From Studying Eugen, to Standing in Eugen's Study:
The Grammatical Method for Group Leadership

Paul Myers, Ph.D.
University of Portland
(Paper originally read at Millikin Conference 2002)

Introduction

I originally read a version of this paper in 2002, at a conference dedicated to Rosenstock-Huessy's call for planetary service. I have updated sections of the paper which to my pleasant surprise still stand as an accurate and hopefully helpful exploration of how to apply the Grammatical Method in daily life, some 12 years after the original draft. And yes, I continue to have the concepts explored here inform my daily work.

I am Paul Myers. I am the son of a psychologist. I have been married to my high school sweetheart, Shannon McNassar, for the past 27 years. I have two sons, Ryan and Patrick, ages 19 and 23. Like my father, I am also a psychologist. I have been the director of a multidisciplinary center for student health on the campus of the University of Portland for the past 18 years.

In my daily work, I play many roles. I am a supervisor of professionals from a variety of professional fields. I supervise physical health, mental health, disability services, health education, and both academic and pastoral counseling. I am a consultant to administrators, faculty, parents and students regarding health and mental health crises that may occur among the students, and sometimes from a member of one of these other groups. I also consult with parties on the implementation of disability law and accommodation planning in our campus community. And, to top off this list, I provide psychotherapy and crisis intervention for a small caseload of clients each week. In any semester, I am usually involved in handling suicidal student situations. And in one day, my work can move from the mundane activity of submitting a budget proposal, to helping a parent and child negotiate new ways of relating with one another, to helping a suicidal student discover other ways of problem-solving that involve embracing life rather than escaping into death.

From this brief description you can imagine the benefits that accrue from being able to speak many cultural dialects. I am sure all of you could generate a wide inventory of different types of people and activities that are part of your daily life as I just did. In my case, I hope you can appreciate that I work with the most desperate and the most capable of our student body, and I often see professionals in their most heroic, and sometimes most frail, moments. Eugen's thought and life have been instrumental in my navigation of such a world.

I need to confess that I have told this story before. However, I have never had an audience with the ability to understand the depths and nuances of my words as I believe may be the case here today, in this assembly. I am thrilled by this opportunity, and I look forward to learning from you as much as I hope you might discover from me.

Rather than making this a formal academic presentation, I have chosen to tell the story of my journey from my initial study of Eugen's work, to eventually standing in Eugen's study; and how I moved from that study to standing here in the middle of America with all of you (this talk was first delivered in Illinois). I want to observe *with* you that by using names and places and times, this presentation will be a more personal experience than is typical at conferences; so much so that it might sound self indulgent, and for this, I apologize. I don't mean to be self-indulgent. I do have another purpose in mind.

It is obvious that I could use academic convention and present many of the same facts with all unspecified pronouns (e.g., one, they, it) and vague time and place references (e.g., "Long ago in a place far, far away…) and it would indeed appear to be more "objective." One advantage of such convention is that it "universalizes" what may be quite particular. Further, if the experience were less personal it might obscure some of my personal prejudices and their sources. It also might inhibit your biases about the teller of the tale, me. However, such a step is artificial because real people thought and did things in my story and by hiding them we risk losing the texture, the harmonies, the nuances of the spirit of people in particular times and places. We hide the risk involved in this whole enterprise, risks of misunderstanding, rejection, or even of blind, or unjustified acceptance.

For here, now, it seems appropriate to risk sounding narcissistic, risk triggering prejudice and other forces that might interfere with "pure reason" and the merits of the facts, but I have chosen that risk to create the possibility that we might unleash the power of names, and naming that power which moves the spirit in each of us. Eugen clearly called us to revitalize our speech with one another. Such speech just might keep us all a bit more accountable and engaged to display a conversation between and within generations, and other groups. I would like to suggest that such appreciations are a direct and priceless gift from the writings Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.

The Story of My Journey

The story begins in 1985, from the area of our planet called the Willamette Valley, in the State of Oregon, in the United States. The journey moves to North Central Indiana, and back to Oregon again. In 1999, it included a wonderful visit to Four Wells, Norwich, Dartmouth, and Eugen's grave at the edge of the cemetery on the hill, thanks to the hospitality of Clint Gardner. The journey also takes us to the cyber-community that has been created through the Internet that is both nowhere and everywhere.

