

EXPANDING THE CIRCLE: DEVELOPING AN AMERICAN INDIAN POLITICAL THEORY FOR LIVING WELL IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Stephen M. Sachs

The public affairs of the world are greatly out of balance, at this writing in the fall of 2013. In the United States, and many places across the globe, people are deeply divided, with massive peaceful demonstrations in numerous nations, violence at varying levels in others. Relations among people and with the Earth are often seriously out of harmony. From an Indigenous point of view, there is too much emphasis on, and struggle for, power as control, and not enough on empowerment. The causes are many. Some have to do with overly narrow views of economics and development, while others have to do with upbringing, teaching and learning, how we come to view the world and guide our actions in it. These topics are considered elsewhere. All of these are interrelated with the political, which is the focus of this paper.

Applying the Principle of Diversity or Place

American Indians, and Indigenous societies generally, while still organized as bands and tribes, before they began to expand into states, while not perfect, did relatively well in generally providing good lives for almost all their citizens (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch, 1). At the center of virtually all Indigenous political and social relations has been a respect for all people, all beings, with the Earth seen as a living being. All people, and indeed all beings, are considered relatives, and ought to be treated as such. Thus, one's community is to be thought of as a family, in which everyone has a responsibility toward everyone else (Sachs, 2011). As the Comanche say, individuals and societies need to live and function according to four basic values, the "Four Rs": Relationship, Responsibility, Reciprocity, and Redistribution. It follows from the nature of relationship that community members have responsibilities for one another. This responsibility requires reciprocity in relationships to maintain, and at times recreate, the harmony and balance of the community. Thus, reciprocity involves a redistribution to achieve and maintain a dynamic balance. This is not just a redistribution of concrete things, but of all that is valued, including of actions.

To keep the community in harmony and balance, everyone's welfare needs to be provided for. Since the autonomy of each individual, and their ability to contribute to the community are highly valued, so far as possible, assistance ought to be given to others in ways that are empowering, rather than in ways that cause dependence. Indeed, empowerment is critical to maintaining a well-balanced community of harmonious relationships based on a continuing reciprocity consisting of interdependence, which is undermined by an excess of dependence.

All of the basic principles of Indigenous relationship have been part of an all pervading spirituality and general world view, without dogma, that each society has held. But the respect has not been limited to members of the same society, or holders of the same world view. Diversity has been honored, because in a complex world no person or group can have a full understanding of the world, or even major issues. Everyone benefited from an exchange of views, and dialoguing on the issues. Everyone concerned had something of value to contribute to the broader understanding.

We need to return to this kind of valuing of diversity, difference in place. To a degree, movement in that direction has been occurring in the West and elsewhere. Behind the more reported, often angry, exclusiveisms, as has been seen, particularly in the United States, in the advancing struggle for gaining equality, the concept of equality has largely moved from assimilation, with everyone becoming a member of the dominant group, or essentially the same through a melting pot process, to multicultural diversity, with people becoming accepted for who they are in their own personal or group culture, in a tossed salad process. This has been seen in the ongoing struggles for racial, women's, gender, religious and ethnic equality (For example: Naylor, 1997). It is also at the heart of the rise of multiculturalism in numerous nations. As Natalia Simanovsky, noted, "In Canada, multiculturalism is deemed by the majority of society to be a successful government policy precisely because it promotes, among other things, national unity. For the most part, multiculturalism in Canada fosters social cohesion by placing all cultures on an equal footing. It creates common values, such as tolerance, that can be shared by the many different members of society, despite the fact that many citizens originate from a variety places with disparate religious backgrounds. In other words, multiculturalism can be defined as an approach that aims to assist with the integration of immigrants and minorities, remove barriers to their participation in Canadian life and make them feel more welcome in Canadian society, leading to a stronger sense of belonging and national pride" (Simanovsky, 2012).

But while in the U.S., Canada, and elsewhere, there have been uneven and inconsistent gains in this direction, and the world, almost all nations will only function well today, if all move much further from feeling the necessity of unity through sameness and conformity, to unity through diversity, which can produce great synergy, as shown in the discussion of work teams below.

The principle of diversity, with respect for all members of the community (and beyond), encompasses everyone having an equal say in all decisions that affect them. This is essential for people to actually be full and equal members of the community, and also to feel that they are honored members of the community – a necessity for their own wellbeing, as well as for encouraging their continued participation and support for the community and the way it functions.

Applying Traditional Principles of Inclusive Participatory Democracy in the Twenty-first Century

Thus some form of inclusive participatory democracy is necessary to achieve the best society. This requires a full and equal vote by all competent and of age citizens, in all relevant decisions – something that is still being struggled for in the United States. But voting is the tip of the iceberg of participation, only being meaningful if it is supported by a much larger base.

For everyone to have to have an equal say in huge post-industrial societies the means of expression have to be equal and equally accessible to all, while the media needs to be equally expressive of all points of view and opinions, as well as representatively reporting accurately the full range of relevant information. There are a variety of vehicles that can be used in a post-industrial society to attain the open access and broad representation of views necessary for a participatory society. One route is to require, in a fully private, or mixed private-public media system, broad and diverse ownership of electronic and print media, supported by equal access requirements, such the "fairness doctrine", developed by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC), in 1949, requiring broadcasters to cover public issues and provide each side with equal coverage, or opportunity to respond (Fischer, 1990, p. 550). As issues often have multiple aspects and sides, the full range of views ought to have the

opportunity to be heard – though as time, or space, for such discussion might be limited, it would be legitimate for less time to be given to views well outside the mainstream. Such equal time regulations might apply to print, or other media, as well (as was argued for, but rejected by a majority of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo*, Fischer, 1990, p. 573). The same openness can be achieved in a fully public media system, if diversity of control and opinion are built into it, and the system is truly common, and not dominated by, or operated with advantage for any governmental or private interests, or combination of interests. Similarly, an open and neutral internet, without censorship or favoritism of one opinion or group over another is essential in the information age, as is the right and ability of people to freely form social, economic and political interest groups, with broad freedom of expression and petition in practice. In addition, information relevant to public affairs needs to be broadly and equally readily available and accessible, with secrecy limited to an appropriate minimum, if citizens are to have the knowledge necessary to make good decisions.

