disciplines. We are committed to a normative social science and social policy on a normative philosophical anthropology. We are transdisciplinary because we seek to see through, across, and beyond all individual disciplines.

CONSCIOUSNESS AND CULTURE is a child of the end of the twentieth century, born to provide a forum for people to express original ideas and new understandings of human consciousness and culture. We seek to counter the overspecialization of knowledge in our time. There have been various attempts at interdisciplinary research and publication in the past, but they still assumed and accepted the principle of specialization into disciplines. To be interdisciplinary is not enough, however, to counter the entrenched competitive and proprietary attitudes of the various disciplines and professions as they exist today. In this journal we are committed to seeing through, across, and beyond the disciplines as now constituted, to focus on the primary realities of human being and society. We seek to bring together the now separated and overspecialized disciplines engaged in researching human consciousness and culture. We seek to advocate and express truth, love, wisdom and understanding through our own openness to the Source of all being. More details from: John-Raphael Staude, Founder and Executive Officer, The International Transdisciplinary Association, Department of Philosophy, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

John Rowan

Alternatives to Hierarchy

If the changes in organizations are really going to work, there has to be a change in the view of what human beings are like. We have to adopt a view which abandons the negative view of man's basic nature, and takes up the more positive view. We do not need to adopt the view that man is naturally good (though I personally believe this); it is enough to say that man has many capacities and potentialities, and we can choose which to play up and which to play down. In a world which is changing as fast as this one is, we need to play up those aspects which will bring about a creative response to change, and which will lead people to be proactive rather than reactive. And there is now a lot of evidence to show that people can be much more creative and self-determining than they are usually permitted to be. As Bennis (1) says:

> *Bureaucracy, with its 'surplus repression', was a monumental discovery for harnessing muscle power via guilt and instinctual renunciation. In today's world it is a prosthetic device, no longer useful. For we now require organic-adaptive systems and structures of freedom to permit the expression of play and imagination and to exploit the new pleasure of work.*

So what we are now saying is that by modifying hierarchy, by increasing lateral communication and upward communication, together with a revision of the assumptions about how human beings basically work, important changes can be made. But the question now arises - if this new view of man were really taken seriously, would hierarchy be acceptable at all? Does *any* form of hierarchy, no matter how

modified, basically limit and harm people? Or to put it the other way round, do people who have learned to be genuinely self-determined and creative find that they have to create some form of hierarchy in order to be able to co-operate at all for common ends?

We need to be quite clear that what we are asking is not merely a technical question; it is a moral question too. Those who are most dissatisfied with hierarchy feel that the most moral relationship is the one which least violates individual integrity, in which each participant sees the others as ends in themselves, and not as means. For such people, hierarchy cannot be modified so as to be acceptable - it must go altogether. The demand is then for an organization where decision making is directly done by all the members (not through delegates or representatives); where all discussion is done face to face (not through questionnaires or voting procedures); where decisions are taken unanimously or by consensus (not by majorities and minorities); and where no one person has higher status than any other.

Such a set-up tends to be small, but can rise up to the order of 200 people. However, new questions tend to emerge as the important ones, as Kanter & Zurcher (2) have urged:

NOT	BUT RATHER
How large does a system grow?	How small, intimate and connected does a system manage to stay - and still do whatever it has to?
How much does a system produce?	Do relationships and tasks offer participation, involvement, excitement and learning?
Does a system or relationship meet standards of reliability, predictability, stability and control?	Do relationships and roles change in response to needs of the participants?
How efficiently are decisions made?	How widely is power shared?

It becomes clearer that we are now talking at last about a non-repressive organization. And, as we said earlier, there is very little academically sound research on such organizations. A book like Melville's, (3) for example, promises much more than its performs - one can rescue only pregnant hints, such as:

> *That's why we have to grow slowly here, because it's like a mosaic. Everyone has his own kind of strength and his own weakness to overcome.*

I mean everyone here represents a distinct facet of the family, and each one of us is a little different from anyone else.

The first of these quotations comes from a commune in Oregon and the second from one in Vermont, but the thought is the same - that each person is unique and has something very personal to contribute.

