



GCPH Seminar Series 6 Seminar 6

Radisson Blu Hotel, Glasgow

Tuesday 18 May 2010

***'Power and Love:
a theory and practice of social change'***

Adam Kahane

Carol Tannahill, Director, GCPH:

Good afternoon everyone, I think we should make a start. Can I check that you can hear me? Excellent, nods at the back, that's good, welcome to this final seminar in the Glasgow Centre Population Health 6th Seminar Series. It's extraordinary for us to think that that's us now completed six seasons of these very interesting and diverse seminars at which Andrew Lyon uses his creativity and intellect and networks and sometimes a bit of perseverance to bring to Glasgow a range of interesting and diverse people to tell us about the work they do, how they see the world, and for us to think very carefully about what that might mean, about how we go about our work here in Glasgow with an objective of improving health, well being and sustainable communities in this part of the country.

For those of you who don't know me, my name's Carol Tannerhill and I have the pleasure of being the Director of the Glasgow Centre for Population Health and I am your Chair for this afternoon's seminar. So my first task is the usual, just please make sure that phones are on silent at worst and switched off at best, please, and that would be great. If there is a fire alarm that goes off the exit is at the end of this room. So please make your way out there. The format of this seminar is after I finish my introduction I will hand over to Adam who will address us for somewhere between three quarters of an hour and an hour I think, telling us about power and love, more of which in a minute. And then you'll have a good half hour for discussion and questions and answers, following which there is a scope to network out in the lobby there and continue the conversations and discussion of your reflections on what you've heard this afternoon.

So it's now my pleasure to introduce Adam Kahane who has managed to avoid any volcanic ash problems and made his way here from Canada. Oh no, you've come from Brazil I think, sorry, from Brazil, to talk to us this evening. Adam is a leading designer and facilitator of processes, through which different constituents from business, governance and civil society can work together to achieve progress to solve tough, complex, social problems. And he has worked on some very, very tough complex, social problems. Through his career he's worked in more than 50 countries in every part of the world. And he has facilitated a whole range of what sound to me, from reading his work, extremely challenging but, I think probably some of the most important problems that have faced the world over that period of time.

He's facilitated the Mont Fleur Scenario project in South Africa in which a diverse group of South Africans worked together to effect the transition to democracy. What a phenomenal achievement. He's created an alliance of people from different parts of the global food system as a route to getting sustainable food more mainstreamed in the agenda and not of marginal interest. He's

worked in Columbia during the civil war, in Guatemala after the genocide to support the implementation of the peace accords and the different sectors of Jewish Israeli Society. And that's only a few of his achievements and I'm sure we're going to hear more examples this afternoon. From initially studying physics at McGill University, Adam then graduated with post-graduate degrees in economics and behavioural science. His career has involved strategy and research positions in large international organisations involving him in living and working in many different parts of the World, but not yet in Scotland, I think. So maybe that's a pleasure for the future. He now lives in Boston and Cape Town with his wife and family and is a partner in Generon Reos part of Reos Partners. Now those of you with a classical training will know what Reos means, flow, is that right?, yes, good. Flow, the focus being therefore on movement, achieving movement and progress forward. Reos Partners is a global partnership that supports innovation and complex social systems. From what I understand the approaches are practical and can be applied at a range of different levels from national levels to international systems, to local organisational and community issues.

So as you listen to what Adam's saying I think one of the things to do is to think about how that might be applied at some of the different levels and in relation to some of the different social challenges that we face here. Adam is author first of this book, *Solving Tough Problems: An Open Way of Talking, Listening, and Creating New Realities*. This was described by Nelson Mandela as: "a breakthrough book which addresses the central challenge of our time; finding a way to work together to solve the problems we have created." That sort of tribute must have made him feel pretty good I guess and it's only one of many tributes on this book. His more recent book, *Power and Love*, which is the subject matter of today's seminar, describes how these two processes, that of power and that of love, are the fundamental drives that generate social change and need to be employed together. I thoroughly enjoyed reading it and as well as all of his other achievements I can recommend Adam to you as a very clear communicator whose propositions he makes in makes in very persuasive and gripping ways. So it really is a good read and I highly recommend it to you. So Adam we're really delighted that you have come to join us this afternoon, we really look forward to hearing what you've got to say and to hear more about *Power and Love*, thank you very much indeed.

