



WORLDWORK IN ORGANIZATIONS

An Introduction and Three Case Studies



© Max Schupbach, Ph.D.
2049 NW Hoyt Ste. #3
Portland, OR, 97209
fax/voice: (503)210-0314
max@maxfacilitation.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	2
II. Worldwork – <i>Transformation in Organizations, Communities, Business, and the Public Space</i>	2
III. Conceptual Highlights of Worldwork.....	11
IV. Europe, USA and the Caribbean – <i>Deep Democracy, Collaboration And Strategy in a Global 500 Company</i>	14
V. Punks, Businesspeople, Police, Residents, Addicts and the City Administration - <i>An Open Forum in Zurich, Switzerland</i>	28
VI. Who Is The Culprit – <i>Organizational Development In A Prison</i>	35

INTRODUCTION

This collection introduces the Worldwork model and three case studies of some of its possible applications. The first chapter provides an overview of the model, describing its underlying methodology, perspective, and conceptual framework. The following chapter presents highlights of the theoretical concepts, and elucidates some of the terms and concepts that are used in the subsequent case studies. The three case studies in this compilation represent a few of the vast range of settings in which the Worldwork model can be applied. You can either read the two preliminary chapters first, for an introduction into the methods and concepts applied in the case studies. Or you can go directly to the case studies, beginning on page 14, and refer back to the initial chapters if needed.

WORLDWORK – TRANSFORMATION IN ORGANIZATIONS, COMMUNITIES, BUSINESS, AND THE PUBLIC SPACE

What is Worldwork?

Worldwork is a new paradigm for working with change within the complete spectrum of organizational and communal life. Its process-oriented view introduces new universal categories to describe and work with change and flow in organizations and the collective at large. It sees everyone as being simultaneously observers, participants, facilitators, followers and leaders; although at times, we might be identified with only one or a few of these roles. Worldwork allows analysis and facilitation of groups on a variety of different scales, from global processes to local events, and in the public space as well as in various organizational forms such as businesses, non-profit organizations, government agencies, religious communities, etc.

In these pages, I hope to demonstrate how diversity, deep democracy, complex system theory, quantum thinking, and the study of consciousness are intrinsically linked, forming a new paradigm - a paradigm that is not only rational, but also poetic. It embodies accuracy in its scientific theory, as well as the beating heart of the community spirit, and it includes a deep respect for the various self-realization processes of the individual members and the bottom line needs of organizations. It is this combination that allows the facilitation of the creative, unpredictable, often intense process of organizational emergence – to the rhythm provided by the conductor of a universal symphony.

Measurable and Non-Measurable Aspects of Reality

Developed by Arnold and Amy Mindell and their teams, Worldwork values equally both non-measurable and measurable aspects of reality, enabling a more complete and comprehensive picture of an organization.

The application of this seemingly simple concept extends in fact over a vast range of situations. The measurable and non-measurable categories are similar to visible and invisible, or tangible and intangible. For example when we work on diversity issues, we value “measurable” components such as gender, race, age, class, sexual orientation, etc, as well as non-measurable components such as hopes, dreams, feelings, ideas, and talents, etc. By the same token, power that is related to one’s specific position in the hierarchy, or to one’s general socio-economic rank, is often measurable; while aspects of power such as “wisdom of an elder”, “strength of moral conviction”, or “street power”, are less measurable but equally important in the calculation of the power balance. In another realm, for example in a business environment, the equality of measurable and non-measurable aspects can mean that the factual information of the value chain and the numeric aspects of the financial management are inseparable from the hopes, fears, attitudes and conflicts that exist among the members or departments of the organization, and that all of these facets together can be seen as an indivisible reality. Singling out certain parts as being more important than others will inevitably create trouble zones coming from those aspects that were marginalized. In this context, Democracy and Diversity are seen as principles that go far beyond social justice, political correctness or numerical equality, like, for example, representation of equal numbers of women and men in a committee. We rather encourage respecting all individuals, organizational trends, experiences, and states of consciousness. We view this as indispensable for the mathematics of finding and using all the information within a given system.

In this sense, the Worldwork paradigm bridges science with the humanities by introducing a framework that encompasses and enhances both. At the center of Worldwork’s philosophical framework are awareness and the study of consciousness. From this center, Worldwork makes fresh connections to three main areas:

- **It establishes a link with the findings of quantum mechanics, chaos theory, and network theory.**
- **It integrates and uses postmodern concepts from sociology, political science, psychology, and anthropology.**
- **It encompasses many of the concepts and the wisdom of indigenous and shamanic cultures and their understanding of the importance of community life and relationships.**

Worldwork theory demonstrates how the study of the consciousness unifies these approaches.

Where is Worldwork used?

Although in many circles Worldwork is best known for transcending the principle of majority rule and the political correctness by introducing the concept of Deep Democracy into diversity work, its range of applications is virtually limitless. Deep Democracy is a new awareness style which respects all individuals, trends, and states of consciousness. It includes the awareness that the world can only partially be understood and that everyone and every state of consciousness is needed to represent reality. On a personal level, it requires educating ourselves to notice all our inner experiences while dealing with the outer world, holding an awareness in a given moment of feelings, dreaming, and social power. That has many consequences organizational development, group life, politics, and personal development.

Here are some of the areas in which we apply Worldwork. In each of these areas, Worldwork brings a completely new approach. I include in each area one example of an innovation that it brings, although these examples reflect only a very small part of what is a fundamentally different way of viewing and working with each of these areas.

- **Process-oriented Organizational Transformation: Organizational development and transformation programs for groups, businesses, non-profit organizations, networks and grassroots initiatives.** *Example of an innovation → we show how even the greatest difficulties contain their own built-in multiple solutions, which are accessible to the group for sustainable change from within.*
- **Open forum facilitation for groups of up to a 1000 people in town meetings on various issues of public concern.** *Example of an innovation → we address and unpack the most volatile issues which are most often avoided and show their value for community building.*
- **Open forum facilitation in organizational settings, such as board-management relationship interactions and management-shareholder relationship interactions.** *Example of an innovation → we facilitate awareness and conscious use of rank and power which resolves hidden long term chronic personal and departmental standoffs.*
- **Process-oriented strategy development and implementation on all organizational levels, using a multi-level and diversity-oriented approach.** *Example of innovation → We have a visioning process*

which includes all organizational levels and helps to discover the core organizational myth: the individual and timeless character of an organization, which is its biggest potential and source of power.

- **Individual and collective leadership development programs as well as leadership coaching in the areas of business, politics, government, non-profit organizations, socio-economic reform initiatives, and youth groups, etc.** *Example of innovation → We link awareness and the parallel worlds concept from physics to allow leaders understand complex situations and deal with them fluidly.*
- **Teambuilding and team facilitation.** *Example of innovation → We have a methodology that allows members to experience the self-balancing aspects of crises, and to use it to reach a new level of co-operation.*
- **Urban planning.** *Example of innovation → We use measurable and non-measurable aspects of public space to facilitate new relationships between city administrations, businesses, political forces and marginalized communities. An example of this is the project of "Citywork - Therapy for the City".*
- **Socio-economic change programs.** *Example of innovation → We make the individual hidden talents, which emerge during personal crises, visible, and use it as a key concept in "Leaders of Tomorrow," a leadership development program for unemployed and/or homeless people.*
- **Conflict resolution on various levels in conflict areas like the Middle East, the Balkans, Ireland.** *Example of innovation → We understand that conflict and even war are often a first step in improving relationships between groups and we can meet with all the parties involved with an initial supportive attitude.*
- **Conflict resolution within organizations, including issues of merging organizations, inter-departmental conflicts, and industrial relations, etc.** *Example of innovation → We show how these conflicts are organized by the organizational "spirit", or self-organizing field, and can be used for the purpose of expanding the participants' views regarding the power and potential of the organization.*
- **Health care models.** *Example of innovation → We show how multicultural aspects, patient - care person - health provider relationships, and diversity of medical models can be understood as*

being part of a single reality, which needs input and participation from all the interested parties to create a sustainable future.

- **New participatory models for educational programs.** *Example of innovation*→ Teachers, learners and Facilitators are rotating roles that can be used for creating an educational program, in which community building, personal development and content driven learning are formulated as an integrated whole.
- **Conflict resolution in the workplace.** *Example of innovation*→ We show how individual relationship conflicts, in the workplace, are local between the people and non-local within the organization. This awareness can first be used to ease the tensions between the involved individuals, and second to support the future development of the organization as a whole. The conflicting parties can actively participate in this process on all levels.
- **New ideas about online facilitation and e-community building.** *Example of innovation*→ We show how network theory concepts like the small world phenomena or the concept of degrees of separation expand when you combine them with the three level approach, about which you will read more on the next page.
- **Perpetrator-victim mediation.** *Example of innovation*→ We unfold the processes behind revenge and guilt so we can use them as the driving forces for creating restorative justice solution.

The Pillars of the Worldwork Paradigm – a Perspective, a Methodology, and a Path of Personal Inspiration

The Worldwork Perspective

The Worldwork perspective looks at every person, group and event as equally important to the emerging future of the community and of the globe. It differentiates between three levels, which we think of as parallel worlds.

The first two levels are defined as the measurable and non-measurable aspects of groups and organizations. The measurable level creates a consensus reality, which has, for example, components like organizational facts, but also organizational structures, strategic goals, best practices to meet them, etc. The non-measurable aspects consist of creative tensions and impulses, such as excitement, jealousy, power struggles, and so on... On the third level, the Worldwork perspective includes an awareness of a sense of

connectedness between everyone and everything, a non-dualistic common ground in which disturbing polarities no longer exist.