Moreover, election campaigns for public office, or for citizen voting on issues, ought to be carried out with equal time provisions for all candidates and issues on the ballot, as they are in many European countries (van Biezen, 2003; and “Campaign Finance: Comparative Summary”, 2009), and has been proposed for U.S. Presidential election (e.g. the Fair Elections Act in the Maine House of Representatives proposed by Diane Russell in fall 2013 (http://dianerussell.nationbuilder.com/fair_elections_act), and the proposal of U.S. Senator Bernie Sanders, Sanders, 2013). Under this arrangement, during the period leading up to the voting (often six weeks), a series of debate formats (though each candidate or position can decide if they wish to debate or present) are provided with equal time for each candidate or position during prime time on radio and television, and no candidate or position can run radio or television advertising during the run up to the election period. Usually, the “debates” take place more frequently as the time of voting approaches. The system only functions fairly if sufficient television and radio time is provided, so that the public has opportunity to sufficiently get to know the candidates and positions on issues, and lesser known candidates do not have a disadvantage in the election.

In addition, it may be useful to apply a device used in one U.S. presidential debate, to have a trustworthy neutral non-partisan organization chose a representative sample of undecided voters (or of voters generally) to ask questions of the candidates in the debate (“1992 Presidential Debate with George HW Bush, Bill Clinton & Ross Perot,” 2008).

Also necessary is making the opportunities to vote easily accessible by providing convenient polling locations for all, at appropriate and sufficient times, perhaps including lengthy periods of early voting and voting by mail.¹ In addition sufficient safeguards need to be in place to insure the voting and the counting of votes is fair and honest, with sufficient reviews available to correct errors, cheating and other malfeasance.

Increasing citizen Participation and Input with Electronic Democracy

The development of the internet with web sites, social media, E-mails, Skype, video-conferencing, etc., provides new possibilities for communicating, bridging geographical and social distances, participating and building community that were not previously available. Some, such as Barber, 1984 (pp. 273-81, 307) and Becker and Slaton (2000) suggest that electronic technology can be used to strengthen participatory democracy by such means as televising town meetings, establishing a national civic communications cooperative, and providing an extensive and up to date on line library to equalize

access to information and promote full civic education of all citizens, electronic journalism (Friedland, 1996) and publishing, enabling citizens to petition government and non-governmental entities, and undertaking scientific polling. Some municipalities in the United States regularly televise city council and other important meetings. For example, the City of Stockton, CA operates Channel 97 in Stockton as a Government Access Cable Television channel devoted to Stockton City Government, including live broadcast of Stockton City Council Meetings on Tuesday at 5:30 pm, rebroadcast daily at 11:30 a.m. and 7 and a City Informational Bulletin that gives information about City services, upcoming meetings and special City events when no other programs are scheduled (Chanel 97, 2013).

Barber is among those who propose developing electronic balloting so that citizens could quickly and often be involved in making a large number of decisions that previously had to be made by representatives, with voters logging on to computers at home or in easily accessible public places. Some limited use of electronic voting may eventually become possible, but, at least for the moment there is the technical problem of being able to insure secure and unhackable or otherwise corruptible electronic voting, which as of fall 2013 appears to be beyond the capability of technology for at least the near future. More important is the difficulty of busy citizens keeping up sufficiently with the details of numerous complex issues frequently and regularly to be involved in making competent legislative or administrative decisions.

More promising is the use of electronic means to assist enhancement of public dialog, for example by regularly establishing focus groups of representative citizens to research, in a holistic participatory manner, assisted by experts, and with access to relevant information, considering the full range of approaches to, and views on, sets of important issues. The deliberations as a whole, and summary discussions and recommendations, could be readily available to anyone on the internet, and could be followed up with televised sessions in live time, and available for replay on the internet, telephone and/or Skype (or equivalent) public forums in which anyone could participate in the concerned jurisdiction (from village or city ward to the nation). Some experiments have been done with this approach (Becker and Slaton, 2000), while Fishkin's (1991) proposes the implementation of deliberative opinion polls among a statistically representative sample of citizens that are not too large to preclude meaningful discussion, attempting to model what the general public would think if, hypothetically, it could be immersed in deliberative processes. (Friedland, 1996).

These approaches, however, while quite useful, in many instances abstract from everyday life experience when they are used beyond actual local or internet communities that regularly interact on pragmatic issues (Friedland, 1996). Perhaps the most promising teledemocratic vehicles are those that help to build community and trust. This is extremely important, because from an Indigenous point of view, shared by many contemporary commentators, many current societies suffer from an atomization and alienation that has seriously diminished the quality of human relations, and hence the quality of life, within society. Much of the web of good relations that were the hallmark of the family like functioning of well working Indigenous communities, today has become fractured and skewed. Thus it has become necessary to rebuild community, reestablish trustful, reciprocal, relationships among citizens and social groups.