Adam Kahane:

Thank you very much Carol and thank you Andrew for persevering. It took several years to make this happen so I'm happy to finally be here. I've never lived in Scotland but I lived in London for five years. And I was walking through the streets near where I used to live last night remembering what a wonderful feeling it is when the days get longer. So it made me nostalgic for being in the UK. Thank you, thank you all for your interest and for coming. I'm happy to be here.

As Carol said in her introduction, I've spent the past 20 years working with my colleagues on different sorts of complex, social challenges. Working on climate change in my native country of Canada, a bit in healthcare in the United States, on judicial impunity in Argentina, on child malnutrition in India, on violent conflict in Columbia and Sudan, on sustainable food systems in Europe and South Africa and on social divisions in Australia. And, when I think back on that work one of the primary patterns that I've noticed is that complex social challenges tend to get stuck. It's difficult to create forward movement. Many, perhaps most of the efforts we try fail. There's no straight line, there's no recipes. The result, among other things, is frustration and suffering and pain.

And this pattern has both frustrated me and also energised me for the work. And so I've spent the last 20 years, I would say, with much trial and much error and much learning trying to work out why this is. Why this is that complex social challenges tend to get stuck and how to get unstuck. How to create forward movement or flow. The answer, or one of the answers I've come up with to the question that I've posed has to do with these two words 'power' and 'love'. And this answer

immediately poses two challenges for an afternoon like today, I was telling a friend of mine who comes from a very proper upbringing in New York City that I was writing a book about power and love. And I could see from the expression on his face that he was genuinely concerned for me. He said, “Adam, you can’t do that, you’ve chosen two words which are not permitted to be spoken in polite company” [laughter].

And I dismissed this but then a few months ago I was writing to a colleague in the Dutch Government and every time I would send him an email with the words ‘Power’ and ‘Love’ in the subject line it would be rejected by the Government spam filter [laughter]. God knows what category that fell in. Actually my wife was alarmed to see that this new book was in the romance and sex aid section of a Boston bookstore which she found pretty embarrassing on my behalf [laughter]. The other reason it’s difficult to talk about power and love is these are words that are deliberately chosen, ordinary words but they mean a lot of different things to a lot of different people. So the difficulty I have in talking about it is that people believe that they know what I’m going to say before I say it and don’t listen. As you’ll see I’m talking about power and love and I’m very specifically using particular definitions.

So what I’d invite you to do for the next 30 to 40 minutes is just take your understanding of power and love and suspend it as if from a string in front of you. You may find after 30 or 40 minutes that you think the same thing as you did before. But you may find that the framework I’m offering helps you see something different and helps you look at things in a different way. So in the first part of what I wanted to talk about is why is that in trying to address complex social challenges we so often get stuck. I spent the first two weeks of December last year in Copenhagen participating in a minor way in the United Nations negotiations on climate change. And for somebody who’s interested in how to address complex social challenges this was really like being at the Olympics. The city of Copenhagen was filled with people working in every different possible way on the challenge of climate change. There were conferences, church services and concerts. It seemed that on every street corner there was a protest and on every billboard there was some message about climate change. They were 50,000 people who came to the civil society event, the Clima Forum and in the middle of the first week of December there was a march through the streets of Copenhagen with a 100,000 people as hundreds of thousands of others were marching through hundreds of other cities around the world, I assume, including Glasgow. I spent most of the time in the Bella Centre which was the venue for the official UN negotiations. As you may have seen on television the Bella Centre was filled literally to capacity with 20,000 people. Official negotiators from 192 countries and media people and business observers and NGO observers all networked with each other and with their constituents and friends around the World. Every day at the Bella Centre there were hundreds of official meetings and unofficial side meetings. I’ve never seen, let alone participated in a gathering of such scale and seriousness and sophistication. Somebody said to me it was like being a class where everybody was really interested in the material and everybody had done all the pre-reading.