Communes are not, of course, the only non-repressive organizations. Mosher (4) describes a three-year-old community of some 200 people (sculptors, computer specialists, film makers, teachers, radio producers, carpenters, potters and others) working and living in a five-story warehouse. Chesler (5) tells of a school started and run by the students (an independent high school in Milwaukee) where decisions are taken at weekly General Meetings, and where:

> *Evaluation of student progress was conducted jointly by students and teachers; the same feedback process was used in evaluating teachers. Both academic growth and social relationships were used as criteria.*

But such organizations are few and far between, and what happens far more often is that power and hierarchy are still there, only mystified by talk about participation. One classic example of this is the word 'unstructured': this would always make red lights come on and little bells ring, because it nearly always indicates that someone is certainly deceiving you, and may just as often indicate that he is also deceiving himself. Romey (6) sees through this when he says:

> *A group of conference participants who thought our conference staff was trying to use an 'unstructured' approach started to examine what we were up to and came to the conclusion that we were actually 'managing' (structuring) the conference to a substantial degree. They decided they had not been aware of the structure because it was different structure from what they were used to.*

And this leads to a further thought: over and over again what destroys our attempts at non-repressive organizations is the hierarchy which occupies our own minds. Brought up as we have been in situations where oppression and alienation are normal, we keep on reintroducing hierarchy even when it is not present and does not need to be present. Explanations for this may vary, but the facts seem clear. As Sorokin (7) once pointed out:

> *The institution of Fratres Minorum was organized by St Francis of Assisi on the principle of perfect equality. Seven years later equality disappeared.*

And he goes on to say that when hierarchy is wiped out, it regularly reappears in the old or in a modified form, often being built by the hands of the levellers themselves.

NEED FOR A NEW KIND OF PERSON

What then emerges from this is that it is not enough to change the structure and make it non-hierarchical. It is not even enough to get rid of the pressures of money and power, because the Fratres Minorum divested themselves of these embarrassments. It is not even enough to be pure-minded - I don't suppose any of us can beat St Francis of Assisi at this.

What seems to come out of the research so far is that two or three separate steps are needed to produce the new kind of person who will not slip back into hierarchical forms of oppression.

Step One is to become aware that something is wrong inside as well as outside. This is quite easy to achieve, but Torbert (8) describes it particularly well:

> *It was not until after I experienced this entire*
> *difficult (experience) that I came to realise fully how alien*
> *and threatening to most people is the process of self-direction . . .*
> *This threat is partly due to the huge scale of work that becomes*
> *revealed as necessary before we can consider ourselves as*
> *self-directed - a revelation which destroys our cherished belief*
> *that we are free to do as we wish from the outset. Intellectually,*
> *I had already understood how the unpleasantness of accepting*
> *ourselves as both* unfree *and* responsible
> *leads us to the more pleasant, but irrational, social*
> *illusion that we are unfree and irresponsible or free and responsible.*

To come to this realization that we are unfree and responsible is one of the hardest things to do in any full or genuine way. And what makes us unfree is the *control mechanisms* inside us which usually correspond pretty well to the control mechanisms outside us. We adopted our control mechanisms because they seemed at the time to give us freedom; but now that it seems clear that they do not, it seems almost impossible to give them up. It is easy to see, as soon as it is pointed out, that the people who are most controlled are the most unfree - whether the control comes from outside or from inside.

Step Two, then, is to do away with the need for control mechanisms, whether from inside or from outside. This may sound not only difficult, but dangerous: are we asking for random action or completely uncontrolled behaviour? Let us listen to one or two people who have made this shift, to see what it feels like from their point of view. First Caroline Sherwood (9):

> *One of the most significant things about control*
> *is its link with dishonesty. When I am in control I have ceased*
> *to be open and accessible and am imposing a false rigidity on*
> *myself; or I am attempting to limit other people or situations*
> *in which I find myself. This dishonesty springs from self-distrust -*
> *a fear of my inadequacy to cope as I am.*

She points out that control is almost always a way of avoiding the present movement and the present situation - usually by planning something about the near or distant future. Fritz Perls (10) says:

> *There is only one thing that should control: the* situation. *If you understand the situation, which you are in, and let the situation which you are in control your actions, then you learn how to cope with life. Now you know this from certain situations, like driving a car. You don't drive a car according to a programme, like 'I want to drive 65 miles per hour.' You drive according to the situation . . . You listen to the situation. The less confident we are in ourselves, the less we are in touch with ourselves and the world, the more we want to control.*

And Shostrom (11) makes it clearer that what is being talked about here is a contrast between man as a manipulator and man as an actualizor. The manipulator always has to feel he is exploiting, using or controlling himself and other people, but he usually does so in self-defeating ways. He treats people as things, and then is surprised that this does not work. In fact, as Perls' example makes clear, it is not even a very good idea to treat *things* as things; it is better to treat them as part of an ongoing situation of which we are a real and present part.

Which brings us back to Mary Parker Follett. In her work on management, she always stressed 'the law of the situation' as the key to social relationships in management which were non-coercive and non-repressive. She said:

> *One* person *should not give orders to another* person, *but both should agree to take their orders from the situation. If orders are simply part of the situation, the question of someone giving and someone receiving does not come up. Both accept the orders given by the situation.*

It is the spirit which shines through all the descriptions of non-hierarchical organizations. But it is interesting that Mary Follett never talks about morality - she only urges this approach as the only approach which actually works, even in hierarchical organizations. And in fact there is often a gap between the power a superior is *supposed* to have over a subordinate, and the power he *actually* has. Power is always really a process of negotiation within certain constraints.

If this is true, then the new type of person we are now talking about may be necessary for *any* form of organization to work in a healthy way - a way in which it approaches the environment in a proactive rather than a reactive mood. And it is clear that this is the kind of organization which Mary Follett always envisages (13):

> *I heard an address by the managing director of a certain firm who said in the course of his address that the*

emphasis in regard to facts used to be on the accuracy with which they were gathered, and the fairness and balanced judgement with which they were interpreted. Now, he said, we are coming to know that we can make facts. It seems to me that there is much food for thought in that sentence. We need not wait on events, we can create events.

References

1. **W.G. Bennis.** *The decline of bureaucracy and organizations of the future,* in H. Baumgartel et al (eds) Readings in group development for managers and trainers, Asia Pub. house 1967.
2. **R.M. Kanter & L.A. Zurcher.** *Concluding statement: Evaluating alternatives and alternative valuing,* J.Appl. Behav. Sci. 9, 1973.
3. **K. Melville.** *Communes in the counter culture: Origins, theories, styles of life,* William Morrow & Co. 1972.
4. **C.R. Mosher.** *ONE: An urban community,* in same ref. as 2.
5. **J. Chesler.** *Innovative governance structures in secondary schools,* in same ref. as 2.
6. **W.D. Romey.** *Risk-trust-love: Learning in a humane environment,* Charles Merrill 1972.
7. **P.A. Sorokin.** *Social and cultural mobility,* Collier-Macmillan 1959 (1927).
8. **W.R. Torbert.** *An experimental selection process for a collaborative organization,* in same ref. as 2.
9. **C. Sherwood.** *Control, Self & Society 1,* 1973.
10. **F.S. Perls.** *Gestalt therapy verbatim,* Real People Press 1969.
11. **M.P. Follett.** *Freedom and co-ordination,* Management Publications Trust 1949.
12. **E.L. Shostrom.** *Man, the manipulator,* Bantam 1968 (1967).
13. **M.P. Follett.** in H.C. Metcalf & L. Urwick (eds) *Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett,* Pitman 1941.

PREGNANT FATHERHOOD

A rush of fear ran through me, sitting on the floor
In my ante-natal class the other day.
My baby's imminent birth came real for me a moment
And I did what they are trying to teach us
(Me and Lucy)
Not to do.
I panicked.
I panicked at the thought
That I might not love
My baby enough.
As I am not feeling loved enough
Myself by my friends
At the moment.
And as I felt
My own father
Not there enough
When I needed him.