These three levels are seen as equally important perspectives. They are parallel worlds that only seem conflicting or irrational from a Newtonian viewpoint. The Quantum Mind, which is aware and open to the self-reflecting tendency of the universe, experiences them simultaneously, with shifting focus, and flows between them easily. This perspective, together with the methodology, can be used, for instance, to solve conflicts and create synergy between a rational, fact-oriented faction of the organization, and the feeling, relationship-oriented part of a group.

All three levels interact together and create a picture that shows a process which is ultimately creative and meaningful, pulled by the future as much as it is driven by the past. Unfolding this meaning allows us to co-create an emerging future, and to watch seemingly unrelated or even disturbing events fall into place, creating a bigger picture. From this perspective, we find that most problems contain their own built-in solutions.

The Worldwork Methodology

The Worldwork methodology includes concepts, methods, and interventions for facilitating emerging processes on these three levels, and for assisting organizations in consciously making changes for the co-creation of their own futures. Instead of working to overcome obstacles that stand between us and our goals, we find and track the self-organizing streams that exist in groups and use them as wormholes into the parallel universes.

Some of the Worldwork concepts, such as the idea of the field in physics, have their origins in modern science. It conceptualizes a phenomenon, where we notice the effect of a structuring force on reality, without the reality being in physical contact with the source. An example would be gravity, where a force field surrounding a body of finite mass will exert forces on other bodies without having to be in contact with them. The ancient Chinese concept of the Tao can be viewed as something similar. The Tao that cannot be said is considered to be an organizing principle of reality. Although it can not be seen or even expressed, it influences everything. Fields organize the life of organizations, giving us often the feeling, that we are powerless in influencing the groups that we are part of or even lead.

Other Worldwork concepts have been used for millennia in spiritual and indigenous traditions around the globe. For example, the concept of dreaming—as we use it in Worldwork—can also be found among the Australian Aboriginals. It refers to a process of creative imagination in which we perceive ourselves as being a part of, with or without our conscious intent. Or, to say it another way, it combines the notion of self-organizing

tendencies of systems towards equilibrium with a sense of awareness and meaningful directedness.

The idea that we can look at the “dreaming” of an organization suggests that if we notice that the organization, at times, behaves as if it were autonomous; we should not think of it as an out-of-control driverless car but rather as an enchanted organism that follows its own intelligent, possibly non-linear, yet meaningful impulses—a recognition that is not always immediately accessible to the linear thinking of participants.

Another Worldwork concept: the “ghost role” differentiates the extent to which a group identifies itself with its participation in a particular event. For instance, some members of an organization might use the word “we” when referring to something that they identify with, but the words “the organization” when referring to something that they feel is not in their control. The statement, “We all worked hard, but the organization doesn’t value that,” shows a simple example of this phenomenon. In this case, “the organization” is presented as a kind of a ghostlike figure that does not seem to value everyone’s work—a non-local presence that seems to disturb some members. If we give a voice to these “ghosts,” groups can find their underlying creative potential and meaning. In this case, for example, members might play out the ghost of the organization in a role play, and, through this process, discover that they need to change the organization by valuing one another more.

Worldwork defines as **the edge** the point at which a group is challenged by its development to identify itself with an idea or experience that is new for them. In the above example, the edge for these participants is to identify themselves with actually being the organization that they consider themselves to be victimized by. In so doing, the organizational change can happen right then and there, in that session, among those present, through the valuing of one another.

Because the edge is the focal point that carries the greatest potential for change and is closest to the self-organizing stream of the organization, it is often perceived as an area in which things are getting out of control.

Worldwork contains a body of techniques and interventions that track the multi-level experiences of the interested parties. Because interventions are linked directly to the actual experiences of the participants, group members need not prescribe to the Worldwork paradigm. This notion is especially important in the area of conflict resolution.

Worldwork as a Path of Inspiration and Personal Development

A person's decisions to lead, facilitate, and actively participate in organizations and in community life are founded upon a profound inspiration. The calling that initiates the outer decision to work in this arena organizes and facilitates a person's learning path and direction of personal development. Learning, in our view, is largely based upon connecting with this inner process, and discovering one's own personal myth in connection with the world at large, as well as with a given organization. Teaching is the facilitation of this connection between the learner and the learner's path. This inspirational path binds the paradigm, the methodology, and the personality of the facilitator/leader/elder into a seamless whole, and is the source of the attitudes and feelings that each of us brings to our work. By placing awareness in the center of our observations, research and personal interactions; we learn to believe in our actual innate potentials and can naturally develop the authenticity and emotional intelligence that ties methodology and perspective into a lived and felt human experience. The unique ways in which we work, facilitate and lead can not be separated from our individual core values about life, community, our role in it, and our role in the world at large.

History of Worldwork Development

Worldwork is a daughter paradigm of Processwork. Both paradigms are centered around the role of awareness in how we place value on the non-measurable and measurable aspects of reality. Process Work was developed by Arnold and Amy Mindell and their associates and has evolved over the last 30 years into a comprehensive paradigm which introduces cutting edge consciousness research into the modern framework, bringing new impulses into physics, mathematics, medicine, psychology and the study of collective behavior.

Processwork is mostly known as a comprehensive psychotherapeutic model for personal development. However, it is applied in a large diversity of areas, such as work with body symptoms and coma-states, as well as in theatre, filmmaking, and creative performances.

Worldwork branched out of the Process Work model about 15 years ago, and has since been researched, written about, applied, tested and developed by Arnold and Amy Mindell and the Worldwork team. Both Process Work and Worldwork are emerging paradigms, subject to continuous debate and change.

CONCEPTUAL HIGHLIGHTS OF WORLDWORK

Here are some highlights from the theory and methodology explained previously, which will be useful for a better understanding of the case descriptions. According to the Worldwork paradigm, an organization or group functions on different levels, which act as parallel worlds. One level is the everyday reality, consisting of organizational facts, people, structures, goals, strategies, and problems that need solutions. On another level, which is self-organizing, a group is structured by an organizing principle, a field. The field distributes the various polarities, or positions, within the group. On a self-organizing level, some issues that are considered "problems" are in fact attempts of the system to balance itself. Many of these self-balancing tendencies are related to polarities, where only one side is directly visible, and the other side is a non-local presence within a group. For example, listen to a leader saying: "We are strong and fearless, and will go on no matter what!", and you can sense the polarity in the group, a doubter and skeptic, for whom those words are meant, an imagined opponent, who believes we are hopeless and we don't want to go on. As facilitators, we can make roles out of these positions in order to make them more visible, and give them a chance to interact. Imagine it as if the group is following the script of an invisible director - something like a larger non-local group mind - to perform a play. When you try to lead a group, you might sense that an invisible hand is working against you, when in fact it is this self-organizing tendency that is pulling in a different direction.

Roles can be further differentiated into consensus reality roles and ghost roles. Consensus reality roles (also called "CR roles," or I sometimes just use the generic term "role") are positions that belong to the central belief system of the culture or group, and thereby are generally accepted by that group. They can be voiced without provoking a strong group reaction. In contrast, ghost roles are behaviors that we cannot voice, because they are not "acceptable" or "rational" within a given organizational culture, or outside of what it considers "reality." Although ghost roles are not explicit, everyone feels their presence and suffers from them. Ghost roles can also be detected in unintended communication.

CR roles and ghost roles perform a sort of shadow play. Imagine a puppet theatre, in which two puppets are having a dialogue, and behind a lit cotton screen of the puppet theatre, you see the contours of a third puppet. The two front puppets are caught in a dialogue, but once in a while the puppet behind the screen interjects a sentence. The puppets in front seem to be unaware of the shadow puppet behind the screen, and tend to believe that the other visible puppet had made the remark. In a puppet theatre, this leads to amusing misunderstandings. Amusing to the spectators, but not to the puppets, who are actually distressed! The level of the distressed puppets that cannot see the shadow puppet would be the consensus reality level; the level that includes the shadow puppet would be the self-organizing level, or what we call the dream level.

By the way, the above example about the audience but not the puppets enjoying the play also holds true for group processes. Many of the interactions, if you are caught in one polarity or role, can be very painful, but once you understand the structure, speak the ghost role behind the confusion, it might even produce a smile on your face.

We are all aware of these dynamics. When we talk about what “really” goes on in a group, as opposed to what is being said on the surface, we are in the realm of roles and ghost roles. The roles speak the appropriate sentences, use the appropriate communication style, and have the appropriate viewpoints, whatever they might be in a given organizational culture, but we hear the whispers of the ghost roles in the insinuations and subtext, the gossip, the lack of reactions to some of the things that are being said.

One reason that groups often avoid making unintended communication explicit, or giving voice to the ghost roles, is the fear that the consequent conflicts will be irresolvable. This makes sense from a consensus reality perspective, where we are used to not having our conflicts resolved and where relationships can be harmed forever, because someone spoke “the truth.” From a Worldwork perspective, this makes sense from a different angle. Roles and ghost roles are non-local in the sense that they belong to everyone. Therefore, processing ghostroles means to realize that you too are like the person, role or group that you thought was responsible for all the difficulties. This is also why if a person who has taken on an unpopular role within an organization leaves, someone else will often pick up the same role or some of its aspects. Although ghost roles are most easily projected onto other groups, they are also present in one’s own group, where they remain marginalized. In the case description, you can see how both subgroups that are being described project a particular behavior of their own group on to another.

As a result of these dynamics, it often takes an emotional or charged interaction to understand fully how these roles are present in one’s own group. The process of gaining self-awareness about one’s own nature cannot easily happen on a rational and linear level only, as it is precisely that level that often contains the belief systems that marginalize the very issue that a group needs to wake up to. Because of this mirroring process, the only resolution in that sense is a raised awareness about how we are the other, how we ourselves are part of and contribute to what upsets us most. No wonder we shy away from direct confrontations.