The core dynamic I observed in the Bella Centre was a collision between two camps, each with its own drive and its own discourse. And, I’m not speaking here about the collision between rich countries and poor countries or between people who wanted to move on climate change and people who didn’t, although that collision certainly existed. But rather a collision that I think of as more fundamental. On the one side was what I call the power camp. You had the governments of the UK and the US and other industrialised countries who framed everything they said in terms of maintaining their position in the global system, their competitiveness. You had the countries of China and Brazil and my adopted country of South Africa and other industrialising countries, talking mostly about growth and development. You had African countries and other poor and vulnerable countries talking about their development or even their survival. And then you had a motley crew of oil companies and shipping companies and windmill companies concerned with their growth and profits. What all these different members of the power camp had in common is that their discourse was about their own need for development and growth and self-determination.

On the other hand, or the other side, you had what I am calling the love camp. And the love camp was perfectly exhibited in the opening ceremonies on the Monday of the first week in December. You had the Danish climate Minister, who was the Chair of the negotiations, who opened the meeting by talking about the responsibility of the negotiators who were there to deal with this issue, the importance of their task. You had Rajendra Pachauri, the head of the scientific body, the inter-governmental panel on climate change talking about global imbalances and ecological questions. You had a film that had been made just for the conference about children and what life would be like for children if climate change was not addressed and the ethical issues this raised. And then finally you had this beautiful singing by a Danish adult choir that opened the hearts of everybody in this huge meeting room.

What all of the discourses or the discourse of all of the members of this love camp had in common was that they were all talking about interconnectiveness and the health of the planet and humanity as a whole. These two distinct drives and discourses produced complexity and consternation and conflict because these two camps were radically polarised. The power camp's view of the love camp was that the love camp was being impractical, even unrealistic. And the love camp's view of the power camp was that the power camp was being irresponsible, even oppressive. Now what was apparent to me then is that both of these camps are strong and neither of them is going to go away. The power camp can ignore or deny the importance of the interconnectedness and health of the whole. But ignoring or denying the importance of the interconnectedness and health of the whole doesn't make these phenomena go away.

I spent a fair amount of time there with a friend of mine who's a climate scientist and he kept muttering under his breath, "You can't negotiate with Mother Earth." At the same time the love camp can deny or ignore the importance of development and growth and sovereignty. But ignoring or denying the importance of development and growth and sovereignty doesn't make these phenomena go away. And sitting in the back of this negotiating room some of the most telling and touching moments were when a man named Ian Fry would put his hand up to speak. Ian Fry was the negotiator for the country of Tuvalu. This little island in the Pacific only 26 square kilometres, 12,000 people, the highest point on the Island of Tuvalu is 4.5 metres above sea level. And several times from the very first session on the first date to the very last session on the last date, Ian would put up his hand and he would say some version of, "I object to the way this negotiation is moving. If you continue to move in this direction my country will cease to exist and I simply cannot go along with this."

So the way I saw it, this collision in Copenhagen between the power camp and the love camp was the collision of an irresistible force and an immovable object. And what we saw at the end of that second week in December and what we still see is that the climate situation is poised between breakdown and breakthrough, between being stuck and moving forward. And the question I was left with is what will it take to move forward on this complex challenge. But when I thought about it further I thought that what I had seen in Copenhagen was an extreme example of what is in fact a universal phenomenon, that the collision between power and love often produces breakdown and stuckness. And so the more general question is, what does it take to move forward on such complex social challenges?

When I look back at the 20 years of work I've done what I can now see in retrospect, it certainly wasn't obvious to me at the time, is that I have encountered this collision between power and love many times. I got started in this work in 1991, I was living in London, working in the scenario department of Royal Dutch Shell. I was the head of a political, economical, social scenario group. And one day we received an unexpected phone call from a group of activists in South Africa associated with the African National Congress. Nelson Mandela had just been released from prison, the opposition movements had just been legalised, the negotiations to deal with the situation had just begun. And this group of opposition activists wanted to use the Shell scenario planning methodology to undertake strategic planning about how to end apartheid. Shell, you may remember, had been subject to a boycott particularly in Europe for not having divested from South

Africa and so they were very happy to oblige. And as I was the youngest and most expendable member of the department I was despatched.

