting is leading the meeting. but it has to do with what you want to happen at the meeting not with the person leading it. Doing something that he is unskilled to do and not well prepared to come off as over against the meeting coming off. I don't know how you adequately dramatize for yourself the seriousness of just always asking ~~ourselves~~ what relative to the task does our orchestration need to look like. And you know you're

eague unprepared as another to do whatever task ~~that~~ is required ^{relative} to the vision that we have laid out. Then finally, occassioning periodic accountability.

I suppose the team is always in the midst of its fellowhood and trust in which it establishes a consensus and creates constructs and assignments to implement that consensus. In the midst of that there is always the question of Are we in fact doing the task that we came together to do or are we doing something else?

Adn it strikes me that that is a very objective question. That has to do with running through the kind of assignments that were given or the kind of rational

constructs that the group stands present to.. The consensus that ^{was} ~~the group a~~

articulated. The statement of ~~the, or~~ the trust, or the mission or the task of

that group. That's a very objective thing. It is not beating somebody ~~over the head~~

^{head} because they didn't do it the way you would ~~have~~ had them do it. And then th

question finally of that accountability is if we were at X point rather than at

Y point, how do we get ourselves to Y point. You simply -need to know the status

^{what} of ~~where they have been~~ done by the team on behalf of the whole team or the

or the team as a whole in order to move on. If you were so busy honoring so and so and how hard she worked, last Saturday rather than the ~~a~~ question of We unders
x
stand you worked very hard, What did you get done? If even though it got done, it doesn't matter how hard anybody worked you don't know where to move next. That kind of struggle there I suppose. To me also accountability has ^{also} ~~something~~ to do with celebration. That if the only time you ask yourself where you're at is from the position of has everything gotten done? ~~then~~ it becomes rather serious and dull. buisness. When an event gets done and its obviously ^{been} a victory *you've also got an accountability*. To mark that that is a victory. There is nothing more destructive in terms of corporateness than the kind of situation in which the only time I'm asked about what I've done is when someone suspects that I haven't done it and wants to see that we fix things up relative to the future. There is also the time when you ask what we've done and we know very well that what we've done was fantastic and we rehearse that just as powerfully and ^{mark} ~~love~~ that as we rehearse the times when we ^{need} revise our future plans in order to deal with what's ahead. All of this goes into the operation of the

events relative to the future. Well, in the midst of our times, each one of us is focusing our care on a community, bears the weight of discerning how it is that teams will operate if you look any-where in ^{of} buidness, particularly in production and management, the question is how on earth do you get a certain job done effectively?

I believe it is, ^{Sol} that experimenting with a team of people makes a department. and they just divide up assignments as they will rather than just an assembly line method of construction. They are with us trying to figure out how ^{it is} that people can work together relative to a task effectively. The kind of struggle that you see in government ~~today~~ in this country today (and I don't ~~mean~~ really mean ^{is} this country much less than many nations ⁱⁿ the third world) is a struggle to get said " how do you formulate a team that can operate effectively relative to a task?" And that's a struggle the end of which is released as corporate power. Being engaged in that ~~struggle~~ struggle is what releases the power of ^{an} the individual (who is finally relatively meaningful) but the power of an individual as part of an entity that did something in history, and ^a entity that made a mark in the midst of civilization. And that's ver

powerful individuality although it may not come that way at first blush.

It's that ^{that} ~~which~~ will formulate primal community What's being asked in the midst of every neighborhood is, "How on earth as a neighborhood can we operate together with each other, rather than having to lock ourselves in at night or lock every one else out during the day? ^{How} Then how is it that we can operate together as a community in the globe, the polity is and where do we look for forms of how to operate together as a team across ^{the} the earth? What kinds of forms and structures and operating principles are needed there? That polity of the globe is also the experiment that you are ^{doing} when you're teaming. And I suppose finally its and experiment in just devising how people might be engaged in the ^{wald} globe. The kind of popularity of war movies and pop ~~movies~~ films and gangster movies says to me ^{that} ~~that~~ we crave in a way to be significantly engaged in a task we understand. The trouble with the task ^{is} ~~is~~ we get is that we don't have a way to go to understand if we don't have a way to get hold of all this. I started figuring out the dynamics of a team in figuring out the dynamics by which every human being today can be engaged with all

kinds of passion that made of.... the 20th century a time of unbelievable excitement

rather than a time ^{of great} ~~for~~ tragedy.