Through the story I wish to share, I hope to illustrate some truths about life-long education. I will share the steps I have taken to try to unpack the meanings and utility of

Eugen's writing on the Grammatical Method. And finally, I hope to demonstrate some foundational tools for group leadership and community-building that have come from testing hypotheses born of the Grammatical Method.

Some Truths about Life-long Education

When I visited Four Wells a several years ago, I was asked by Freya von Moltke and Clint Gardner, why Eugen's writings stuck with me, since so many students do not seem to get as excited about his work as I apparently have been. Even on the e-groups list, people write me personal emails asking, "Who are you? And how did you get into this?" The answer is more complex than I can fully articulate here, but it might suffice to say, "it was exactly the right time!"

I was introduced to the thought of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy in a seminar taught in the Honors College of the University of Oregon. The professor was Dr. Dominic LaRusso. Dr. LaRusso was one of the most impressive educators I have ever known and I understand that he died in November 2000. I will always be sorry I did not thank him for the gifts he gave me during that last seminar before his retirement from the University of Oregon. I wish to thank him now. I can assure you his spirit and his words, live in me, and are manifest in this very moment of my sharing with you. Imagine. I know many of you know exactly what I mean, because Eugen is in your heart and soul in the same way, or you would not be in the middle of America with me today.

Out of that classroom experience, one of the most salient memories for me, in addition to Dr. LaRusso's passion, his tone of voice, his deep caring for our education, was that I had never scrutinized a book so intently as I had *Speech and Reality*. The text acted like a final puzzle piece that when inserted into the puzzle helped to define so many observations and concerns I had developed as a young college student.

Until I met Eugen's writings, I had been steeped in critiques of positivism and the illusion of objectivity throughout my college studies. Reading Dostoyevsky, Neitzsche, Heisenberg, Jung, Goethe, Adolf Portmann, Kant, Descartes and others highlighted for me that the assumptions and tools of science were being misapplied to a wide range of fields and that reductionistic thinking and political systems were distorting our self-understanding. I could also see that the engine for reductionism and reification of concepts was often based in emotion and politics inspired by economics, a point often ignored by science and the academe at large.

I also had a strong interest in a group who had modeled the hypno- and psychotherapeutic communications of Milton Erickson. The result was packaged as Neuro-linguistic Programming and was sold to psychotherapists. I was intrigued by the group's methods. But I was also interested the political fallout they experienced from the established academic schools in psychology, namely, psychoanalysis, behaviorism and humanistic psychology.

At the same time, I lamented the application of scientific methods to literary criticism, history, and religion. I found human relations miraculous on their face and I did not see the need for quantification to support the value of these aspects of human experience. I was also struggling with the often smug dismissal of my religious inclinations by so many members of the faculty, who saw religion as primitive superstition, and the cause of war and strife (rather than noting the role of natural resources, technology races, ego, and the pursuit of wealth).

There is more to this story, but suffice it to say that my interests, my frustrations, the community from which I came, and my ambitions resonated with some of Eugen's critiques and observations. I could not help but begin a dialogue with the thoughts and feelings I found printed in *Speech and Reality*, and later, in *I am an Impure Thinker*, and then many more of Eugen's works. While I know many have been most influenced by Eugen's thought on Christianity, and on history, I have primarily focused on the observations and hypotheses related to the Grammatical Method.

A Quick Primer on The Grammatical Method

While the Grammatical Method has been proposed as a tool for study of great epochs, world religions, international relations, and the like, I have focused on how the Grammatical Method and those larger sagas of the human spirit, inform or predict the truth about the individual and about small group human relations (remember I am a psychologist, among other things). In the "Cross of Reality," with its time and space fronts, I could hear Kant's reference to time and space. In attention to inner and outer space, I could hear an answer to Bacon, Comte, and Descartes. I had ammunition to battle materialism and scientism in academia. I could hear Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* in a different manner. I could better explain my frustrations with the positivistic biases in American psychology. In short, the Grammatical Method engaged me in "the Great Conversation" referenced by those at Chicago (e.g., Hutchins and Adler), in a manner that moved me from passive recipient, to humble and sincere, though certainly limited, participant in some aspects of that conversation.

The Grammatical Method was also a perfect match with the practical, interpersonal application of language modeling in Neuro-linguistic Programming, and Eugen's illumination of the truth that has been under our noses all along—grammar shows one's orientation and relationships in time and space. Further, that the grammar displays changes in authority, valuation, and intimacy, as individuals and groups move through time and space together.