One development moving in this direction is a shift by government and non-profit organizations dealing with welfare issues and programs, beginning in the 1980's, to take social capital and community assets-based approaches to target communities. "Social capital" describes the durable networks that form social resources through which individuals and groups strive for mutual recognition

(Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992: 19). As such, social capital is the necessary infrastructure of civic and community life that generates 'norms of reciprocity and civic engagement' (Putnam, 1994: 167). Assets-based development (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993; McKnight, 1995) stresses locally generated knowledge that permits communities to mobilize their assets, broadly conceived, to address problems. An increasing number of local projects, as well as funding programs in foundations and federal agencies, have begun to incorporate these insights. By treating communities as social capital networks, rather than strictly as discourse communities, we can begin to ground the connective elements of new information technologies in social life and social structure" (Friedland, 1996).

For the increasing rise of social networks, the internet, and especially social media, as well as E-mail and other electronic communications have been extremely empowering, and an important factor in enabling participatory democracy through democratizing organizations of all kinds, as is discussed below. It is significant that across much of the Middle East, the Arab Spring, which began in Tunisia in 2011, was largely organized and participatively coordinated through social media and networking (Schillinger, 2011; and Dewey, 2012).

The emergence of internet networks by advocacy groups for the purposes of sharing information and ideas and engaging in mutual problem solving could already be seen in California, in the mid-1980s in the Institute for Global Communications (IGC), serving individuals and groups engaged in advocacy for social justice, human rights and the environment, and in HandsNet, which expanded from a set of California-based community organizations working locally in the areas of hunger and nutrition, homelessness and housing and community economic development to serve as a national communication vehicle (Friedland, 1996). "Both have organized new models that generate information out of the needs of their members. Both draw their information, at least in part, directly from their members and represent: few forms of what I call 'distributed responsibility', which makes widely decentralized nodes of the network primary information gatherers. Finally, they address specific organizing problems (in very different ways) and have been driven by this practical problem focus" (Friedland, 1996). Thus such networks can build community by linking and empowering members, whom they serve around common problem solving needs and efforts, and representing their members in political arenas, with the speed, volume of information capacity, and breadth of coverage to keep their lobbying and petition functions quite representative.

The number and range of issues and actions that representatives of local groups, and people at the grassroots level become involved in are much more than the constituents can themselves decide upon, in each case, and even monitor in detail. But they can monitor representative samples, establish monitoring personnel and systems, and require that new policies, and major questions that arise in the course of operation, be deliberated inclusively and participatively, via any number of means, depending on the circumstances, from face to face meetings, e-mail exchanges and voting, to teleconferences. As Mansbridge (1980) shows from working with such groups, as trust is established and maintained in the network, it is not necessary for everyone involved to participate in every instrumental decision, or review every action, once basic policy is established by participatory process (until it is either brought into question, or the need to make new policy or action guidelines arises), as representative agency has been established, and is continued by being subject to question and review. This is quite similar in principle, but using contemporary means, to how the Wendot and other Indian federations conducted business participatively and inclusively beyond the local community (Sachs. 2013a, Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 1).

It is important to note that such networks can function for their own and their members independent information guidance and decision making; for planning and advocacy, often to government, but also to nongovernmental organizations (whether business or non-profits); and as direct inputs to government, as occurred in the State of Vermont, beginning in the 1980s (Friedland, 1996), when the city of Burlington, under the leadership of socialist mayor Bernie Sanders, made economic development a major focus of his administration, establishing Neighborhood Planning Assemblies, while a local government access channel, Town Meeting Television, started with deliberative and access concerns, then moving quickly toward an emphasis on planning for sustainable development. In 1992 Vermont launched a statewide telecommunications planning process. Then, in 1994, with the assistance of a grant from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which had come to place increasing emphasis in its community development grants on assets-based strategies, the City of Burlington, “established a public access telecomputing center as a model of how to move disenfranchised communities from a focus on housing development issues to ones of sustainable community economic development” (Friedland, 1996). This is somewhat similar to the non-electronic (but computer assisted) democratic process that the Comanche Nation of Oklahoma established in the 1990s to build community consensus on proposals to the tribes government council, the Comanche Business committee, discussed below.

Beyond Electronic Democracy

Electronic communications for building community and inclusive participatory democracy are extremely important in the Twenty-First Century. But like all vehicles they have costs and limitations as well as advantages. Interactions by electronic means lose important substantive aspects that are essential parts of face to face relationships. Moreover, staring at a computer and television screens for too many hours for virtual experience, not only denies direct experience, but creates physical problems for people, especially young people, for whom it is important to limit the time they spend in electronic activity, while the very young ought not to be exposed to computer and television screens at all (Kids Health from Nemours, 2013, http://kidshealth.org/parent/positive/family/tv_affects_child.html; Ravichandran, Padma and Brandel France de Bravo, MPH (2012), “Young Children and Screen Time (Television, DVDs, Computer).” National Research Center for Women and Families, <http://center4research.org/child-teen-health/early-childhood-development/young-children-and-screen-time-television-dvds-computer/>).

We need to engage in direct activity and interactions, to be socialized to fully meaningful life as whole people living within society, to build and maintain healthy, rewarding relationships with one another, and with our environment, including nature. As indigenous people say, it is a question of balance. This author works with the internet and e-mail to produce issues of two online journals, and worked to develop several books and many papers, including this one, word processing on a computer and exchanging chapter files for comment and editing by E-mail with people at a distance, some of whom he had not yet met in person. But he also spends time in personal and community interactions in the concrete world, engages in enjoyable physical activity in dance and hiking, which provides much beauty in the course of renewing his relationship to nature, while taking time for inner reflection and meditation. All of the time, activity and interchange spent off-line, is critical for maintaining the dynamic balance and perspective to function well on line.