This is how I found myself in September 1991 unexpectedly facilitating an exercise at a conference centre outside Cape Town, the conference centre was called Mont Fleur, of these people. What was most interesting and surprisingly interesting to me about this experience was that the team I ended up facilitating was made up of people not just from the African National Congress but from a variety of opposition movements. Other political parties, trade unions, community activists, academics and also members of the white establishment, business and eventually members of the White Democratic party and Conservative party. There was a joke people used to tell in South Africa around that time, that faced with our unbelievably complex and daunting social challenges, we have actually two options. There's a practical option and there's a miraculous option. The practical option is right now we all get out of our chairs and down on our knees and we pray for a band of angels to come down and sort this out for us. And the miraculous option would be that we continue to talk with one another and find a way forward together. And, of course, to everybody's surprise, and not least the South Africans, this version of the miraculous option eventuated. This was surprising and inspiring to me and I became very interested in this way of working on complex social challenges which I didn't know existed. I became very interested in what was going on in South Africa, very exciting experience for a young man. I also became very interested in the woman who was the organiser of the project. And so by the end of the project I had resigned from Shell and emigrated from London to Cape Town and married the project organiser. So all together a successful project [laughter].

And what I learnt from that experience and which is the thread that I've been following for the 20 years since is that under certain circumstances, I didn't really understand what circumstances, but under certain circumstances it is possible to move forward on even the most complex and daunting social challenges. And I wanted to know what those circumstances were and how to do that. I've lived in South Africa since 1993 and when I think about what I've seen in South Africa, at that time and since, and what I know about the history of South Africa before that, I realise that this collision between power and love has played out very, very clearly there. On the one hand, a power drive which has been exhibited in a history of migration and slavery and colonialism and apartheid and armed conflict and peaceful resistance and negotiation. Just phase after phase of encounter between different people, each trying to get on with what they want, achieve what they want in various collisions of different sorts.

And at the same time a very important love drive and I think that what was been so, so inspiring about the South African transition to the international community has been this aspect of the situation so epitomised by the two leading figures of the transition, Archbishop Desmond Tutu with his emphasis on healing and reconciliation and Nelson Mandela with his capacity to reunite the separated. Of course the word 'apartheid' in Afrikaans just means 'apartness' that's what the word means. And so the end of apartheid was, in a certain sense, the end of apartness. And the emblematic moment of this end of apartness, which is the subject of this new Clint Eastwood movie, *Invictus*, was this moment when Mandela went onto the pitch of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and took a symbol of White Afrikaner rugby, and with a single gesture transformed it into a symbol of the unity of the nation as a whole. So there's something in the South African story which is also about the collision between power and love and somehow for reasons that certainly weren't clear to me at the time, this set of forces were able to be resolved in this miraculous fashion.

Since then, my colleagues and I have worked with this South African approach in every part of the world on many different challenges and the general form of the work has been as I had seen in South Africa to work with teams of leaders who come from across a given social system, who may not know each other, may not agree with each other, may not like each other, may have a history of literally shooting at each other but who realise that they can't get where they're trying to go except together. And this has been the work of the last 20 years in which I have seen this collision between power and love many times. Now when I thought about it I realised that this collision

between power and love which I'd seen globally at Copenhagen and nationally in South Africa and many other places, I'd also seen in all the organisations I'd worked with. Whether as a consultant to government or company or NGOs or within Shell, as an employee, or even within Reos Partners.

That on the one hand you had this crucial phenoma, this power drive of every individual, every department trying to do its thing, get's its job done, push forward its initiatives, its ideas and at the same time this love drive manifested in different ways as friendship or team mate-ship or common purpose of some sort. And finally, what I noticed is the same collision very strongly within myself. That I feel within myself a very strong drive, a drive to be myself, to do my thing, to achieve my destiny and at the same time a drive to connect with others, to be in communion with others. And I can certainly tell a version of my own biography which is about this collision between the power drive and the love drive.