The process of achieving this awareness can be highly emotional. It often forces us to traverse a period of escalation and confrontation. If we are able to do that, and at the same time follow our total experience with awareness, step by step, we will eventually come to appreciate that these roles are present within the whole system. The total information or knowledge contained within the roles now becomes explicit and can be used creatively by the whole group. From this perspective, disturbances or problems are

potentials that are crying out to be used! It is the facilitator's job to create a safe container for the participants, and to make sure that at the end of a group process, conflicts are resolved, and everyone has understood new dimensions about the problems that were being presented. Participants and clients not only have the right, but also the duty to be skeptical and concerned about the outcomes. It belongs to the work of the facilitator to notice and relate to these fears and make sure that everyone is protected.

Sustainable facilitation is based on discovering and supporting the basic self-facilitative tendencies of the collective. Roles which actually facilitate the entire process are themselves contained in all groups, yet these roles are not always recognized or expressed by the group itself. One example of these roles is eldership. Eldership is based on a warm detachment that understands life and people as a developing and unfolding mystery and therefore respects and supports every person and tendency, while still being able to create boundaries in a non-offensive way. It is rooted in a person's convictions about the meaning of life, and the role that spirit and nature play. These convictions don't necessarily have to be explicit, but are often just felt in a person's heart. The elder remains centered in her or his own beliefs about the core values that make living together on this planet possible. However, these beliefs are not forced upon others, but rather modeled in a way that inspires others to follow. Eldership is independent of age and is expressed as often in ordinary people as it is in leaders and facilitators.

EUROPE, USA AND THE CARRIBEAN – DEEP DEMOCRACY, COLLABORATION AND STRATEGY IN A GLOBAL 500 COMPANY

Background and preliminary comments

In this case description, you can read the report of a strategic development retreat, which we facilitated within the leadership team of a Global 500 corporation. (The Global 500 is a list of the largest 500 companies in the world.) This group has an international presence, and its headquarters are in the United States. Its activities span several different and very diverse industry sectors. We are two external consultants, who organize and facilitate an annual strategy retreat with the executive management branch of one of the industry sectors. The group consists of 50 to 60 people. More than half are top senior executives, the others are experts from various levels of the organization and from countries from all over the world, who for different reasons were invited to participate in the retreat.

These retreats address many issues, and are intended to create a common vision and a roadmap for the coming year. Although the primary focus is on general strategy development, many group members are also interested in working out team issues as they come up, which are considered to interfere with overall organizational efficiency. Smaller organizational problem spots that are possible learning sources for company-wide development are often included in the agenda. We assist the group in creating an agenda, and guide the group through it. When “hotspots” appear (moments in which the group shows the potential to polarize around a particular issue) we try to establish a consensus in favor of or against the group delving more deeply deeper into the problem area.

Thus during the retreat, linear group processes with goal setting, task allocation, budget planning and other such activities organically mix with highly emotional group processes, relationship work, and visioning. Towards the end of the retreat, we help the organization, often in a highly energized session, to rediscover its myth. The organizational myth contains the essence of an organization, its uniqueness, its role in the world at large, and the meaning it has for the development of humanity. Every organization has such a myth, regardless of its size and mission statement. The myth is a pattern that encompasses the various manifestations of the organization, and can even be found hidden away in what at times look like blatant errors or malfunctioning of the group.

Often, the visions of the founders are aspects of the organizational myth, for example Henry Ford's vision of a car for everybody. Also, the difficulties that the organization went through in the beginning and that are still talked about in anecdotes and stories of the "first days", like the famous days in the garage of the Hewlett Packard founders, carry in them the deeper

aspects of the organizational myth. This myth needs to be rediscovered and remembered sporadically, as it breathes new life into routines, brings fresh excitements to our work and makes our activities more meaningful. We use the final session to get to the essence of the process of the overall retreat and unfold the organizational myth from that. Finally, we then facilitate translation of this myth into a final vision and use it to frame the overall strategic approach in terms of the organizational development and the change management tasks ahead. This process shows how an organizational myth is an organic quality inherent in all groups, and once discovered gives rise to a vision. It's a powerful experience to discover the spirit that brought the organization so far to wake up to the changes that want to happen and then finding a form to co-create them. Finally, we provide awareness techniques to track the changes during the implementation period over the months to come.

In the case of the organization described here, we are facilitating the retreat for the third consecutive year. After some initial skepticism from some of the participants about the value of working on the different levels (which gave us an opportunity to explain how our methods add value) the group is now excited about exploring possible problem areas. If the majority of the group considers a problem area too inconsequential to merit discussion, but others disagree, we set up subgroups or offer one-on-one resolutions outside of the regular meeting hours.

Preparation for the retreat

We typically spend up to two weeks preparing these sessions. The preparation includes:

Peer coaching and preparation:

Before going into any organization, especially for the first time, we feel apprehensive. Instead of trying to overcome our fears, we explore them. They can tell us a great deal about the organization that our normal rational view has ignored.

In this case, we worked on our nervousness about one member within the sponsoring leadership group. It was his first year in that organization and he was very critical of the whole project, which he obviously believed was a waste of time and money. My first judgmental reaction was to think he was uneducated and didn't know enough about a system approach in general or Worldwork in particular. In the peer coaching session, my co-facilitator supported me to do a role play in which I assumed the role of that person. When playing this role, I suddenly found that the background and experience as a banker and investor that this person brought into the group was not taken seriously enough in this group of strategic thinker and leadership experts. This was very helpful to me, because one of the topics in the retreat, which is not discussed in this case description, was to debate the continuation of a particular industrial activity, which held considerable emotional value in terms of the company's history and tradition, yet no

longer made sense in terms of its profit. The company had had this discussion for three years in a row, and decided year after year to continue it, as a symbol of their roots and history so to speak, and as a trademark of their mission statement. For them, it turned out, that this particular business activity was considered a figurehead for the company's relationship to the environment and diversity, both being an important part of the original vision for this group, which they wanted to be seen and recognized for. Because of my inner work, I felt more competent when this discussion came up to support the strong view of the new member to discontinue the activity in question, and could assist in offering an alternative, to make this tradition explicit and frame it as an essence, and how it was present in some of the group's most recent activities. This process finally culminated a year down the road in a new company statement regarding its relationship to diversity and the environment, framing it in context of all their business activities and corporate governance. I mention this for two reasons: first to show how the facilitator's own fears and reactions can be a source of useful information about the group as a whole, if they are unfolded, and second, to show how these values also play out in the case description below, where the discussion focuses on another topic.

During the preparation period, we facilitators must undergo a peer coaching process in which we work with each other for greater awareness about our own agendas, questions, fears, and reservations that we may have about the upcoming event. We also resolve possible teamwork issues, like competition and jealousy. Simultaneously, we contact our sponsoring leadership group to assess the present situation, clarify their goals and agenda, and receive updates on the latest developments. A week before the actual meetings, we invite all the participants to join us on our extranet. The extranet is a secure online environment which can be accessed via the internet, and that allows for sharing of documents, poll taking, group discussions, the use of an online whiteboard, and the possibility for confidential one-on-one coaching interactions. This online facility provides a space to modify the agenda and presort topics before the meeting, and gives a preliminary overview of possible hotspots. We also use the extranet after the retreat, for debriefing of possible remaining issues that surface in the days after the retreat, and to assist with the implementation of the change process.

As part of our preparation, we also research numerous content questions that touch on the topic of the coming facilitation. During the preparation phase of the case that is described here, we became aware of a potential topic, expansion into the Caribbean space, which led us to study associated aspects. Not only did we read the company's annual report, we also had one of our associates conduct independent research into the world market situation for the particular industry sector of the department that was seeking an expansion, the company's dynamic strategic positioning within the global market, and the executive's rationale for the expansion of that sector into the Caribbean space. We also studied the economic situation of

the chosen country, and one of our associates researched and created a cultural profile of the three main groups that were involved in the project. We are great fans of over-preparation, which we believe is an indispensable condition for successful facilitation and consultation. It's part of our own Total Quality Management (TQM) approach. We have found that this extra knowledge invites more credibility and trust, allows participants to speak more freely and directly, while at the same time assisting us in adding content to the discussion. However, once we begin to facilitate, this knowledge remains in the background, and we follow the spontaneous emergence of the group process, using the information from our preparation only if needed within a particular context.

The Case Description

The process that you are about to read is meant to give you an overview of how a group can work on an issue by changing levels. The description leaves out many facilitation details. It doesn't focus on the exact interventions and the complexity of level changes. It therefore suggests a sense of ease and speed in what is a highly charged interaction. Although, if a facilitator has the necessary understanding of the various roles present, the group process should have a sense of ease and effortlessness, and convey the impression that it all was an organic flow. If you are interested in learning more about the micro dynamics of the Worldwork facilitation, please go to the section in the website, that zooms in to one of these facilitative interactions and explains breath by breath how this works, so you can understand more about the complexity of the methods and interventions.

When reading through it, you might be surprised at the speed at which it all occurs. Part of that is because of I have often used a summary of what actually happened. Nevertheless, the whole process took a little under an hour. The reason for the speed is the use of the ghost role and the concept of edges, which reduces cycling, the phenomena that both sides go back and forth with repetitive arguments.

Opening Scene

It is Day Two of the meeting. This afternoon, the whole group will meet. This afternoon's agenda includes a topic regarding the development and progress of the new branch of one of the company's production groups in the Caribbean, the first for this production line in this part of the world. The rumor during the break is that this branch has been fraught with problems, and that the intention of the meeting is to bury the project.