Moreover, to achieve social harmony, people have to achieve inner harmony. Treating each other (and being treated) respectfully is a major help with that. But we also have to do our own inner work. At a

minimum, we need to reflect regularly to clear the psychological complexes, impacts of trauma, guilt, etc., and clear our consciences by asking for and acting to seek forgiveness for inevitable transgressions, while giving thanks for what we have received. Ultimately, we need to take responsibility for doing this, but we also have to have the humility to ask for appropriate help, when needed. In addition, as Native people recognize, there is a spiritual (not necessarily religious) side of life that needs the opportunity to unfold. This can be just recognizing human spirit, in ourselves and others, or it can be something more. We each find it differently, but we need to give it space to be whole people and be able to relate well with others. Some find it in meditation or spiritual practice, others in music, in dance, in nature, in the space between steps while walking, or just in quiet moments. To be whole people, and empower ourselves to be good citizens, we have to give ourselves the inner space to be who we really are.

Direct Ways of Building Community

Community building for individual, group, organization and political empowerment can, and must, take place in non-electronic ways, as important as the tools of electronic communication, linking and interaction are. An interesting example has been the development of Time Dollars (a form of co-production) by Edgar Cahn (Cahn 2000; and Time Dollar Institute, 2012) (which also can, and sometimes does, function using electronic vehicles). Time Dollars build and maintains relationships among people through a non-money (or by creating a special non-currency money) system of creating reciprocity, returning people to the kinds relationships that were the hallmark of well-functioning Indigenous societies. The Time dollar system is very simple, and operates effectively through time banks functioning with a very simple computer accounting program (Time Banks, 2012, <http://timebanks.org/>). The principle is that for one hour of work, that the organization or community in question wishes to designate as eligible, a person doing that work receives credit for one time dollar that can be spent for any good or service identified by the organization or community. Thus people are empowered by earning services or goods, rather than being given them, and reciprocal relationships are established. As a result, people deal better with each other, and some people who have been engaged in criminal activity do not do so with people they are now related to by time dollar networks, because they need each other.

This has many other applications, but has been extremely useful in low income areas. For example, Sarah spends time as a companion four hours in a week for elderly and disabled Margie. In return, the neighborhood organization time bank provides her with one time dollar with a collaborating attorney for legal work, that she could not otherwise afford, and three hours of plastering and painting work by unemployed George, who in turn is able to buy with time dollars a used computer from the neighborhood organization time dollar store, that he needs to start his own business.

Time dollars have as many applications as the creativity of people can come up with. They have been used to help young people, who would otherwise drop out, stay in school and do well. For example Tom has had trouble doing the work in his sixth grade math class, but he knows enough to tutor fourth graders in math so he can earn enough time dollars to buy sporting goods (or a computer) that he wants. Seeing that he can help the younger students in math gives him confidence, and an interest in succeeding in his own studies, in which his performance greatly improves. The Time Dollar Institute (renamed Time Banks USA) reported (Time Dollar Institute, 2012), "In January 2006, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* reported that about 25,000 people in the United States and 60,000 internationally participate in Time Banks, strengthening the bonds among participants and increasing their effective

purchasing power by the equivalent of millions of dollars. There are more than one hundred Time Bank programs in the United States, including two operated by Making Connections sites. Twenty-six other countries also have Time Banks. In November 2007, the International Time Banking Conference drew 238 leaders from thirty-one states and twelve countries. Other ideas developed by Cahn to allow clients of formal service systems to play a more active role in service provision are being adopted by organizations ranging from the National Legal Aid and Defender Association to England's National Health Service.”

Appropriate Decision Making Structures and Processes

Traditionally, American Indian and other Indigenous societies benefitted greatly by deciding by consensus, talking issues through, taking everyone's concerns and interests into account, until everyone agreed, or acquiesced (having had their say and seeing no point in continuing to push a position that lacked support). Deciding in this way often is more time consuming than making decisions by majority vote, but it has several advantages. First, with deciding by consensus there is an emphasis on creating holistic decisions, as best as possible including and balancing everyone's concerns. That often leads to better decisions than are achieved in a majority vote process, where one side may simply overpower the other, or compromises that are attained to achieve a majority may be more about giving bits and pieces that do not fit well together to various parties, than creating a well-balanced set of actions. In addition, consensus decision making, when it functions properly, through its inclusiveness, has a stronger tendency to create actual unity, and a sense of identity with the group, encouraging continued participation, than does a majority vote system of deciding, which may more easily promote divisiveness and faction.

Traditional Native societies operated in a context that was of smaller scale than the broader, more widely interconnected world, of the Twenty-First Century. Deciding by consensus often works very well in relatively small groups and communities, but how are its principles to be applied in today's larger scale societies. Traditional Indian federations give some clues as to how modern mass societies can use their communications technology to become far more participatory. The Wendot, Hodenosaunee, and Muscogee, for example, after first discussing issues, sent representatives to tribal, and in turn to federation councils, with decisions at higher levels having to be ratified at lower levels, so that discussion often went back and forth between levels, and representatives to higher levels were thus actually more representative of their constituents than is generally the case in current legislatures (Harris, Sachs and Morris. 2011, Ch. 1, Section 1).