Unpacking the Meaning and Utility

So there I was, 20 years old in Eugene, Oregon. My head was full of big ideas. A revolution in psychology was on the verge of my cerebral cortex and the tip of my tongue. But it was not time. I did not have the authority, the skills, and other life experiences to communicate my discoveries, my connections, and my hope for a future of

better interpersonal communications. I had grandiose hope for a science of psychology that would provide a mirror with a more complete reflection of human nature.

I must confess that I knew it was not time. So, I began training. I continued reading widely. I bought copies of *Speech and Reality* for family and friends to better engage in on-going dialogue and more discovery. I also began to make personal observations in my daily interpersonal communication. I confirmed my experiences of the differences between I love, you love, he loves. I confirmed the confusion that takes place when these are misrepresented or misunderstood as identical states of risk, commitment, or intimacy.

When I graduated from college, I became a researcher in a market research company so that I could be near my wife until she completed her degree in teaching. As fate would have it, I was trained in creating and analyzing video transcripts of group discussions of products. I was the ghostwriter for five very different people who sold research projects to high technology companies. These two activities allowed me to experience and observe communication patterns among groups of people in a unique manner and it allowed me to better appreciate how a person's whole personality influences the words they choose and the timing of their delivery.

I also began to make observations of my work place with gems gleaned from *Out of Revolution*, *The Christian Future* and *The Multiformity of Man*. It was enough to really get a guy going! I began to notice what kind of time orientation was rewarded, and what kind was ignored, depending on one's role in the sales and delivery of the service and products (in our case, gathering opinions and perceptions was the service, the written reports and board room presentations of findings, were the products). For me, in that particular role, in that company, my past did not matter. It never came up. Ever. My ability to anticipate the future needs of our leaders and customers were what brought recognition and reward. I also found that none of my co-workers had a clue what I was talking about when I gingerly raised Eugen-inspired questions about our working conditions, roles and values. Not simply because I am inarticulate, but I believe it was because it was not the right time and place for such exchanges.

After a year in the for-profit business world, I returned to higher education. I entered graduate studies at the University of Notre Dame in 1987. I was invited to study with Dr. George Howard, a counseling psychologist and prolific writer, whose work was then focused on the history and philosophy of psychological science. At that time, he was publishing papers on empirical demonstrations of human volition and critiques of deterministic models of human beings. That is, he was challenging B.F. Skinner's dismissal of the Black Box, but from a different perspective than the cognitive scientists who set out to map the workings inside the black box. Dr. Howard and I published a few journal articles and book chapters during our work together. We addressed elements of the philosophy of science as applied to psychology as science, and to the specialties of narrative psychology, constructivism, and experimental demonstrations of human volition.

While at Notre Dame, I attempted to develop measurement strategies to test elements of Eugen's Grammatical Method hypotheses. But two forces kept holding me back. First, I could not get support from colleagues. I had shared audiotapes of some of Eugen's U.C., Santa Cruz lectures, and described the hypotheses over many a beer or soda, but I could not get others excited about lending a hand, and given the many irons I had in the fire, I could not put a completed research package together. The second force was that I kept running into my own belief, at that time, that to psychometrically represent the "Cross of Reality" would be a betrayal of Eugen's thought. It would be akin to counting the number of times a biblical reference occurs to statistically prove a text was inspired by God, or to apply "scientific" or "statistical methods" to literary criticism or historical story telling. I feared I was objectifying human experiences rather than meeting and preserving them in the respective fronts of inner or outer space and past or future time. I was attempting to put all of these fronts into the outer front of space, into the past, into an objective test tube, if you will, via questionnaire responses. And what would that prove in the end? Thus, I decided to abandon the questionnaire, test-retest, quasi-experimental research designs I had learned in the research laboratory, and to turn to naturalistic observation and clinical intervention to further explore the Cross of Reality and the rest of the Grammatical Method.

For example, I worked for a year in a drug and alcohol treatment center in Michigan City, Indiana. It is a town that is surrounded by refineries, foundries, smelters, hard working people, and at that time, rampant abuse of crack cocaine and other substances. I began to listen to the grammatical tense used by patients as they spoke. I simply observed when they were using past versus future tense, and how these references related to their emotions in the present moment. What was the quality of their emotional state as they moved through time references, and where did they place the locus of control for the events in their life?