Brigitte, the project leader, opens with a report, summarized as follows:

"We have come across some problems so far. There were problems within the supply chain of the builders. Some materials got lost, vanished, or were the wrong kind. In addition, there were some personnel problems. Workers either didn't appear when they were supposed to, or walked out on their jobs. We had to hire non-skilled workers to meet one deadline, which

resulted in additional problems, setting us even further behind. The communication between the corporate project management and the local team is often complicated. But we think we can overcome the problems with a renewed effort.”

Brigitte, while trying to convey confidence and control, sounds frustrated, looking down at her report and avoiding everyone’s eyes.

Alonzo, the leader of the Caribbean team, now speaks up. What follows is a summary of his remarks:

“Yes, there have been difficulties. We don’t have the necessary infrastructure yet in place. It’s sometimes difficult to find some of the materials that we need – sometimes they are not available. Also, we were slowed down by extreme weather conditions...but we are doing our best, and we will finish the project as close to the deadline as possible. I am sure we can work out the differences.”

Alonzo sounds very detached, as if talking about someone else. He too, avoids looking at anyone. The atmosphere is tense.

Other executives pose some questions; rather than answering, Brigitte and Alonzo basically reiterate what they have already said. Several of the leading executives are now nodding, indicating that they understand, but their facial expressions are skeptical, someone is frowning, some brows are knit, someone leans away from the speaker, another person crosses his arms. One executive proposes in a neutral manner to give the project one more month, before deciding among the immediate stake holders how to continue. Several people agree and the group seems ready to move on. The group atmosphere is stale and somewhat heavy; Brigitte looks upset. The group follows our suggestion to spend more time exploring the issues surrounding the project.

***Analysis:** The two sides have stated their initial positions both sides appeared to know what the other one was going to say. No doubt, that discussion had happened several times before. They have transmitted both intended communications and unintended communications, or double signals as we refer to it.*

On a “measurable” or consensus reality level is the content of this discussion, which signals a mutual understanding of the problems, and an agreement to keep trying to resolve them. This is the intended communication. Both sides have a tacit preference for rational linear reporting, as if they were reciting items on a shopping list, and the suppression of the open conflict is palpable in the atmosphere and is expressed through tone of voice and body language. These last aspects, tone of voice and body language, are unintended communications. We distinguish another level, a self-organizing level, which we also call the dreaming level. It is self-organizing because we cannot control it, and we are not identified with what is happening “to us.”

It is on this self-organizing level that the “ghost roles” can be found in unintended and often non-verbal communications. In this case it is the anger in the voices, the discontent of the executives listening to the progress report, and the general atmosphere of depression and frustration at the end. What is being postponed is not so much the decision, but the escalation of the conflict that is present in the non-verbal communication. We think that the group could benefit from escalating now.

Many parallel worlds are present at this point. For example, from one viewpoint, often described as a democratic-humanistic one, you can argue that the headquarters, with its predominantly European and American thinking style, needs to open up to diversity and accept the different cultural values of the Caribbean crew, and learn to work with them. On other side of that polarity, is the viewpoint of organizational viability, or corporate strategy. There you might argue that it is time to cancel the project, as it is costing too much, and endangering the competitiveness of the entire organization.

These viewpoints are only the tip of the iceberg. Behind them are issues of the development of the globalization, and tied in with this, a basic discourse about what is progress, democracy, and what values will help us to grow and flourish on this planet. Within this debate is the discussion about cultural differences and the evolution of societies, which appear as time spirits, so to speak on the local stage of the play on corporate culture and strategy. Whereas the stage might be local and roles played out by the local actors, the roles that are being played can be found all over the globe.

From the democratic-humanistic viewpoint, for example, the success or failure of globalization depends on the ability of those with more economic resources to relate to cultural styles in other areas of the world, and to allow for an empowering experience. This position would argue that if people do not learn to appreciate other cultural styles, there will be no sustainable resolutions, but rather revolt and rebellion. From the viewpoint of organizational survival, corporate viability is threatened in a competitive world. It is argued that if there is no organization left, there will be no people with jobs with whom to discuss democratic values. From a Worldwork perspective, both of these viewpoints are partial realities; they are parallel worlds. Both must be correct and complementary, since they are part of the same field. Combined with additional viewpoints and parallel worlds, they represent the entire reality. With the introduction of the concept of Deep Democracy and its methods for working with these polarities, we hope to give voice to unintended communications for the accessibility of as much information as possible to the organization as a whole. The potential crisis is not a problem, but the system’s attempt to balance itself. The facilitator’s job is to create the boundary conditions within which this can happen safely.

Intervention: Our goal is to help both sides to go over the edge and represent the ghost roles, in this case the positions that are politically incorrect.

Voicing the Ghost Role: Deep Democracy Beyond Political Correctness

One of the facilitators starts out on the headquarters' side and obtains permission to voice a ghost role, after reassuring the other side that she will be on their side in a moment. The facilitator says:

"If I were part of the headquarters, I would think: This is not going anywhere. It was a mistake in the first place - we will have the same problems with the plant on a continuous basis. Let's abort the whole operation. They are not developed and educated enough, and too 'flaky,'" and don't see the opportunity we offer them. Let's build in a place where we will have less of these problems. I can't say that out loud, or we will have a big brawl in here, because everyone will be insulted."

Some people actually smile, and one person unconsciously nods a little when she hears that spelled out. Others protest -- no, such a thought would never cross their minds. Interestingly enough, one of the Caribbean team members also smiles and looks relieved. Another team member looks furious.

***Analysis:** One side has gone over the edge, and escalated by making a "politically incorrect" statement. Now we need to facilitate the response from the other side.*

The Caribbean team leader first answers rationally, repeating that the team is doing its best. The smile as well as the fury that we noticed when the role was played out, is a ghost role that needs to be unfolded.

The facilitator inquires first about the smile. The person who smiled answers right away that it is a relief to hear these words spoken out loud. She says she often feels this way when she interacts with that group, but it's never said. The facilitator understands this answer as positive feedback for continuing to unfold this position, and receives permission to voice the ghost role for the Caribbean team. He says:

"If I were you, I would think the following: they never understood us. They are arrogant and greedy, and instead of helping us to get this done, they constantly criticize us and look down on us. Obviously they have no clue about who we are."

"Yes! "One of the Caribbean knowledge workers exclaims. "They always treat us as if we were stupid and lazy. "

Then, turning to the American project leader, the knowledge worker replies:

"You seem to think that if we were not constantly supervised, we would all take off and go to the beach for the day."

The atmosphere has changed. It is now electric and everybody looks wide awake.

***Analysis:** This is an escalation with mutual reproaches. Both sides have escalated and broken out of the group's usual communication style and state of mind. It is up to the facilitator to frame this new development and to create a safe environment in which to find a sustainable outcome. First, the group needs to be supported in having gone over the edge – in allowing change in.*

The facilitator frames the change. She says:

"Congratulations, you are both impressive; this is the first step for the resolution. Notice how powerful you both have become. It's this power that will solve the problems, not only the politeness that I sensed before. It's this power that you now both display that is going to finish the project."

Both sides breathe a little easier.

Both parts that are being criticized are ghost roles, unpopular positions that no one can identify with. Because no one identifies with these positions, the information behind them remains hidden, and we can therefore only look at them judgmentally. In order to resolve this dilemma, we need to pass through the emotional non-linear process that we are now in, and get to the essence of these roles. Look at how these sides appear to one another:

The headquarters' side: an arrogant, inflated western mindset that thinks it can do everything better, faster, and more intelligently, and that is cold, mechanistic, distant, greedy and ignorant.

The Caribbean team's side: a lazy, sabotaging, ignorant, undeveloped person, who lives in fantasyland, and doesn't understand that problems need to be solved immediately and on a material level.

The intervention is meant to help each side to identify with some aspects of the accusation, so that the actual processes behind the stereotypes can be revealed. This is a complex matter, in which the facilitator can use her own eldership and leadership. Read the abbreviated version of how it continued:

Ghost Role and Role Switch:

The facilitator points out that most accusations hold a bit of truth, and that either side can help to create a sustainable outcome by picking up the accusation first. Alonzo, the Caribbean team leader, looks at the facilitator, indicating that he might want to try first. The facilitator picks up the cue and says:

"Alonzo, maybe you want to try first, and I'll assist, and then I'll help the other side."

Alonzo speaks right away and looks now straight at the other group:

"Well it's true; we have a different experience of time and life. For us, time is not a thing that can be wasted or used. Time allows us the opportunity to be and to live, to have relationships and to be with friends. Our lives are rich because of our experiences and bonds, and because of our joy, not because of the profits we make. We think that time and the freedom to spend it in the way that we want is the most precious gift."

As he speaks, you start to notice a shift in attitude. Everyone is impressed with his ability to face the issues on the table, and to own his part in creating the problem. As he is completing the last sentence about time and freedom being a gift, one of the senior executives, a Swede, blurts out, "that actually sounds nice!"

Other members of his group glare at their colleague.

Analysis: This is a significant moment. When one side identifies with its part of the accusation, we witness the beginning of a role switch. One member on the US/European side is actually affirming the role that is being played out on the Caribbean side, which will inevitably act as a catalyst for others in the group to identify with that role. This development is partially predictable. For reasons of a basic self-balancing tendency, if one side picks up the accusation, the other side tends to waver from its original position. The whole group doesn't have to change. Awareness that the role is present among them is more important than unity.

Immediately one of the facilitators frames Alonzo's ability to bring forward the core issue. The facilitator then picks up the role switch, asking the Swede what he would do with more time. He responds:

"I would take time, go to the ocean, leisurely rethink my projects, and find a more creative approach to them...maybe with music. "

He says with a chuckle:

"Most of the time I am under such a time pressure from the outside, constantly chased by deadlines, that I never have enough time to really think about the new creative things I have on my mind."