So what's going on here? There's some pheonoma, some pheonoma that I've seen at the global level, at the national level, at the organisational level, at the personal level. What's this about, how can we understand this pheonoma that is occurring at all social scales? The way I have come to think about this is that what we're seeing is a collision between two basic universal human drives. And of course there's many definitions of power and of love but what I've settled upon is a pair of definitions that were offered by a German American theologian whose name was Paul Tillock, who wrote a book, I think in 1955, called *Power, Love and Justice*. And I've settled on these Tillock definitions not because I have any particular allegiance to Tillock. I'd actually never heard of him before I came across this book. I wouldn't say I'm an enormous follower of German American Protestant, exstentalist theologians [laughter]. It's not really a movement I see myself as part of.

But Tillock's definitions to me have enormous explanatory value. Much of what I've encountered and have been trying to understand and work with over these 20 years in my professional work and in my personal life I think can be explained by Tillock's definitions. Tillock defines power as the drive of everything living to realise itself within increasing intensity and extensity. The drive of everything living to realise itself with increasing intensity and extensity [emphasis]. And the clearest image I have of what Tillock means by power, have you ever heard of this NGO movement, called 'Guerilla Gardening'? So Guerilla Gardeneners are people who skulk about at night in a built up city like Glasgow. They find an empty lot that's covered with whatever garbage or tar and they put seeds on the ground because they know that the seeds will sprout and go through the ground and the rubble and make a green space. And this image of the seed is, I think, the clearest image of what Tillock means by the drive of everything living to realise itself with increasing intensity and extensity. This is the drive to development and growth and self determination which I saw on exhibit in Copenhagen, in South Africa, in organisations and in myself. Tillock defines loves as the drive towards the unity of the separated, the drive towards the unity of the separarated. And what he's implying by that particular choice of words is that there is an underlying unity. It's not one that has to be created but which exists, which has been or which appears to be fractured.

So this is the notion of interconnectedness or health or wholeness which I saw on exhibit in Copenhagen and in South African and in organisations and in myself. Now so far so good, if you think about this in a calm lecture room like this afternoon it sounds pretty straightforward. Drive to self-realisation, drive to unity, I can do that. In theory this is simple but in practice I've concluded that it's not only difficult but dangerous. And the reason it's difficult and dangerous to work with these phenomena is because, as everybody knows, power has two sides. A generative side, the strive to self-realisation can create things, can grow things like a seed and a degenerate side, a side associated with oppression, with undermining the power of another. And the other reason it's difficult and dangerous to work with power and love is because as not everybody knows, love also has two sides, a generative side and a degenerative side. I once took this course where a lot of my fellow students were from Texas and the fun thing about studying with Texans is they have this really wonderful way of using the English language. And one of my friends said that his son had been in the Netherlands and had fallen in love and he said, "When mah son came home he was so in

love he wasn't worth shooting" [laughter]. And I loved this expression, this image of love which is so, so crippling, so sapping of one's power that one's not worth shooting.

So, these two sides of power and these two sides of love show up in human systems at all scales. Let me give you two examples, a small one and a larger one. I think the clearest way to see these two sides of power and these two sides of love is just to look at historically constructed gender roles. So in the starkly constructed gender roles the husband represents masculine power and the wife feminine love. The generative side of the man's power is he goes out of the house in the morning with his briefcase and the generative side of his power is that he can participate in creating something in the world, in making something happen, in building something up. The degenerative side of his power, which is the subject of hundreds of novels and hundreds of films is he can become so focused on this thing he has to do, his job, his destiny, that he becomes disconnected from his colleagues, from his family and he becomes a robot or a tyrant. The two sides of love can be seen in the role of the woman. The generative side of her love is that she literally gives life to the children, figuratively to the family as a whole. The degenerative side of her love is that she can become so focused on this unity, on holding together, that she undermines or suffocates the power of the members of the family and much more fundamentally, much more fundamentally of herself. So I think this image which certainly I recognise from families I've been close to and maybe some of you do as well, is the clearest way to see this two sides of power, two sides of love.