From these observations it appeared to me that anxiety was a future orientation experience. It appeared that pure depression is an experience of the present that involves powerlessness and hopelessness about the past, and future, and that the greater the future concern, the more the depression included an anxious component. The more the past was un-revisable, un-repairable, the more hopeless and depressive the patient became. It was also fascinating to observe the role drugs and alcohol played in patients' attempts to stop their emotional/spiritual clocks. It was common to hear patients say, "I get loaded to stop the pain, but man, it is right there to hit me in the face when I am clean again. And, things are worse now, because I didn't take care of business. Things just store up inside and the problems didn't get solved." That is, the patient temporarily stops their own time, yet the world's time keeps moving forward, and when they awaken from their chemical slumber, they find their past still waiting for their attention, and an accumulation of new issues that require a response.

In addition to tense, I also heard the critical role played by the personal pronouns employed. The "first timer" in treatment, the non-AA follower, the patient in denial, usually made attributions in a pattern where first person references were tied to instances of being a victim, and references to accountability and responsibility for negative

outcomes or behavior were made to second and third person entities (e.g., it was your fault, or his fault). Imagine that you have lost the custody of your children due to obsession with "getting high" from drugs or alcohol. As you come to your senses, can you imagine "stepping up to the plate" immediately and saying, "I am completely responsible for putting drugs ahead of my love for my own children?" However, later in treatment, people can and often did say, "I am responsible. It was my decision." "I have to make amends for this and/or that mistake." "When you do this, I feel sad or angry."

As an important aside, the Hollywood movie star, Dennis Quaid, was on the Larry King Show on television, and when asked what made drug treatment work, the actor said, "Honesty. Being able to finally face my world and myself honestly." Further, he went on to say healing required a community of people challenging each patient to be honest which brings the individual to a place of restored courage and strength to keep their developmental clock ticking. In so many words, both he and my former patients were articulating the power of the Cross of Reality. Imagine what the Grammatical Method can contribute in orienting people regarding their personal, communal, and generational responsibilities as they move toward greater honesty.

Moving with these observations, I began to ask patients questions to elicit consideration of neglected fronts of the Cross of Reality. Those obsessed with the past, I pulled for consideration of the future. If they focused on the internal, I invited them to articulate and become more honest about the external. I highlighted moments they observed benefits from balance in their orientation. I looked for phenomena related to faith to address decadence. I looked for respect to address examples of revolution. I listened for sources of power to quiet the wars and I listened for sources of intimacy and belonging to address anarchy (radical autonomy). While I never collected quantitative data, I believe that many patients felt heard, understood and more hopeful as a result of such exchanges. How do I know this without statistical tests? They spoke such words to me, and I understood.

Group Leadership and Community Building

I will skip some periods in my own journey to better link this paper's purpose and the rest of my journey. I want to take you back to 1996. I was offered a position at the University of Portland. The position is the one I told you about when my story began. The situation was that this multidisciplinary team, staffed with wonderful, competent and well-intentioned individuals, was in a state of anarchy within itself, and in poor connection with the world around it. The group needed a new leader, a new style of leadership. I thought, "What a tremendous opportunity to put the Grammatical Method to a serious test."

As the new leader, I knew that part of my job, as politician, was to tell everyone where we are going. But as a student of the Grammatical Method, I knew that to be better than a politician, I needed to tap my own Cross of Reality, I needed to tap the individual group members' Crosses of Reality, and I needed to tap the collective team's Cross of Reality. I made the assumption that error, and social illness, according to theory, would

come from a mismatch between a particular orientation of each individual, and the demands of a particular time and space around that individual. The second source of illness would come from gross imbalance in the attention paid to any particular time or space front. I also discovered rather quickly that my own authority as the youngest person, the newest member, an outsider, meant that I needed to establish authority, value, and influence by attending to how the Cross of Reality addressed empowerment and interpersonal connection and trust ("professional unanimity" for lack of a better term).