Many executives agree now, although some still disagree. One says:

"Yes, remember the time when Horst [another executive] broke his leg, and the good ideas that he came back with after his two weeks in the hospital?' [Everyone laughs.]. He was a nicer person, too!! [Everyone laughs harder.].

The human resource director, who had listened quietly to the conversation, says:

"Actually, if we had more time, we would probably be more efficient and not less. That is what I hear us say."

The US/European subgroup has now embarked upon a lively discussion about how to use time, how to deal with time pressure, and how to find structures that make more room for creativity. They seem to have forgotten

about the Caribbean people on the other side, who are watching the conversation with beaming faces. The US/European subgroup decides to add a topic to the following day's subgroup section on time pressure, creativity, efficiency, and how to find the balance. The leader of the US/European subgroup suggests that some of the Caribbean team join them for the meeting, as they might be helpful in this process. The Caribbean people smile proudly.

***Analysis:** The issue of time and how to use it is now seen as a global issue that is present on both sides. At this point, the US/European subgroup members indicate that the interaction has added to their own learning. Time pressure and the impulse to escape it are no longer seen as an issue that is present only on the Caribbean side. Rather it is an issue that is present everywhere. The Caribbean team initiates the de-escalation by admitting to some aspects of the reproach. This admission alone has powerful effects, and can be considered responsible for the change within the US/European subgroup.*

Processes are self-balancing. The other side must also own part of the reproach. Now we must assist the other side in going over the edge.

The facilitator now asks the other side to identify with the reproach. Brigitte, with some prompting, admits:

"Yes, it's true. I look down on many people, because they are not as efficient and intelligent as I am, and don't see always where the possible value addition or profit lies."

There is a big sigh of relief on the Caribbean side and but also some disagreement throughout the room.

***Analysis:** It is politically incorrect to own the experience of excellence and feeling superior. Brigitte has stepped into a ghost role. Arrogance also needs to be unfolded, as laziness was. After the process of unfolding, lazy was recognized as a term for a different experience of time that is present and needed in both groups. Unfolding arrogance should lead to a similarly uplifting reframing. The relief on the Caribbean side about the admission of the arrogance is no surprise for a worldworker. Contrary to the common belief that the admission would cause outrage, the opposite occurs. The effect of the ghost role was always felt; now that it has a voice, we know we can process it.*

The facilitator asks her how she knows this. She looks confused at first and then she says:

"I feel it when I talk to people."

I ask her to take time to actually feel it, and to identify with the feeling. As she does this, a smile suddenly appears on her face, and she says, surprised:

"It actually feels good. It has a feeling like crème brûlée, my favorite dessert. Soft and sweet, and a little tangy."

When asked to elaborate, she explains.

"I have so much experience, have created projects on so many continents...I am very capable and organized, and by now I understand most of the problems that I come across. I feel proud and good about my knowledge."

She looks embarrassed, and when asked about this shyness she replies, "You are not supposed to feel good about yourself." There is a gleam on her face. The room goes quiet. Many people look touched, and the Caribbean team leader suddenly bursts out:

"I have experienced this, how experienced you are, and it's so wonderful to see you talking about it now so openly."

She looks surprised that he doesn't criticize her, but actually admires her. She asks if it is not offensive to say that.

"No."

Alonzo replies,

"On the contrary. You allow me to be proud of my work, too. We had many difficulties, but we did overcome so many [and lists a few] and if it wasn't for us starting this dialogue, we would never have gotten to appreciate any of it. "

Brigitte nods in agreement, and looks at him with relief and surprise. She says:

"If I were more in touch with this sense of accomplishment, I probably would interfere more and speak out more about how to do things."

Suddenly someone starts clapping. There is a great atmosphere in the room. Everyone feels the relief of the change of atmosphere. Both sides agree that there has been a mood shift, and appreciate the opening of the communication between them.

***Analysis:** Arrogance is now seen also as a global issue. Arrogance is a perverted expression of self-confidence and self-appreciation. Once it is owned, it opens the way to pride, leadership and eldership. Both sides are waking up to these connections, and start to discover their own learning through this process.*

The Resolution

An executive member now asks what practical effect this will have upon the actual project, and what the next steps are.

***Analysis:** Now that the information that was hidden in the ghost roles has been discovered, and the group has experienced a change in the previous governing state of mind, consensus reality returns. Initial underlying tensions are unfolded and discovered as keys for enhanced collaboration, synergy of diverse groups and talents, and the building of a trusting relationship*

between the two groups. This process now should bring forth practical solutions to the actual problem.

The Caribbean people begin by saying that they can actually do better. One of the members admits that some of the delays might have been avoidable. A knowledge worker says, half jokingly, that maybe they were “resisting.” They now state that they want to try harder, because they want and need the jobs:

“We want to learn to work more efficiently and we understand that the plant will benefit all of us. We want to learn how to do this better, and we look forward to being trained in this area. If we talk like this to each other, we’ll work 24 hours, it’s more fun than the beach!”

He adds the last phrase in a mocking tone, referring to his earlier comment.

The group decides to spend the next day working in their subgroups on what can be done to improve efficiency, and invites team members from the other group to participate. They create a joint team consisting of two members from each group to design a strategy for long-term planning of the supply chain issues, and for resolving personnel issues. (On the following day, these groups discovered that diversity issues and supply chain problems are deeply linked, and developed new ways of dealing with them.) The project leader looks thrilled. She brings out her eldership by stating congruently and powerfully:

“This has been an amazing learning session. I am grateful to the team for having brought out the importance of teamwork and relationship. I did notice that you, [looking at Alonzo and his colleague], were the first to take responsibility for what didn’t work, the first to support me in my leadership, and the first to bring us together. ”

Alonzo nods and has a charming grin on his face when he says proudly, “I notice this, too.”

The team leader says, “I know this will be a great branch, and I now know we can finish this on time!”

There is a great sense of relief, a new feeling of closeness in the group, and hopefulness in the air.

Analysis: *It is now the facilitator’s task to frame the process that the group has just gone through by reminding everyone of what has been achieved and what next steps should be taken, and by bringing forth the question of how this process has added value to the overall project. In more traditional strategy development sessions, many of the underlying conflicts over power distribution, internal politics, diversity issues, etc., often appear as heated debates about best strategies and best practices. Because underlying processes are rarely directly addressed or resolved, these discussions tend to cycle, or resulting outcomes meet later with passive resistance. On the other*

hand, if underlying issues are actually addressed and successfully resolved, many groups are so elated and relieved that they get lost in the feel good atmosphere and neglect to bring the resolution to a practical level. At this point, it is the facilitator's responsibility to bring the group back to the practical tasks by summing up the steps and creating a timetable to implement the changes that the group has decided upon. This needs to happen in the context of the group process, to show that practical management, the criteria of shareholder values, and value-adding strategies are not separate from teamwork issues, and that they actually enhance one another. In today's world, corporate groups are sometimes wrongly attacked for being too materialistic. However, many indigenous cultures understand and implement the need to understand conflict resolution, group process, community-building and even spirituality within the context of creating better practical solutions. Hence the Hopi saying: "Does this talk grow corn?" Can our work be used practically and add value to the everyday reality of our organization?

Framing and Deliverables

We framed the process for the group in this way:

The company side believed the Caribbean side to be incapable of meeting its efficiency requirements for the completion of the plant. The Caribbean side believed the company side to be incapable of meeting the leadership requirements that were needed for collaboration. In the course of the process, we witnessed an empowering experience in which the company, the seemingly more US/European side, learned that owning excellence in efficiency allows for implementing and teaching it in a more related and collaborative style. The Caribbean side learned about its leadership abilities in teamwork and team building. Following its own vision of relationship and teamwork, it took the first step in each stage of the group process. This side learned that it can use this ability with awareness to become more efficient in solving its teamwork problems. The process has shown that diverse talents need not clash, but can exist synergistically.

We then asked everyone to break up into small groups and discuss how this awareness now can solve the remaining practical problems

The groups reported back after 45 minutes with the following results and plans:

Joint development of a training course in time-management techniques and managerial skills for the local team, with special focus on diversity issues and collaborative efforts.

New strategic planning steps to deal with long- and short-term supply chain issues (not being able to find materials or having to wait for them to arrive) and the creation of a special joint team consisting of members from both groups for supply chain problems, personnel problems, and industrial

relations problems, with a particular focus on diversity issues and collaborative efforts in all of these areas.

Scheduling of a meeting with the main suppliers, including a group process about the existing problems and how to solve them.

Postscript

The participants told us that they considered this a highly successful meeting, and they later informed us that the plant had been finished on schedule. Two years later, the corporation celebrated a production record in its Caribbean branch. Although we don't suppose a single causal connection between the meeting and the outer success, we thought it should be mentioned as part of the story.

Closing Remarks

This case description is meant to give you a general idea about how the paradigm can be applied. The effectiveness of any teamwork intervention applied, such as the one above, depends on an ongoing culture of support. The description omits many details and doesn't include a detailed account of the awareness process of the facilitators. It also excludes the details of the preparation work and the subsequent debriefing. Both teams were coached online in our extranet for two months after the retreat. At times, these online sessions were followed up with phone conversations in addition to one or two personal meetings, to anchor the changes that occurred. In response to the requests of three individuals, we coached them over the next year, past the point of completion of the plant.

PUNKS, BUSINESSPEOPLE, POLICE, RESIDENTS & ADDICTS AND CITY ADMINISTRATION IN AN OPEN FORUM IN ZURICH, SWITZERLAND

The Background

Stadelhoferplatz – Stadelhofen Square in English – is a popular shopping area in the center of Zurich, Switzerland. It is a buzzing park, lined with restaurants and shops, and an outside restaurant in the summer where many people sit on benches, taking breaks from shopping. In the center, there are flowers and a fountain. There is a train station nearby, which brings a high flow of commuter and pedestrian traffic into the area.