In a limited way, that device can be, and indeed has been, applied in different settings in recent years. For instance, It should be noted that upon moving to a participatory form of government and economy, despite a number of flaws that made the system as a whole less democratic in practice than theory, beginning around 1950 until the step by step demise of its liberal period starting in the mid-1970s, Yugoslavia operated its government and all but the smallest businesses using participatory principles.² This included requiring legislators at every level to discuss annual budgets and major proposals with voters at meetings across their districts between the time of proposal and final voting, while economic enterprises functioned as cooperatives under worker self-management. In the larger cooperatives (“self-managed enterprises”) issues relating to the entire workplace had to be decided by the central workers council, and by employees in each of the businesses units, often with back and forth dialogue between the center and the parts, until a decision was finalized, and numerous organizations in the United States, and elsewhere, operating on a participatory basis, have functioned very successfully in this manner. The

successes, despite the limitations, of the Yugoslav social and workers' self-management system for a number of years shows the possibility of such arrangements functioning on a considerably larger scale, and in a much more diverse and complex socio-economic-political system, than that of traditional American Indian nations, if they are applied appropriately for the situation in question (Sachs, 1977, 1981; Riddell, 1970; and Sachs and Sachs, 1974, pp. 45-46.).

The Example of Participatory Budgeting

A more recent set of developments with participatory budgeting at the local level in an expanding number of locations extends beyond the Yugoslav model of having legislators consult with citizens on proposed budgets, to directly involve people in the budgeting process (Sewart, Miller and Hildreth, 2014, pp. 193-218). The current move toward participatory budgeting at the local level began in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 1989 and has since spread in various forms to over 1200 municipalities worldwide, including more recently to New York City, Vallejo, CA, and Chicago, IL, though the inclusion of local citizens in setting budgets in the United States extends back to continuing participatory decision making on all local issues by New England Town Meetings (an Indigenous influenced development, Sachs, 2013a), and by participants in local Community Action Programs (CAP) in the War on Poverty under the Equal Opportunity Program of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Just what participatory budgeting means has varied widely in the post 1989 cases. In some Canadian instances, it has taken place at the organization level, with concerned people involved in setting school and housing budgets, and hence the actual priorities of the organizations. In Chicago's 49th Ward, residents took part in meetings to determine spending choices for capital improvements, with the result that the included projects expanded from the ward's former, and the rest of the city's continuing, usually funded" high priorities", such as fixing potholes in streets, to also include such usually not funded "lower priority" projects, as dog parks, community gardens, decorative bike racks, and murals.

In Porto Alegre, a city of more than one million people, with wide spread poverty and income disparity, with a third of the population living in isolated slums with little access to city utility and social services, all of the city's residents were invited to take part in meetings to establish the municipal budgeting priorities. In the first years less than 1000 people participated, but after a decade the number had grown to some 1400, as people saw the resulting change in city priorities. The results included an increase in sewer and water connections from 75% of households in 1988 to 98% in 1997, while the changed budgeting brought extensive increases in the number of schools, public housing projects and health services. The outcomes of participatory budgeting vary according to the range of issues to be publically decided, and according to the breadth and quality of the participatory process. The results indicate that participatory budgeting, appropriately applied, can be an effective means of public participation that tends to diversify and equalize power, as it empowers people in the course of encouraging their participation, while having an equalizing effect on the distribution of public goods in the course of building and strengthening human relations in the community, to enhance the communities commonness (and *communitas*). In the fully participatory society, participatory budgeting can be used as part of broader participation at every level, using processes appropriate to the given situation.

The ILIS Process: A Contemporary Indigenous Example

A contemporary Native American case demonstrates that governance can be made more representative and effective, and the political system more participatory, by making public input into government participatory, with interaction between consensus decision making bodies at different levels. From

1990-1992, the Comanche Nation of Oklahoma applied the Indigenous Leadership Interactive System (ILIS) to overcome serious problems with the culturally inappropriate form of government that had been imposed on many Indian nations by the U.S. government (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 4, Section 1). The Comanches traditionally lived in small bands governed in a participatory manner with leaders acting as facilitators, who as respected wise elders, also provided guidance to public opinion and discussion. In 1990, the tribal business council, elected at large from the four Oklahoma Comanche communities was set up to make decisions for the community. Tribal members felt alienated at not being directly involved in tribal affairs, in which they felt left out, and, in fact, often were not even represented. This resulted in low turnout in elections and at annual general tribal meetings, difficulty in the council passing any measures, no matter how appropriate and well framed they might be, for lack of consensus, and a great deal of infighting in the community – especially on political issues. People, no longer able to participate directly in community affairs, felt unable to fulfill the basic tribal value of contributing to the wellbeing of the community.

To improve this situation, ILIS, an inclusive participatory strategic planning process, designed according to traditional Indigenous North American values, using contemporary consensus decision making techniques and technology, and applied appropriately for the situation and culture of the Comanche Nation, was established to provide public input to the Business Committee, with meetings at the tribal level and in the four Comanche Communities. The tribal level meetings were composed of representatives of every relevant group in the Comanche nation, while the four communities held general meetings of their Comanche citizens. Discussion of issues concerning the tribe as whole went back and forth between the tribal and community meetings, until consensus was established, while individual communities made their own local decisions. The result was that, so long as the ILIS process was used, measures upon which Comanche consensus had been built were easily passed by the Business Committee, while proposals for which no consensus had been established, continued not to pass, and the local committees developed and carried out a number of projects. Meanwhile, the atmosphere and relations across the Comanche Nation improved, participation increased at annual tribal general meetings and in elections, and for the first time in a decade, a tribal chair was reelected.