Let me give you a second example from my work. In 2006 I was invited to participate in a project in Israel. So it was just after the second Lebanon war, there seemed to be an opening to rethink things and one of my colleagues, with some friends of his, he had been involved for many years in dialogues between Israelis and Palestinians... But he thought that what would really be helpful in Israel would be to organise some sort of a strategic dialogue about the future of Israel with a group of Jewish Israeli leaders. You may know that Jewish Israeli society is hugely divided between religious and non-religious, right and left, settlers and people who live within the green line, immigrants and native-born Israelis. And the hypothesis of this group was that until the Jewish Israelis had some sort of shared understanding of what they were trying to do, it would never be possible, it would never be politically possible to make a settlement with the Palestinians.

So we started working with this group which included leaders of all of these different factions. Now the two sides of power seemed obvious to me from the little I knew about the Middle East situation. On the one hand you had in the establishment of the Jewish state after the holocaust a dramatic example of generative power, of the drive of everything living to realise itself within increasing intensity and extensity. You had this linguistic revival, this rebirth of Hebrew as a modern language, this spiritual revival. You had this extensity with this territorial conquest, first in the pre-1967 lines and then into the settlements. At the same time the degenerative side of power was also obvious. If the Jews were trying to realise themselves intensively and extensively and the Palestinians were trying to do the same on exactly the same piece of real estate it's obvious that there would be violent conflict.

What surprised me is we could immediately see the two sides of power within this little team. I don't know how many of you have participated in or tried to facilitate meetings of Israelis. It's a very horizontal society, people aren't afraid to disagree at all. We had long, long, long debates in this team and after one of these long debates a woman came up to me and said, "Adam, I know that I'm being difficult in this group but I'm not willing to compromise who I am just to get along with everybody else." This was the drive of everything living to realise itself. And if everybody in the team is doing this all the time you can imagine why the arguments would go on for a long time and become polarised and stuck. So I could see the two sides of power in this situation.

What took me a lot longer to see was the two sides of love. The team included members of the Israeli parliament, the Knesset and because of a weekly schedule of sitting of the Knesset the workshops had to be held from Thursday night to Sunday night which meant that they had to be over the Jewish Sabbath, Friday night to Saturday night. And because the team was of a 50%

religious Jews it meant that there was a 24 hour period where we couldn't do any work at all. You're supposed to rest during the Sabbath, you can't write, you're not allowed to write, not allowed to use electrical devices. And so my first reaction as the designer of these workshops was, 'this is a disaster. You're telling me you have to have three day workshops but there's one day where we can't do anything. This is ridiculous'.

And it turns out of course that I was completely wrong, that the Sabbath periods were without doubt and in every workshop the most productive period. What people did on the Sabbath is they ate together, they prayed together, they went for walks together. They argued, you're allowed to argue on the Sabbath that's not forbidden [laughter]. And it was without exception those 24 hour periods where the group really became closer, where they were able to progress and where there was really a feeling of oneness, sort of a family feeling. And I realised this is exactly what Tillock means by love being the drive to reunite the separated. That in this Sabbath experience the separated become united which had of course been the premise for the project as a whole.

At the same time, at the same time there were members of the group, particularly the secular members of the group, that were very uncomfortable with this Sabbath unity. They said quite strongly, "Look this unity, this religiously defined unity for this workshop or for the state of Israel is not my unity. This is not the whole that I'm part of. I'm part of a secular unity in my community or amongst Jews and Arabs. Or the global unity of sociology professors or whatever. The unity that you're defining I find constraining." So is this the other side of love and I realised in looking at the macro situation that this question about what's the unity, what's the unity that's separated is highly contested. Is the unity in question here all Jews, is it all Israelis, both Jewish and Arab, is it everybody in the Middle East? It's easy to say superficially well, we're all one but the question of what's the whole that has been separated and needs to be reunited is a highly contested matter. And what I noticed in this group is that as they worked on their power and as they worked on their love both of them became more generative. The power moved from degenerative to generative and the love moved from degenerative to generative. And the work of the team started to flow and become more fluid.