To attend to the Cross of Reality, being a typical psychologist, I employed the hypotheses in an assessment process, and then in an intervention process both with the individuals and with the group. In both the assessment and intervention processes I monitored tense, pronoun choice, and spatial orientation. Further, I attended to times and timing. And finally, I monitored the currency being traded for power and the overall level of professional unanimity or community. But even more importantly, I later realized that I made the unconscious assumption that I was doing all of this to attend to the health of the spirit of the individuals and team. I did not know exactly what that health would look like, but I had faith it would become recognizable through cooperation, healthy pride and respect, sharing of weaknesses and seeking assistance from one another, and movement toward our stated goals of trying to serve others and relieve suffering.

Assessment using the Grammatical Method

I want to be clear that if I told you that this team of 16 professionals was experiencing anarchy, decadence, war and revolution all at the same time, you would call me hysterical and begin planning what you want to do as soon as you politely sneak out of this room. Eugen intended those terms for massive scale upheavals in social life. But what I want to do is suggest that there are smaller scale terms that capture elements of Eugen's intentions.

Anarchy can be translated into a disposition suggested by the assertion: "no one can tell me what I can and cannot do." I saw plenty of this attitude on this team. Anarchy can be understood as a loss of concern with community, collective benefit, and social intimacy.

Decadence in this context could be represented as a lack of concern with the legacy being left for those who will follow, and inadequate concern with future consequences of today's self-serving actions. The future is sacrificed in the interest of today. The focus is on short-term gain and one ignores long-term pain, or loss.

War was captured in us versus them thinking (and speech) regarding resources ranging from money, time, attention, benefits, reputation, whatever the valued resource might be. It can be further recognized, as being when and where dialogue is diminished and conflict is destructive. Conflict comes with either real or perceived feeling that one's sources of power are threatened.

Revolution is the unilateral attempt to overthrow the current leadership and the leadership's agenda. It often involves the objectification of the preceding generations, who are also usually the current ruling class, or group. It often involves dismissal of legitimate value the leadership may have, due to a generalization of the conflict beyond those areas where the leadership may in fact have short-comings.

When I interviewed staff members and observed interactions and listened to complaints and wishes, I could hear evidence of the social ills proposed by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. The next step was to devise a plan for intervention.

Intervention with the Grammatical Method

How could Faith, Respect, Power and Unanimity be restored to this small community? I sought the advice of much older administrators in other settings. Without telling them about the Grammatical Method, I gathered their opinions regarding best case and worse case scenarios, or thought experiments. I presented a problem and asked these sages to offer reactions to my Grammatical Method solutions. It seemed promising enough to go ahead.

I decided to move toward peaceful change rather than a violent, "cleaning house," or "revolutionary" approach. I needed to establish my authority, not through credentials and expertise alone, but through consistency, disclosure, empowerment, accountability, and follow-through. I needed to create the structures and the language to move people into a new time together, and a new space together. I should add that I also had complete power "back-up" from the officers of the university who were exasperated by the situation. This gave me increased confidence, though I never played this card in dealing with my staff. I never said, "I have backing from the top, so you better do as I say!"

Leadership is partly about the future vision. I had boiled down three elements that were easy to remember and rich in implications for a service system. I announced at our first all-staff meeting that we were now in pursuit of ever improving the Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Access of our services (which is still true in 2014). All proposals and activities that obstructed our approach to these qualities of our service would be defeated, and all proposals that moved us toward these qualities would be pursued and supported within the limits of the resources at hand.

I also presented the "Director's Goals" and urged all staff members to hold me accountable to the pursuit of these goals. These 7 goals were designed to create structure, safety and consistency in the work environment. The goals were about their individual risk management and professional development. The goals were about establishing justice regarding resources as well. I locked myself in, the first day. I gave up some discretionary power, in the interest of creating safety and consistency for the team.

Regarding resources, I knew I had to stop the incentives that were encouraging good people to do bad things to get more of the resource pie. I also had to redefine sources of power that were within my control. In particular, I needed a system wherein

individuals could increase their safety, power and satisfaction the more they contributed to building faith, respect, mutual power and unanimity. Now let's examine what was done within each branch of the Cross of Reality.