Increasing Use of Participatory Process in the United States

Over the last decades, the United States and the west have been experiencing a considerable growth in the application of consensus and other participatory decision making processes in many types of organizations (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 1, Section 2; Ch. 2, section 2), partly indirectly as a result of American Indian influence (Sachs, 2013), but largely through independent development arising from the needs and changing culture of the contemporary era. Thus, a number of organizations have been working to have input into public decision making operate participatively. MoveOn.org, focusing on “Democracy and Action”, regularly poles its members about what its positions and priorities should be, empowers its members to initiate their own petitions at local, state and national levels, that other members can choose to sign or not, and, to keep power diffuse internally, only accepting small monetary donations from individuals (moveon.org). Similarly, Occupy Wall Street, as a protest and political action movement, has also worked to function as democratically as possible, particularly within local groups (Boothe, 2012), while organizations like the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (<http://ncdd.org/>), the Network for Peace Through Dialogue (<http://ncdd.org/>), and Search for Common Ground (www.sfcg.org) attempt to expand thoughtful participatory citizen discussion of important issues, helping people to come together in resolving issues, and overcoming differences through dialoguing processes.

In 2013 there are only a small number of highly participatory political groups in the United States, and in numerous other countries. But with the rise of protest and action movements worldwide, including Occupy, Arab Spring (regardless of its ultimate success in bringing change)³, and mass movements in Brazil (Sachs, 2013) and numerous other countries, the number, generally has been increasing, regardless of ups and downs over time. Ultimately, for a society to reach its participatory potential, virtually all groups need to function inclusively democratically.

The Movement for Organizational Democracy

A movement for organizational democracy has been underway worldwide, that has the potential for playing a major role in democratizing societies around the world, and in its most developed form is a full contemporary application of traditional Indigenous inclusive democratic principles. Indigenous institutions are largely very flat, equalitarian people based structures, with basically equal status of participants, based on trust and commitment, with largely equalitarian rewards in concrete terms, but with a limited hierarchy of rewards in terms of honor, according to one's achievements in contributing to the wellbeing of the community or group. The trust did not automatically arise, but had to be built, maintained, and renewed, partly in the court of public opinion, but also through ceremony, such as mutual gifting, or holding a Pipe ceremony or other spiritual ritual (Sachs, 1994; Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 4 Section 1). In some situations, Native societies did function with limited hierarchy, such as in battle where the war leader had a limited authority to command largely autonomous warriors (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 1), because it was critical to act quickly in a coordinated manner, and there was not time for lengthy discussion. The U.S. army has mirrored this aspect of Indigenous practice in continuing to operate using its traditional chain of command during operations, and training for operations, but in using participatory teams for planning and evaluation (University of Foreign Military And Cultural studies, 2012; Zsombok, Caroline E. 1995).

By contrast, with some notable exceptions, European, and later European American, organizations after the Middle Ages, functioned largely hierarchically, on the basis of control, with differential status and reward based largely on position in the hierarchy, though also on the basis of loyalty and service to the hierarchy and the standards it passed down the organization (Kropotkin, 2010; Simmons and Mares, 1983; Bernstein, 1980, especially, Ch. 5; and Sachs, 1997). Hierarchical organizations do have a great deal of power, and, when operating properly, the ability to make quick, unified decisions to coordinate action, as was discussed by Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist* 81, on the need for a unitary, hierarchical executive branch for the U.S. government to administer policy and command the armed forces. But there are also shortcomings of hierarchical organizations, which, first in business, step by step led to movements to modify hierarchical structures, and eventually into a currently ongoing movement to transform them into participatory organizations.

In the mid-Nineteenth Century, businesses in the West were generally rather small, hierarchically organized and managed by their owners. Production took place in what were essentially workshops. In that circumstance, the separation of the employee from the market (as the employee was motivated largely by pleasing the employer to keep her or his employment, and to receive either a wage or piece work payment for work done, with little relation to market forces of supply and demand) was fairly small and not essential, and the dysfunctional aspects of hierarchy were minimal.⁴ By the early twentieth century, the leading capitalist enterprises had become quite large and technologically more complex, with production taking place in factories. Generally, these "corporate" firms were hierarchically managed by non-owners. At this stage two major problems began to have obvious

effects. First, hierarchical organizations suffer from inefficiencies that are compounded by the fact that employees who are paid fixed wages or salaries have no direct connection to the market and thus are only very slightly and indirectly motivated by it (Bernstein, 1980, especially, Ch. 5; Blinder, Editor, 1990; Lawler III, Mohrman and Ledford, Jr., 1992; and Nalbantian, 1987).

Second, the increasing development of production presented new questions of how work could best be organized and undertaken. This gave rise to the scientific management movement and business consulting in this period. In general, consultants such as Frederick Taylor (Taylor, 1916 – 1992, pp. 69-80; and Taylor 1947) developed important reforms (many of which are still useful if they are properly applied in their proper, and limited context) which tended to reinforce the main principles of the dominant form of organization: a system of hierarchical control in a structure of many levels based upon differential status and reward and utilizing top down decision making (Sachs, 1991). As there were basic problems with this model that accelerated as organizations grew in size and technology became more complex, as early as the 1920s some experiments began with forms that were based upon different principles, that were grafted on to the hierarchical model (Sachs, 1991). This included some generally limited use of participation and introduction of some economic incentives, primarily individual piecework bonuses for production workers, commissions for sales personnel and stock options for some managers. By the 1930s, with the development of the human relations movement,⁵ it began to be recognized that there was a human side of management that needed to be taken into account, and that at a minimum superiors needed to make subordinates feel valued, while some thought that subordinates might have useful suggestions and information to pass up the organization (by the late '40s this blended with the emergent cybernetics approach to organization, stressing the need for feedback as part of improved organization communications⁶).