So this is how I am defining power and love and obviously I haven't discovered or invented power and love. These are phenomena that we all know about but I think that I have learned something important about how power and love are connected and it's the following: what is it that makes power degenerative rather than generative? It is the lack of the connection or the lack of love. And what is it that makes love degenerative rather than generative, it is the lack of power, of self realisation. Martin Luther King Junior, the great theologian and activist wrote his doctoral dissertation on the work of Paul Tillock. And in one of King's final speeches, his final speech to the Southern Christian Leadership convention, the organisation of which he was President, he says the following. He says, "what we need to realise is that power without love is reckless and abusive. And love without power is sentimental and anaemic. It is precisely this collision of immoral power with powerless morality which constitutes the major crisis of our time".

So this is my understanding of the essential relationship between power and love. The great biographer of Martin Luther King Junior was a man named Taylor Branch. And Branch writes that he sees the story of King's life as having been about walking a narrow path between reckless and abusive power on the one hand and sentimental and anaemic love on the other. And of course there is a great Greek myth about this idea of trying to navigate between two dangers and this is the story that's told in the odyssey of the Odysseus sailing the straits of Assena, this narrow straight where on the one hand there is this six headed monster with six long neck sharp teeth, Scylla, perched on the rocks. And on the other hand, this monster with the big mouth that when it sucks in water makes a whirlpool, a Charybdis. And the story is that if you're sailing between Cilla and Charybdis the danger is that if you try and stay away from Scylla, you end up in Charybdis and if you're trying to stay away from Charybdis, you end up in Scylla. This is the image I have of what it's like to try to work with power and love. In theory, it's simple but in practice it's difficult and dangerous. Because in many cases our societies and communities and organisations tend to be dominated either

by power or by love, which means they tend to be characterised either by recklessness and abuse or by sentimentality and anaemia. Either stuck on the rocks or in the whirlpool. So choosing either power or love is always a mistake. When we choose either power or love we get stuck and if we want to get unstuck, if we want to be able to move forward on addressing our most complex social challenges we have to find a way to choose both.

Okay the last part of what I wanted to say is to address the question of what does it take? In particular what does it take as individuals, as citizens or as change agents or as leaders to help the social systems of which we're part, get unstuck. To create forward a movement on complex social challenges. In other words what does it take as activists to balance power and love. And what I argue is that we can't do this in the systems in which we are a part if we can't do the same within ourselves. And so the challenge as individuals, as change agents, as leaders, is to learn to employ and indeed embody both power and love. Now the reason this is difficult, in my observation, is that some people are able to do this but most of us are more comfortable with either power or love. In a calm setting like now it seems to easy to work with both but under stress the power people revert to power and become reckless and abusive, the love people revert to love and become sentimental and anaemic.

My own particular pattern, exhibited in a very high stress project in India that I talk about in this book is that I was reckless and abusive on even numbers of days and sentimental and anaemic on odd numbers of days [laughter]. So the point is, the basic point, is that power and love are not a choice, they're a dilemma and one of the people who've written in a very helpful way about dilemmas, the situations where we have two options and we can't choose one is Charles Handen-Turner and Handen-Turner makes what, I think, is a very helpful note that often the way to reconcile a dilemma is not to try to do them at the same time. And so the image came to me which I've used in this book, is that working with power and love is like walking on two legs. So we can't move forward just on one leg, we don't move them both at the same time, we don't stay in balance. On the contrary we use first one leg then another and in a way we're always out of balance, not in balance or in dynamic balance. I don't know how many of you remember this movie, the Wizard of Oz? Remember this movie, there's this wonderful scene where the scarecrow is stuck on a pole and Dorothy takes him off the pole and he's trying to learn how to walk and at the beginning his legs are disconnected and he falls down and then he's able to stumble and eventually he's able to walk and to skip down the yellow brick road with Dorothy. And so the image I have of this is that if we choose either power or love we fall down. If our power is stronger than our love or our love is stronger than our power we stumble. When making progress we're always at risk at falling and if we want to walk we have to be able to use both equally. So have to say I very rarely think that there are recipes in the world but this particular formulation leads to a very straight forward, although I would say not easy to implement recipe, three part recipe which is the following.