Respect: Revolution without Destruction

In all honesty, I am still struggling with Eugen's thoughts on this. To my way of thinking, revolution is not exclusively a violent clash between two generations, where or when a revolutionary group is no longer respecting the past. I can only agree with this assessment if what is no longer respected is an imbalance in "the Cross," or other forms of prolonged exploitation or oppression. My view is that revolution is inspired whenever any part of the soul is oppressed for too long. So if the ruling generation, or group, suppresses an element of the Cross of Reality for too long, eventually, the "outside" group or new generation will rise up and reclaim those neglected aspects of their spirit. I took this as the grand subtext of *Out of Revolution.* I believe there are many ways to conduct one's revolution. Mid-life crises are a form of existential revolution. Career changes are revolutionary for the individual. There are colonial and national revolutions. Some revolutions are not simply an overthrow of past oppression; they are expressions of a hope for a more complete future. Now, to reduce this process to a college student affairs department, I had to translate the macro dynamics just listed, into attempts to overthrow a manager or leader, or the leader's vision of the future.

At the end of the day, someone makes and enforces rules of law or policy. Some one or some group is going to "call that shot." We will always have the seeds of conflict residing in the question of who gets to be the ultimate rule maker and enforcer. Some will escalate that conflict to violence, either non-verbal or verbal. We will get more into this issue of power below.

In my setting, I could see that people were already engaged in a "revolt" against the changes their leader had brought during the prior 4 years. There was a lack of respect for where they had been in their past together. In some ways, when I came on the scene, many in the group were hopeful I would fulfill their hopes and dreams for their idiosyncratic revolution. Each person wanted me to implement his or her unique vision of the future. In the end, a couple of team members found that they would indeed need to make revolutionary change in relation to me because I brought notions that meant loss for them as individuals (namely related to status), but this is another tale.

To employ the Grammatical Method, I felt I had to be respectful of the past. I gave attention to respecting each individual's past contributions, and to the group's past. I simultaneously challenged them with visions of the future that would hold each of them more accountable to one another. This immediately caused some to make choices: would they go with me, against me, or away from me? I believed that if I attended to the "Cross of Reality", on balance, the majority would see individual and collective benefit to pursuing my vision of our future and it would become *our* vision of the future. Only the most entrenched in self-interest would oppose me, and if some of the team were opposed

to such self-interest, I had a viable constituency to move my revolution forward without being destructive. This is in fact what happened. I had a staff of caring professionals who were trained to serve and help others. They found my vision to be more congruent with their values than the "dog eat dog" environment they had been enduring in the prior several years in which "the biggest dogs" received the most influence and perks. Those who were uncomfortable with the new systems and who could not let go of past jealousies or forgive the loss of past "perks," were free to move on to new organizations.

To summarize, we found what was respectful and respectable about our past and moved that toward our future, as collective goals. Also, rather than coercion and threat to produce change, I appealed to the spirit of respect, faith, empowerment, and community. The group members rejected the destructive aspects of the past, themselves. In time, I could no longer keep up with all the changes they began to implement, and I simply had to get out of their way and monitor the "fence line" to ensure we were still mission congruent and generally heading the same direction and creating a similar time.

Faith: Relationships in the Future

On the faith front, I was articulating a broad story of our future. It was a future that included each member of the group, if they chose to work within the fence line (i.e., law, ethics, mission, mutual benefits). It was a future with more personal fulfillment and timeless rewards. It was filled with increased respect, and effectiveness in human relationships. Also, by the way I spoke of the past, I was letting them know that every day they were creating their past, and I was challenging them to decide what kind of past they wanted the future to know about. I did this by increased documentation of policies, meeting minutes, twice-annual historical survey reports on progress, multi-year comparisons of various statistical and other assessments. And we didn't just create documents and bury them in a cabinet. I would randomly dig into the past, conduct a comparative study and share the results with the team. Thus, they saw how the past would be brought up in the future. I was giving them tools to achieve goals if they wanted to go after them, but we made sure they were realistic goals. I did not make promises about material riches, for example, because under our system, I have virtually no control over the funding sources.

Regarding timing and times (epochs), I had to recall "when I was." To act as if a revolution is complete before it begins will cause failure. To throw someone in the water before they can swim is to risk drowning him. Further, I needed to broaden the awareness of time so that people could become more accountable to a longer past and a longer future, rather than just whoever happens to catch them in the moment. Such changes in perspective could potentially change the sources of value seen in the work. For example, "If I create this program I am leaving a legacy to serve many to follow me." Or, "If I continue this activity, it represents the continuation of a long history of providing excellence in this area, and I want to further that legacy and not be the one who broke the chain of successes." Longer time perspectives also broadened our "center of gravity" just as the high wire artist uses a broad pole to center and stabilize her walk. The longer

perspective decreased panic and anxiety. It decreased the impulse to legislate in response to rare or one-time events.