By the 1960s, organizations in the mainstream of business began to modify the hierarchical model, grafting onto it such arrangements as quality circles and other group suggestion processes (Tausky, 1978, Ch. 2; Ouchi, 1981; Simmons and Mares (1983); and Sachs, 1984), quality of worklife programs that included at least some joint labor-management decision making, autonomous work teams on the shop floor and in the office (Emery and Torsrud, 1969; and Dowling, 1973, pp. 51-67), and, in some places in Europe, limited Co-determination with some employees or their union representatives on the top management board - equivalent of the board of directors - "Co-Determination in the Federal Republic of Germany," 1973; and Schaur, 1973).

Outside of the mainstream, some examples of a different model of organization began to appear, based upon employee participation, that were forerunners of a new model for organizing and rewarding work. Often they produced some spectacular successes, though as precursors, they often suffered from defects in structure and/or culture, or were pressured by the differently functioning environment, to take on such imperfections. The most notable of these are the cooperatives at Mondragon, in the Basque country of Spain,⁷ and the self-managed enterprises that became the backbone of the Yugoslav economy after 1950 (Obradovic and Dunn, 1978; and Adizes, 1971). The former grew from a single workshop employing 5 people in 1956 to a federation of well over 100 primary producer cooperatives by the 1980s employing considerably over 20,000 people. The primary worker cooperatives were supported by secondary cooperatives including an investment bank, educational cooperatives and a research and development unit. As a whole they were far more productive than conventional businesses in Spain and were quite successful in the international market. Yugoslavia, using self-managed enterprises that were essentially cooperatives operating on the basis of one employee one vote, enjoyed the second highest rate of growth of GNP per capita in the world from 1954 to almost 1970.⁸ When in

the early 1970's some problems were perceived with the structure of self-managed firms, they were decentralized so that in effect each firm became a federation (Sachs, 1977).

By the late 1980s it began to be seen in the mainstream that participation made for greater effectiveness in virtually every aspect of an organization's behavior, precisely because it was a more human basis for an organization (Simmons and Mares, 1983; and McGregor, 1967, 1989, pp. 66-73). If participation was the proper basis for running an organization, then it should no longer be grafted on to the old model. Rather, a new organization model centered on participation needed to be utilized. The emerging participatory organizational model is very flat, with either few layers, or in its more developed form, no hierarchy at all (Sachs, 1991). It is the team organization composed of a collaborative circle of teams all on the same level. It is based upon commitment, equality of status and reward, joint decision making (with inclusion of whoever is directly affected by a decision) and democratic communication directly among all with a need to communicate. It is a decentralized, networking organization that is really a federation, rather than a monolithic structure (Sachs, 1991; and Pinchot and Pinchot, 1993, particularly Parts I and II, and Ch. 11, 13 and 16). In order to support participation, the system of reward was being changed so that it connects the employee directly to the market and the performance of the firm. This was being done for both the short and long term, with such gainsharing devices as group productivity bonuses, profit sharing and worker ownership or its equivalent (in the U.S. often through ESOPs: employee stock ownership plans) (Bernstein, especially, Ch. 5; Blinder, 1990; and Lawler III, Mohrman and Ledford, Jr., 1993).

Perhaps the best known example of a firm that embodies most of the new model is W.L. Gore, an almost totally employee owned high tech fiber company that in a few years went from start up to a fortune 500 multinational corporation employing over 5000 employees worldwide (Raynor, 1985). Everyone at Gore has the same status. All are called associates. Gore is an organization composed of autonomous, interrelated teams. To work at Gore one negotiates a job with a team. Each team makes its decisions by consensus. Whenever an issue involves more than the members of a team, whomever is concerned (i.e. affected) participates in the decision. As team organizations develop, they tend to lose their organizational egos, making decisions on their merits and not just because one of the parties is a member of the larger organization. For example, as team organizations develop, they tend to lose their organizational egos, making decisions on their merits and not just because one of the parties is a member of the larger organization. For example, when a team at the Indianapolis Ford plant concerned with obtaining high quality steel was told by the Ford foundry that they could not supply steel to the specifications required (until expensive improvements could be made at the foundry), the team at the Indianapolis Ford plant fired the Ford Foundry as a supplier.⁹ Indeed, there are now numerous examples of firms that have sufficiently devolved into federations, whose units act very autonomously, almost as separate firms, that are semi-independent profit centers, buying and selling where they choose either/or both inside and outside the organization (Pinchot and Pinchot, 1993, Ch. 4 and Part II). Similarly, in Japan, in the 1980s and 1990s, independent enterprises came together as federations (*Kaizens*, which at this stage operated with a combination of top down direction and collaborative participation, while externally acting as aggressive competitors, Smith, 1995), while collaborative joint ventures among firms worldwide have been becoming increasingly more common.

The Spread of Democratization to All Kinds of Organizations in All Sectors

The organizational transformation has not been limited to business, but has emerged in organizations of all kinds, encompassing non-profit enterprise (including those described briefly above), and within

government. For example, as early as 1981, Wake County, NC ran a pilot program of 39 quality circles in its agencies. After 15 months, employee moral was up, services to the public had improved with management accepting most suggestions from employee circles, and the county had saved \$151,000 in the first year in improved efficiency ("Pilot Program Saves County \$151,000," 1982). Osborne and Gaebler (1993), Ch. 6, 9. provides numerous examples of the full range of employee participation processes from quality circles to team process in government agencies at every level across the United States, including examples of services becoming more responsive to the people they serve by treating them as customers and communicating with them about their needs and how, and how well they are served.

In an age of large nations, providing a variety of services to many people, while regulating many areas of life, making the bureaucracy participatory and representative for the people it serves and regulates is a critical matter, as those who make and apply policy may be geographically and socially distant from those they serve and regulate. One field in which much has been accomplished to bridge the distance between government and people, after many years is in Indian affairs (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 3), which also has parallels in other fields.