In recent years, Stadelhoferplatz has become a major meeting place for punks from all over Europe. They mix with other marginal groups, such as the homeless 'Alkis', a short slang word for alcoholics, who hang around the square, and often drink. There are also many people with polytoxicomania, a Latin word for those who are addicted to a variety of mind-altering drugs such as heroin, cocaine and amphetamines. The scene can get pretty wild. The members of these marginal groups at times get into conflict, often with violence, or play their portable tape recorders at full volume. Sometimes, the punks beg aggressively, and various mainstream groups who live in or pass through the area have complained, intimidated by the aggressive begging style, the scary looking punks and their big and equally scary looking dogs that roam the park freely. The punks in turn complain of being degraded in a variety of ways by passers-by.

From a wider cultural perspective, Zurich is a town that has become multicultural overnight. Whereas 10 years ago, its diversity was mainly restricted to groups from the neighboring European countries (Greece, Spain, Italy, Turkey), ethnic groups from all over the world have become now a part of the Zurich life. For many of the Swiss people, this change has been difficult. On the other side, countless new immigrants suffer from what they describe as racism and insularity. While some are asking for more tolerance and relationship between the culture and subcultures, others want the government and police to act, and to keep everything 'orderly and traditionally Swiss'.

Against this background, the scene at Stadelhofen has an explosive potential. The City of Zurich has sent the police to keep order, but this has been inherently problematic. For the most part, police work functions well with regard to crimes that are committed and can be tried, or with people who are interested in maintaining a mainstream existence and don't want trouble. However, the punks and marginal groups do not fit neatly into either category. Usually they do not pay the minor fines because they have no money, or indeed have anything that can be taken from them. Even removing them from the area is not a sustainable solution, as they come right back.

The Town Meeting

Given this explosive scene, Lukas Hohler from SIP Zurich, a special action group for the social department of the city of Zurich, and I planned a town forum to assist the various groups in working on these issues. Lukas had convinced representatives from the main groups -the local business association, the chief of police, the city administration and the punks- to risk coming together to work in on their difficulties publicly in an open forum. Two days before the open forum, Lukas and I had separate meetings with all the groups that had an interest in a resolution, listening to their viewpoints and their hesitations about meeting. Everyone was highly skeptical about a possible outcome. Nonetheless, we were thrilled at the result of our networking effort when we saw who of the stakeholders showed up in the tent that took some hundred people. There was the chief of police and his assistant, many business people of the neighborhood, a member of the 7-people city executive council, homeless people who live in the park, the 'alkis' that populate the park, the punks with their dogs, students of the nearby high school, residents who occupy apartments in the area, and many other interested people.

In the beginning, different members stated their positions in a 3-minute expose, including the business people, the punks, the police, and a student of one of the largest Zurich high schools that was nearby, and whose students frequent the park. Out of this, a number of positions were represented as follows:

Business owners: the marginal groups are bad for business, they scare people off, our revenues have dropped, and we feel it is wrong that people get abused when they try to shop here. We hate it if we are being so aggressively panhandled, and our employees are too scared to come to work.

Police: Everybody criticizes us. The business community says we are too lax; the marginal groups call us fascists. The media reproaches us for losing control if something happens, yet accuses us of police brutality if we do intervene.

Punks: Nobody wants us and everybody puts us down. We have an alternative lifestyle and different values, and deserve to live it as we want it, in a free society. You experience us as aggressive; we experience the mainstream advertising and insistence on a profit-oriented lifestyle as aggressive, to say the least.

High School student position: I wish that everyone were more tolerant with each other. Older people often call us young people names.

Right in the beginning, Asi, a punk woman, started to speak, and got interrupted by another punk who stormed in the meeting room, and screamed that she was a traitor, charging her and the other punks in the tent with treason for sitting with everyone, trying to work things out. 'Punks

don't negotiate!' he screamed and ran out. The group was shocked. Some of the business people must have felt kinship with the problem she was facing, but there were those among their group that were against the forum, because they thought it would give the alkis and the punks too much legal status. They had even written to the police and politicians to try to ensure that the forum wouldn't happen. The city of Zurich, however, had voted for a dialog, and outlined their belief that one single solution was no longer sustainable these days. Rather, many views had to be taken into account. Thus the next position was that of the city of Zurich, which declared that we all need to learn to live with one another. Solutions based on legal factors alone will not hold if the community doesn't also work out its differences.

Analysis: there are many roles and ghost roles present. The one closest to the surface is a role on both sides that says, 'don't do the other side the honor to talk to them, because it means you will have to give up your position'. The city of Zurich plays the eldership role, which carries the whole process to begin with.

First interaction:

There followed a heated discussion about begging; how hard it is for the mainstream to say no, and how hard it is to make enough money from the beggar's side. In the back and forth, my facilitator colleague pointed out that both sides were on common ground. Both seemed to complain about how hard it was to make a living and blamed the other side for it. To everyone's great surprise, both sides picked up on it and agreed. The business people spoke about the high rents and overheads, the police about how hard it was to be constantly criticized and left alone with their work, and the punks spoke about how everyone hates and looks down at them.

Analysis: the missing role is the eldership role, which can listen to all the complaints. Every one of the groups feels exploited, and not heard with their difficulties. This is why there was so much negativity about coming: all sides were hopeless that they would be heard with their difficulties.

During this discussion, many amazing moments happened, and spontaneous role switches occurred. The business people, for example, announced that they didn't like that the punks were urinating everywhere. To this some punks agreed and apologized, stating that in the future they would keep an eye on those who did so. Although the tone of voice of some of the punks was one of disbelief, as if not understanding why anyone could focus on such trivial issues, one punk actually got up and thanked the city for putting a mobile toilet in the park. But he then suggested in addition that they should find someone who would clean it regularly, criticizing the city for not keeping the toilets clean enough, so that many punks decided to relieve themselves outside because it was cleaner. My comment, that all Swiss share a common ground in their desire for cleanliness, regardless of the degree of centrality or marginality of their group affiliation, was understood by everyone and brought about a unifying laughter.

As the conversation continued around various different points, members from both sides made comments about what a relief it was to talk together. Then one shopkeeper asked the punks that were present whether or not they would now come forward and intervene if they would ever see other punks giving one of the business people or employee a hard time. 'Yes', said one of the punks, who had been quiet 'I would. Now that we talk together and treat each other as human beings, I feel different about everything.' Some member of the business groups looked touched. Then with some help from the facilitation, the punks asked back: 'And if you see a mainstream person putting one of us down, will you also interfere?' The business people came to an edge. They didn't want to publicly say yes. The punks were obviously hurt by the hesitation. They started to escalate and one punk threatened that they, too, could go back into the 'fuck you' mode. We facilitators framed what was happening by pointing out, that this was an important moment. Both sides had to see that each of them had the power to really complicate the life of the other. It was a moment of encounter with the totality of strength on both sides. Coming together would not be out of weakness or fear, but out of wanting a resolution and better relationships.

***Analysis: Framing**-we framed the strength and power on both sides. This is an important moment. The beginning edge is expressed by the nervousness towards dialogue, out of fear of being overwhelmed or manipulated. True dialogue can only occur if all sides are conscious of their strength to make life impossible for the other side. You want to come together from a position of self-confidence and you want to be respected for who you are. From this position, you can listen understand and relate to the other side.*

When the facilitators framed this situation the scene shifted. A businessperson who ran one of the larger shops in that area, came forward and said that yes, she would interfere and defend the punks. Silence fell in the room. 'Really, you would do that?' said a punk, obviously touched by that interaction, and in disbelief. 'Yes, I would', conceded the business person.

***Analysis:** The people present, by saying that they would defend the other groups against mainstream attackers, become a local community. They are no longer part of the mainstream, because they are now different, belonging to a 'we-talk-together' culture. This is the opposite of the mainstream, which functions by keeping up projections on the 'other'. It was this moment that created the basis for a continuous dialogue that was going to happen in the future. On a structural level, the outsider against whom the 'other' is being defended is also a ghost role in this group. From that viewpoint, the promise within each faction to defend the other can be interpreted as a commitment to future dialogue within the group itself.*

At this point, another member of the business community, who had been silent thus far, said that he thought it was time that the forum participants stop using the terms 'them' and 'they', and replace them with 'we' and 'us',

since they were all sharing the same space. This brought a big applause from everyone. A punk associate went along the same direction, and made a suggestion. This is what I remember he said: 'we all thought this would bring nothing. Now we realize that the sides have softened and that we got a lot closer. This is so much more than any of us expected. Maybe it's time to call a truce, and everyone can try to do their best for three months, and then we'll see if it worked. If one person flips out on either side,' he suggested, 'the other side shouldn't take that as an excuse to fall back into their own personal prejudice, but rather should remember the feeling of tonight. After three months, everyone should get together again, and check on what happened.'

One of the facilitators asked who would remind the other person of that feeling if they forget. Many hands went up.

The forum was over. All sides thanked each other for their participation, and applauded. There was a nearly festive mood in the tent. Even the police, who had been earlier accused of police brutality, got a big applause for participating. In an earlier interaction, one member of a group of social activists had called them fascists, and said that they had used excessive force. I remember the chief of police answering that they did their best, but that they were not always perfect. Police work can be hard, he added now, giving the example of trying to arrest a person for aggravating the commuters, who then turned out to be a professional boxer who beat up the cops. Both of the police captains who were present admitted that it hurt when someone calls you a fascist. The punks grew silent and listened, and then nodded.