The first step is to become aware within ourselves of both our power and love. And this means for the power people who think love is just some thing for romance movies is to see within themselves this drive to reunite the separated. And for the love people who say they don't like power to realise within themselves this drive to self realisation. There'll be a lot of incorrect analogies in this field but a very correct analogy would be here to say, to become aware of both the masculine and feminine within ourselves. The second step is to deliberately work on strengthening our weaker drive. So for the love people to deliberately work on strengthening their power drive and for the power people to deliberately work on strengthening their love drive. And the reason this is important is because people normally do the opposite. The power people say, "Well, you know I'm not very good at this love thing and so my power is way out here and people are always telling that I'm being disruptive or arrogant or pushy. So I'm just going to try to hold back my power." Or the love people say, "Well, you know I don't like to push myself forward, I don't like emphasis on myself so I'm going to try to be a little less open, a little less loving." And I don't think that's good enough. I think actually what's required or the aspiration that's required for the kind of work we're talking about is to move towards 100% of our power and a 100% of our love. And the third step is

simply to practice, to practice putting one foot in front the other and in particular not to choose between or confuse or fuse these two. The counter intuitive part is not to try to move for this perfect balance but to practice the power and practice the love, practice the power, practice the love until they fuse and interpenetrate within us.

The question arises then why is this difficult? Why do we hesitate to step forward and I think the simplest answer would be fear. The power people hesitate to use their power or hesitate to use their love because they're afraid of being hurt. The love people are afraid to use their power because they're afraid of hurting others. I had this counselling teacher once, very difficult class, very emotional, people would cry. And when somebody would cry she wouldn't say "Oh there, there, why don't you just take a break and calm down." She would hand them a box of tissues and she'd say, "Keep talking, talk through your fear." And I think that's what's required. There is a very interesting story and I'll end with this, an interesting story about stepping through your fear and I was told it in Eliat, at the third workshop of this Jewish Israeli group. Eliat is the Southern most city in Israel, right over the Red Sea and my middle name is Moses, so I've always had a big interest in the Red Sea, big interest in biblical stories.

And I'm standing at this window of this conference centre looking at the Red Sea and standing next to me is the oldest member of the team, an ultra orthodox rabbi, 85 years old. One of these guys with the fur hats. And I said,do you know anything about Moses and the Red Sea?" He said, "Yeah, I've been studying it for eighty years I know a thing or two about it." He said, "Adam, did you know that when the Israelites were fleeing from the Egyptians and they came to the Red Sea the scholars tell us that the first ones got their feet wet?" I said, "I don't get it, how could they get their feet wet if God parted the Red Sea, how come the first people got their feet wet?" He said, "Well, let me tell you, I mean there's a story and then there's the story underneath the story. This is the tradition of Jewish biblical scholarship." He said, "Actually the story behind the story is when the Israelites arrived at the Red Sea it was not split. The water was there and what did they do, they sat down on the banks of the Red Sea and cried. They cried for Moses or their department head or God to 'just do something, make a path for us'. And it's said that Moses himself had no idea what to do. And the story goes that there was a young leader whose name was.....and in Yiddish to call somebody ais to refer to a courageous young leader. The story is that.....who did not know how to swim, walked into the Red Sea until the water was above his nose. It's an interesting image, can't swim, walk into the water until it was above his nose and the story goes it was the act of walking into the sea that split the sea. So I think this is the situation actually we're all in. We're trying to deal with situations where there is no path in front of us. There is not even a map of a path in front of us, how can we go forward, the only thing to do is to use both of our legs to put one foot in front of the other simply to step forward. Thank you.

Carol Tannahill:

Thank you for a very inspiring seminar. I think everyone's really enjoyed it and I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank the GCPH team who once again have put on a great series of seminars and particularly Andrew and Fiona, our communications manager, who do all of things behind the scenes that make this go so well. So thank you very much, keep in touch and we will reconvene again after the summer with Series 7 and whatever that has in store. I know it will be interesting and thought provoking, as all the past series have been. So thanks for coming and let's show our appreciation to Adam.

[Applause]