All of this attention to time involved monitoring the grammatical tense used in speech, and it involved the spirit of the times being described. What was the emotional quality of the speech? What was the power or status of the speaker in relation to the listener? Was the listener one of us, or one of them? All of which leads to a more direct examination of the other elements of the "Cross." Rosenstock-Huessy called these the spatial fronts. I think they are also aptly described as the fronts that address power and membership in human relations. Power and membership are often couched in metaphors of space (territory, material wealth in objects, etc.).

Unanimity: Targeting Anarchy to Create Community

To beat anarchy, I needed to create the safety for people to "put down their weapons" and work together toward common, or communal goals. Some of this process is directly tied to how we framed our relationship with the "outside world" which I will cover in a moment. Other interventions were designed to unify our "inside world." That is, sometimes one can combat anarchy by purposefully initiating a "war".

I set out to establish a strong fence line, as I mentioned, with open and free commerce of activity and ideas within its confines. The need for autonomy could be expressed and developed freely, within the boundaries of law, ethics, available resources, and consistency with polices and mission. Some heard a new permission to break out of old confining roles. Some heard that some perceived "injustices" would no longer be tolerated. Again, there is safety that comes from structure and consistency. And there is relief in seeing that there is also appropriate freedom of exploration and expression. For example, staff members were free to express opposition to any policy or opinion they wished. At the same time, they also were held accountable by giving a rationale. They had to be respectful to one another in their opposition. And, when they could, they provided alternative solutions. Sometimes they created reforms, other times they simply received understanding because some policies were not going to change.

In connection with this theme, in the past, professional development money was given weighting based on professional classification, seniority, and as a behavioral award and punishment system. This old system created incentives to "back bite" and to exaggerate personal achievements and to critique one's colleagues (all done in subtle ways, of course), and it also fed tensions between economic classes. The wealthier professionals received bigger benefits than the lower paid staff. It fueled unhealthy communication at many levels. It created fear of what might be said when the leader's office door was closed. Should people tell on others before others tell on you? It created a climate of fear and it divided the team. By establishing a distribution system with a base dollar amount, that was then prorated based on hours worked per year, a doctor might not get as much as a receptionist, but the people providing more hours of service were recognized for that contribution. Those who perceived they lost advantage had choices to make. Those who gained advantage were elated. People looking for exceptions to the rule

immediately tested me and word spread quickly that in some matters, "that darn Paul was pretty stubborn."

By sticking to the rule, there was a noticeable relaxation of tensions related to this area of community life. Such confidence allowed people to plan for their future development with more certainty. Further, I was committed to expanding that resource over time, though I told them it was going to take time. I have slowly grown that pot of money over time. Keeping my word. Making a projected future outcome a reality.

The other element of anarchy prevention and decadence prevention I enlisted was that I frequently reiterated that in our community, an individual is as powerful as they are of service to others or have expertise of value to others. Thus the currency was shifting from entitlements, and power measured through materials and status, to a system where those who are served, dished out the power (influence) and rewards (acceptance and respect) to those who were of service.

For this to work, I also had to dispel the fantasies people had that there was some unlimited pot of money, or that they were going to become financially wealthy, or that they needed to "campaign for a raise" or that I would offer bonuses for meeting their job expectations. I followed the path that rewards, aside from the basic wage, were in professional development that would make one worth more to one's self and to others. I suggested that pay would come in satisfaction and pride in alleviating suffering in others, and that assisting others for your living was intrinsically honorable and valuable.

Thus, I was taking away incentives for the "I am going to get mine today, regardless of the rules" mentality, and replacing them with, "You can be powerful and have increased opportunities by making yourself better at serving others and either moving on for more pay, elsewhere if your life circumstances called for that, or gaining intrinsic rewards here."

Power: Redefining the target of War

The second priority was to address rules of power and relationships that would address the overt conflicts more directly. In simple terms, the psychology of "us versus them" was driving interpersonal relations, internally. Group members had created a "them" out of those who should have been viewed as part of "us." I came at this problem from multiple perspectives informed by the Grammatical Method.

I first proposed an external enemy we could rally to defeat. I chose "our collectively bad reputation among the larger campus community." I intentionally picked an inanimate external enemy so that we did not make personal enemies. In higher education, relationships are everything. I also made the connection that individual and collective job security, and budget maintenance, as well as our professional desire to alleviate the suffering of those we were trained to serve, demanded that we pull together to turn that terrible reputation into a positive reputation.