Closing remarks:

Thanks Lukas for the fabulous facilitation, the great teamwork and the fun mood through the whole thing, and the SIP team (Security-Intervention-Prevention a troubleshooting team of the city of Zurich) for their work. The Zurich press hailed the event as a breakthrough. Lukas has continued his work with the groups who have decided to meet monthly for a round table discussion. These round tables have continued since the summer of 2003 and have created a new model for urban living. These they are open to anyone, and the police, the local authorities and the business community as well as the marginal groups, have usually at least one member present. The atmosphere and problem level around Stadelhofenplatz have radically improved. Thanks also to the progressive administration of the city of Zurich, and especially to the city executive council Monika Stocker, for all the support and openness of the whole project.

Following are a few snapshots, and newspaper clippings to give you a feel for it all.



Open forum in Zurich with a diverse group of participants



Asi and Max after the town forum: Asi was a central and eloquent speaker for the punks during the forum.



The 'expanded' SIP team, who was responsible for putting up the forum, during the debriefing in the local pub after the forum (From left to right Bivoldzic Ibrahim, Gabriela Merlini dos Santos, Lukas Hohler, Michael Herzig, Christian Fischer, and Max Schupbach)

raum der Band befindet, und verwendeten zwei Keyboards, mehrere Lautsprecherboxen, Mikrofone und eine Akustikgitarre. Die Stadtpolizei hofft nun auf hilfreiche Zeugenaussagen.

«Mode». In insgesamt zehn Fällen wurde Deliktsgut im Wert von über sechs Millionen Franken erbeutet. Die Stadt Zürich wurde in den vergange-

brungesociet, polizeisprecherin Nicole Fix geht nicht davon aus, dass immer dieselbe Bande am Werk ist. «Diese Methode ist effektiv – deshalb wird sie angewandt.»



Gewerbevertreter und Punks gemeinsam im Konflikt-Zeit am Stadelhofen.

Markus Felisch

Gewerber und Punks verschafften sich Luft

ZÜRICH – Die Punkszene ist den Geschäftsinhabern am Stadelhoferplatz ein Dorn im Auge. Laut einigen Gewerbevertretern machen Kunden wegen der Punks einen Bogen

um den Platz. Um die Situation zu entschärfen, lud gestern die SIP (Sicherheit, Intervention, Prävention) des Sozialdepartements beide Parteien zu einem Forum ins extra dafür aufge-

baute Konflikt-Zeit auf dem Stadelhoferplatz ein. Rund 50 Personen, darunter knapp ein Dutzend Punks, verschafften sich Luft und machten Verbesserungsvorschläge.

B
de

ZÜRICH
frist
betre
tutor
ungen
gab
geger
schär
Reto
depar
Minu
hatte
ment
schie
nen a

Se
eig

ZÜRICH
Migra
hen
gratio
malrat
hat d
Plus»
die S
werk
Seco
des K
sich d
aus w
entsp
ten s
Mittel

Press cutting: 20 Minuten, a Swiss newspaper

WHO IS THE CULPRIT – ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A PRISON

Introduction: Quantum Entanglement - Organizations as Holograms

The quantum view of Worldwork assumes a field-like organizing principle that has a structuring influence on an organization. Analogous to a magnetic field, where the magnet is not in direct connection with metal filings, it can organize the effects of field and is noticeable on all organizational levels, although there often seems to be no direct causal connection to any source that is producing it. On each organizational level, or within a particular department, subgroup or leadership group, we can witness the specific local expression. Many organizations could enhance their efforts at change management by becoming aware of this hologram effect, and how the problems of one particular department or section are mirroring a process that belongs to the organization as a whole.

Often these issues can also be seen in society at large. Sometimes, society hasn't come to terms with the issue that the organization is dealing with, and the organization turns out to be an agent for cultural change, forging a new way for all of us to follow. If an organization becomes aware of this aspect of its development, it can create the proper strategies for it to be more effective on that level. This in turn will have a productive influence on how it will bring its innovations to the market and understand its own internal conflicts better.

Among the many organizations in which we have facilitated change are law enforcement and prison systems. We have researched and worked within correction facilities in the USA, Japan, Australia and some European countries. The following piece provides a short spotlight of this hologram dynamic on our work within one such correctional facility. It demonstrates how the process of working on internal change not only gives rise to new and improved practices within the prison facility itself, but also contains the basis for a possible marketing campaign to change social awareness. Furthermore, it can lead to better strategies for how to relate to funding agencies and the political bodies that control the prison system.

Escalation and De-escalation: Facilitators as participants, leaders and followers.

Another important aspect of any facilitation is the unfolding of escalation and de-escalation processes. All escalation is based on the process of a person, or a collective, feeling threatened, not heard or not respected. When dealing with open conflicts we therefore need facilitation methods that allow us to work with escalating conflict in a way that empowers the person and enables self-respect and dignity, while at the same time creates boundaries that contain the conflict from escalating further. Worldwork believes that escalations themselves are useful, as they hold within them the power and pizzazz that will eventually allow the two parties to come together as equals, and to use their diversity in a new and creative way.

How we understand and support escalating processes between two or more sides when we are in the role of the facilitator is a crucial element in any facilitation, and includes also how we work with escalation if we ourselves are getting personally addressed. Different organizational cultures frequently have developed their own credo and ground rules for how to proceed with escalating processes. These programs usually work up to a point, such as when breaking these ground rules can mean losing a job or have other kind of consequences. Worldwork was developed with warring factions in mind, where the ground rules are not followed, and where there are no means for enforcing them. This has turned out to be a great asset, as we have found that in many open conflicts the ground rules are only being respected as long as there is some sort of power balance. Thus, for example, military experts are well aware that the Geneva Conventions tend not to be followed, even by groups with an ethical standpoint, at the point when one party feels that they are fighting for their survival. This we have found true also for organizations on all levels, as is demonstrated in the following case description.

Background

The organization that we now introduce was a prison, where we were scheduled to work for a few days. Our program, which we designed with the person responsible for change management, included facilitating a group of inmates in their maximum security wing, followed by working with a group of the staff, which consisted of guards, nurses, counselors, and administrators. Finally we met with some members of the executive leadership. Our approach to change management in prisons didn't stop at working with the staff only. We developed also a process-oriented counseling approach for inmates and a process-oriented professional coaching model for guards. As part of that approach, we tried to make the hologram effect visible for everyone involved, in order for the group both to understand some of their conflicts, and also to give access to a parallel world, where everyone sees how they play an important role for society at large. This helped them to work together towards a change, while at the same time remaining in a world with strict boundaries and rules that are enforced by one side. What follows is a summary of one of the days.

Opening Situation: The first group we worked with was mixture of inmates, some correction officers and ourselves, the three facilitators. As we opened the group, one of the inmates challenged me right away, as the lead facilitator.

His basic viewpoint: 'I know they have flown you guys in from the USA, because they (*the prison administration*) are afraid of a prison riot, and because we are all so fed up with what is happening in here. Now you are supposed to prevent that, right? Well, it won't work, buddy!! '

I instinctively tried to de-escalate and respond truthfully that this was not the case, and that we had no prior knowledge of any unrest.

Inmate: 'Oh yeah,' he answers, 'either they didn't allow you to tell us, or you would be too much of a coward to admit it if you were allowed.'

Analysis: *This is a direct confrontation and escalation, which can no longer be avoided, since my offer for de-escalation was not accepted. I must admit it was a little scary. The prison world sustains interactions where you negotiate out of a position of strength and not weakness. There are many reasons for that. One that is often overlooked is the loss of respect and dignity that follows incarceration, creating a subculture or world that partially endorses brutal fighting to reclaim self-respect and dignity. Behind the bully, who runs over everyone, and has no compassion for the other side, can be a ghost role that we can describe as:*

'I am in prison and I am captive. I can't do or design my day in the way that I want to, but I still have my self respect, and still have my power. I would rather risk things and pay the price for it than give up this belief in myself.'

On the other level, the prison inmates and guards play out the drama of instinct and domestication, of power and boundaries.

Intervention: *The inmate needs to be met in both worlds.*

I answer:

'You are scary. You must be used to bullying and challenging everyone in this place and getting away with it. I say no to that. I love the strength and pride that I sense behind your words - it's awesome to experience that in these surroundings, and see how your spirit soars in the midst of all the troubles - but I hate how this comes out as an attack against me. I will insist on us meeting as equals respecting each other, no matter what you do, because I know you are looking for that also. Why else would you show so much strength?'

We silently stared at each other for a long moment, our eyes locked into each other. He then broke out in a grin, and said, 'You're alright.' Everyone breathed out!

Analysis and comments: *One interpretation of this interaction was that the credibility of the facilitator and the respect for the inmate both seem to have found a place, such that no one was forced to back down. It felt like being in an initiation ritual and a test for how authentic a relationship can be within this particular setting. Central to this was the authenticity of the facilitator's feelings, such as admitting fear or owning making mistakes. Such honesty and authenticity supports the move towards a sustainable solution.*

In our analysis, the ghost role is the 'prison revolt'. The escalation that just happened can be viewed as 'the prison revolt' and since it was solved on a personal level, it is more possible now to solve it on a group level also.

Beginning Intervention: *To bring out the ghost role of the one who revolts and the one that is revolted against. Key questions here include what do you want to revolt for? What is getting to be too much? Here follows a summary of how that interaction went.*

Facilitators: 'We would like to know in detail, why a prison revolt was mentioned. Who can explain that best.'

Inmates (assuredly): 'The guards hate us, they make our lives as difficult as possible. They think we are the scum of the earth and shit on us whenever they can.'

Several guards protest: 'This is not true; we are just following orders. We know it's difficult in here, but we respect you as human beings, and want to support your process of rehabilitation.'

Inmate: 'No, you don't. I wanted to call my family yesterday, for example, for the birthday of my daughter, and you didn't let me. How is that helping me with my rehabilitation?'