I also balanced access to the director (a resource). I allowed no "tattling". I created forums for dialogue. I created a process where a dyadic conflict that reaches an impasse would go to one of these forums to find a consensus solution. We adopted policies and standards that were the highest among the professions and held everyone to them regardless of background (e.g., the professional ethics regarding confidentiality of records).

I also modeled, for this environment, how to seek consultation and assistance. I modeled professional development activities. I am not sure this would work in "cutthroat" environments where any sign of "weakness" can mean dismissal or overthrow. In my context, however, I let everyone know that I will overthrow anyone who pretends they are all finished growing as a person, or as a professional. If you think you are that perfect, then you must have finished growing and you are very likely to make mistakes and act in gross self-interest. In effect you are high risk and I will come after you to either get you to change back into being a "student" and "listener" again, or I would arrange for you to leave our community.

Finally, I not only attended to use of pronouns, I taught others to attend to the choice of pronouns as well. In fact, many in administration at my institution have picked up this particular intervention. When someone says, "the administration says" we are quick to note if the speaker is a member of administration him or herself. And if a non-administration person says "the administration" we work to have them recognize the individual people they are referencing. This produces more accountability and responsibility in one's public pronouncements and speculation. It also prevents splitting "us" into various "us" versus "them" factions.

Status Report from One Grammatical Revolution

For many years now, my staff members work very well together. We have our conflicts and disagreements, but we have come a long way in our pursuit of our future goals. We have dramatically increased student access to our services. We no longer have battles over resources; we have battles over details regarding how we will implement new ways to be of service to others. When I arrived we had a very poor reputation. Now our students complain that they cannot get in to see us, because we are too busy, even though we have slowly, but surely, increased our availability. There are many lived examples I did not cover, but I offer these examples as a model for discussion. When would attention to tense, to pronoun, and to times and timing help you to address common struggles and conflicts in your church, your place of work, in your family? What currency is exchanged for power? Are people trading for justice and communal benefit, or are they trading in natural resources or money? What are other contexts for assessment and intervention using the Grammatical Method?

And Now to Eugen's Study

Needless to say, I have been thriving in the challenges and opportunities of my work. One of the benefits has been that I have daily access to the Internet and to

academic forums. One day, a few years back, I thought I would see if the Internet had anything to offer related to Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. Sure enough, a new e-group had been formed. If you looked back at the archives, you will see that I raised questions about the kind of community we wanted to be, and what our language suggested about our individual and collective aspirations for the Eugen community we were creating.

Another fascinating aspect of the e-group is the way text creates confusion and misunderstanding compared to actual human speech, particularly with this group of people who tackle some very complex systems descriptions and belief systems.

As mentioned earlier, in June 1999, I had an opportunity to travel to Burlington, Vermont for a disability services conference. With a few minutes of computer detective work, I was able to track down, and identify on maps, the addresses of Ray Huessy, Clint Gardner and Mark Huessy. I was able to begin coordinating a visit with Clint. So, after an informative conference and some fly-fishing on the Winooski River, I met Clint Gardner for lunch at the Norwich Inn. From a lovely lunch and discussion, he took me to see Eugen's grave, to see Dartmouth, and he took me to see Freya Von Moltke. I still recall my shock that after we had a lovely chat in the living room, Freya asked me if I would like to see Eugen's study. Realize now that Eugen died when I was a child. It never crossed my mind that his study would be kept almost exactly as it was when he used it. What a thrill! I scoured his bookshelves with my eyes. What texts fed those aphorisms, gave the raw material for so many bridges to be constructed? Sadly, today, I do not recall the titles; I only recall the book-covered walls, the lovely window views of lush greenery and the warmth and generosity of Freya and Clint. I am very appreciative of their gracious hospitality and patience with a sincere yet amateur student of Eugen's work. I left Vermont with new inspiration to unpack and share the many gifts a great teacher has left for all of us.

I can honestly claim that Eugen was a teacher who opened my ears and my eyes to perceiving the human soul in my family, friends, employees, and students. A teacher who has given me tools for deeper understanding of the world around me, by simply appreciating the Cross of Reality present in the speech and writing we encounter every day.