Guard: 'You always want to call, but you know you can only have so and so many calls. You have to plan it better.'

Analysis: *The ghost role of the guard who hates the prisoner and thinks that 'they are scum' is still floating in the field. It's now cycling. Every accusation from the prisoner's side is meant to show that the guards hate them and work to spite them. Every answer is meant to prove that the opposite is true. There are many ways how one can view this process. One of them is the idea that the prison inmates, as those with less rank, are pushing up against those with more rank, and that the self-reflecting tendency of the system is trying to bring more awareness to the rank situation, so it can be used better. This was our working hypothesis at the time and we started to unfold the rank position by assisting the guards in showing their rank.*

Intervention: *Who on the guard side can admit a little bit and sometimes that the original accusation is true, and that they can use their power in many ways?*

After a long journey and the negotiation of many edges, one guard acknowledges the accusation. This amazingly courageous man, who had spoken up several times about his compassion for everyone earlier on, admitted to being part of the ghost role.

Guard: 'Yes, often I hate it here and on some days, I despise you guys. During these days, I do think you are scum. I want to sit in my office and have as little to do with you as possible. If I come in here, I can't wait to get into the little cubicle and turn on the TV, so I don't have to interact with any of you.'

There is silence and a change of atmosphere, and in our perception some sort of relaxation. Then an inmate reacts. He quietly says:

Inmate: At least you're honest about it. See,' he says to the other prisoners, 'I told you so.'

Others nod, and one prisoner adds that he knew it all along. The voices are no longer raised as before. It's a de-escalation signal that a facilitator picks up.

***Analysis:** Again and again, we are surprised at how by owning a ghost role actually has a de-escalating effect on the situation. Here especially, where you would intuitively expect a riot, the atmosphere actually became less tense. Unfolding changing atmospheres is a central part of our facilitation model. One of the facilitators frames it and asks for clarification of what happened.*

Facilitator: 'This seems to relieve you' she asks. 'Can you explain why?'

Inmate: 'Finally, someone has the courage to admit it to my face. I will respect this man from this day on. If we had more people like him in here, this place wouldn't be such a mess. We are just sick of the way that no one ever admits anything, and always acts like they do everything right. It's sickening if you get treated all day long as if you were dirt, and even more sickening if they never tell you straight into your face, and just avoid you.'

One of the guards nods inadvertently.

***Analysis:** Like in the other case examples, you can see an organic role switch happening by one member of the opposing side agreeing. Please read more in the theory section about how the quantum view in Worldwork sees this role shuffling invariance as part of an innate tendency of organisations to self-reflect. In the situation here, we now can follow the role switch and unfold it further.*

Facilitator, turning to the guard who nodded: 'You know about that?'

Guard: 'Yes, I am sometimes in a similar position, as many people turn away from me when I say that I work in the prison. Many of my neighbors avoid me. If I make friends with someone, they sometimes tell me with surprise that they didn't think that a prison guard could be a nice person. Even the prisoners say you must be stupid if you can't get a job outside of here. They despise us for working in here.'

A couple of prisoners nod.

***Analysis:** The ghost role of being identified as scum is filled as both sides now are in it. They become aware that they do it with each other, but are also on the receiving end of it by the mainstream. This process of internalization is well known from the studies of marginal groups. The marginalized group internalizes the view of the mainstream. They inadvertently make a role switch by viewing themselves and each other in a similar way to how they experience the mainstream's view of themselves. A new ghost role of the mainstream bystander has now emerged, who doesn't want anything to do with prisons, and looks down at the world of crime,*

incarceration and law enforcement. Here you can see role switching and quantum entanglement. To begin with, the guard sees the prisoner as scum, then the prisoner sees the guard as scum, and now the mainstream bystander sees the whole system as scum. The guards, the prisoners and the mainstream bystanders act as entangled quantum objects, where you no longer can localize one signal with one group. All signals belong to all groups.

The facilitators start to play out the roles, and are being eventually joined by guards and inmates. Here is a summary of what the role said.

The mainstream bystander: (played by the guards and inmates together, as they perceive the role): I think criminals are dirt, prisons are dirt and I don't want to deal with them. Police and prison guards are brutal and enjoy brutalizing and incarcerating other people. It's a world of perverts regardless of which side you look at. I don't want to have anything to do with it, don't want to see it, read about it, and pay for it. It's like a garbage dump. Keep it out my sight.

Those that speak for the guards and inmates reply to the mainstream bystander:

Inmates and guards: (in a roleplay that is answering to the bystander role) 'You are also a criminal. You cheat a little here, you lie a little there, you take drugs that are legal and probably some that are illegal. You kill your friends, if it gets you ahead, you betray your children if there is an advantage. You are not really better than us, just more lucky or more devious.'

***Analysis:** The marginalized group detect themselves in the flickering signals of the marginalizer. The bystander is also a criminal by ignoring social issues, by not processing violence and by pretending not to be part of the system. The prison community, including the 'perpetrators' and the guards, is a ghost role for society, which doesn't deal with its own aggression. Inmates and guards so to speak act out our inner and social drama before our eyes, keeping us in line with the law.*

On the other side, in the role of the bystander, there is an answer:

Mainstream Bystander role: (played out by prisoners and guards): 'Yes, it is true, what you are saying. But I don't despise you only. Sometimes I look at a prisoner and envy them for their courage to have left the rules of society and followed their own rules. In these moments, you look free to me and I feel like a prisoner.'

There is an awesome silence, and then a prisoner with tears in his eyes says:

'Thank you!! And I have envied you for your courage to resist your impulses so that you can lead a life that is supportive of your families, and allows you to have relationships and go for walks in nature. I miss all of it in here.'

There is a pause. Everyone is quiet, while many look touched and sad. One of the facilitators asks if someone could speak to the atmosphere. Another inmate says that it is good to know, even for a short moment, that however far apart we are from each other, underneath we are somehow connected and the same. Some guards nod.

Then an inmate says, with a big grin on his face: 'Hey, that's good stuff you guys are doing, where can we learn that.'

In a consequent discussion with every one, we were told that the biggest problem for that group is boredom, and that many of them came to realize how much they want to learn things. We spent the remaining sessions with this group teaching them conflict facilitation skills, and peer coaching skills. Those were our special areas of expertise. We also could have taught anything else, from astronomy to organic gardening, so eager were they to learn.

Postscript

In the staff meeting later in the day, in a very touching process, the same ghost roles emerged, such that the guards, nurses, counselors, and administrators suffered from not being respected for what they do, and from not being thanked by the public. We thanked everyone present for making our streets safer, for allowing us to not have to worry about crimes so much, and for their contribution to creating an easier life for those on the outside. One guard, with tears in his eyes, said that in the 26 years of working there no person yet had thanked him for his work, or even acknowledged the value. He reported that some people would react by becoming quiet, or hostile, when he revealed that he worked in a prison, while others would get curious and wanted to hear some titillating stories. Many would say that they could never do such work. The group closed with new insights over the importance of the role that they played in society at large and a growing sense of self-respect for being agents for social change.

In addition, we taught interventions to the staff for interacting in situations where they felt marginalized by their mainstream friends, and started to develop strategies for how to inform the public about the deeper aspect of their work. This was seen as part of a long-term strategy in which self-respect, marketing of ideas and awareness for society, improved funding and increased workers pay were all linked together and needed to be supported by the organization as a whole.

Conclusions

In a meeting with the warden, I thanked him and asked for support in these ongoing projects. His concerns, although on a different level, paralleled the processes that the guards, inmates, psychologists, administrators, and staff people went through. In the ensuing conversation he complained about the lack of support from politicians and media for his work. He bitterly criticized the politicians, who didn't want to be associated with crime and prison

because it was bad for their image, especially in times when public safety was more in the background. Likewise, the media, he complained, only reported on prison issues if there was a scandal involved. In the discussion, we talked about how politicians and media themselves are part of the same polarity that we witnessed during our days in this prison. The warden was helped to realize that he was not only leading a prison compound, but at the same time was also an agent for social awareness around such issues. Describing such a conversation as very helpful, the warden likewise talked of the negative attitudes of society and lack of appreciation for his work, such that, as he put it, 'these attitudes get to you, and you yourself start to think that what you do is not of real value.' We were shocked, but then not surprised, to hear that he too couldn't remember when the last time was that someone publicly or privately thanked him for his work.

As in some of the other cases, these days created the foundation for a new organizational visioning process. In one of the countries that we worked in, some of our work was videotaped and made available to other prison facilities, in an effort to disseminate their experience and results through the whole system.

We ourselves were very much moved and have since tried to raise the public awareness on these issues, wherever we have the opportunity, as here on our web site for example.

The prison system reflects a greater problem within society at large, and demonstrates also both that the problem is resolvable and how this can be done.

The problem is not so much the particular characteristic of one of the roles, but the lack of relationship between them. The isolation, which inmates undergo when being imprisoned, leads to complicated reactions that further asocial behavior and hinder or inhibit rehabilitation. This isolation is a larger issue, as you can see above, because it is not only the inmate that gets isolated, but in fact the whole system. By working with a process-oriented consulting approach, a number of changes happen, such as a shift in the relationship between the various organizational parts, and new strategies to break through the isolation. This is indirectly addressing the warden's issues with the lack of financial and political support for his organization. With the inner changes of the organization, their myth and vision becomes clearer, which in ensuing sessions can be addressed and formulated into appropriate PR and political strategies. Finally, it brings a new light on staff training and inmate counseling, creating the basis for change management in an organic way.

You can go to www.maxfacilitation.net and find a translation of these articles into Arabic, Chinese, Farsi, French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Malaysian, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Urdu, Xhosa and Zulu