People Input into Government: The American Indian Affairs and Related Example

Relations between American Indians in tribes recognized by the U.S. federal government (the processes for determining which tribes are recognized, and who are members of those tribes raise important issues outside the scope of this discussion) are a special case, that has general relevance for the relations of all people to government, but some of whose aspects, are particular to their special status, which makes them not just another interest group. Indian nations are domestic sovereigns, within the United States, whose sovereignty, at least in theory, the U.S. government has recognized, but often violated in practice, so that efforts are continuing to realize that sovereignty in improved government-to-government relations, in which Indian nations are accepted as partners in American federalism (Harris, Sachs, and Morris, 1991, Ch. 3). What is relevant to all citizens is the communications model that has been put into place in an attempt to insure that U.S. government Indian policy, and its implementation in practice, are appropriate, and consistent with the needs and wishes of the recipients, within the limits of that policy, and that Indian tribes and people have a proper voice in the making and adjusting of that policy. The communications channels established function no better than the people involved work with them, and which external politics allows. But they often are effective, and are suggestive of what might be undertaken in other contexts.

Beginning at the tribal level, there has been effort to decentralize programs downwards, so that tribal governments who are able and willing can either run their own federal programs, according to the relevant guidelines, or contract out the running of the programs. Decentralization is an important general principle. While in the post industrial age, many basic policies need to be set at national, regional, or state levels, consistent with the Indigenous principle of place, each location is different, and local people often know the particulars of their circumstances better than anyone from outside. Moreover, the greatest opportunities for participation are at the local level, where people are in community together, and when their relations are fractured, or less than optimal for people to feel part of the community, helping them feel better about themselves, increasing opportunities to participate inclusively locally is a strong measure for building community, and increasing the quality of relations among neighbors, and, more broadly, the quality of life. At the same time, it is essential that there be

clear guidelines, sufficient review from higher levels, and channels for local people to complain if they are not being properly served, or their rights violated, as this is sometimes a problem amidst the vagaries of local politics, which may involve prejudicial relationships. Assisting decentralization of federal programs to tribal, state and local governments in the United States, has been a change in perception, beginning in the 1960s, from viewing federalism as a competitive, legal structure of separation of authority, to a cooperative system (with competitive elements) with the federal government more often carrying out policy by empowering the states and localities through grants in aid, with varying degrees of discretion by the recipient, than by exercising control (Grodzins, 1966; Elizar, 1973).

A relevant precedent for participation in running federal programs at the local level is that at the beginning of the “war on poverty,” the local communities receiving a community action program under the Equal Opportunity Act were empowered to elect their local program’s governing board (Greenstone and Peterson, 1973; Bowen, 2008). (Later, after numerous mayors complained, perceiving that the practice was undermining some of their power base, community action board membership was changed so that the target community, the mayor, and involved nonprofit organizations each selected one third of the board). Electing boards of directors, in local programs is an excellent vehicle for participation. When that is not appropriate, advisory committees can be elected, but while this provides an important voice, it is no more effective than the willingness of officials to listen to it. However, when an advisory committee is not heeded, it may be in a position to raise the community, and its friends and allies, in protest, which may bring about change.

Also, where an agency functions locally, it is beneficial to decentralize around the jurisdiction (if it is sizable), and to establish interactive relations within the community, or various communities. Done properly, this will improve community relations and the effectiveness of operations, as well as provide valuable opportunities for participation and empowerment of community members. A good example, is community policing (Wilson and Kelling, 1989; Greene and Mastrofski, 1988; Brown, 1989; Goldstein, 1987, pp. 6-30; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Moore, 1992; and Weisheit and Falcone, 1994).

In medium and large urban and suburban areas, standard policing is usually largely centralized, in a hierarchical system, with the main decision makers at the center distant from, and not personally knowledgeable about, most of the areas, and the day to day police activities in those areas, they are responsible for. Police officers usually live outside the precincts in which they are stationed and patrol, and precinct stations are usually centralized in the precinct. This alone, usually means that most of the officers do not know the neighborhood, its people and circumstances very well, nor do the people living and working in the precinct know, and have much of a relationship with, the officers who serve them. This becomes a serious problem in high crime, minority neighborhoods, with few, if any of the officers, members of the minority in question, much less residents of the neighborhood. Often this leads the citizens of the area and the police to be alienated from one another, with relations marked by mistrust, and sometimes fear on both sides. This situation is worsened when police incentives are to respond as quickly to calls as possible, and spend as little time as possible on each call, in order to be available for future calls. This means that police often know little of a situation they are called to, or happen to arrive at, often suspect, hassle, and arrest the wrong people, increasing the alienation and further lowering the quality of police service, and doing little to reduce crime or ameliorate the problems that cause it.

Outside forces can have some advantages if properly applied in certain situations. As outsiders, they are not involved in the interplay of interests in the community, and if properly directed can act impartially and with relatively little fear of personal reprisals from those against whom they act or whose interests they may threaten. There are cases early in the Twentieth century in American Cities (when police patrolled neighborhoods on foot, and knew their beats fairly well) where local police have been ineffective in quelling riots, because of their relationship with the rioters, where a not much larger force of national guardsman from outside the city were able to swiftly restore order. But the very distance that members of an outside force have from the community undermines their effectiveness in the long run, and in worst cases can make the police more of a problem than an aid to a community. Those in the community (e.g. gangs and war lords) who benefit from weakening the policing force can easily exploit the situation to turn people in the community actively against the police. The harder the police try to act proactively through massive raids and hit and run operations, the more they are likely to turn the community against them as innocent community members are likely to be insulted, hassled, injured and even killed with little real effect in reducing crime or maintaining order.

A particularly bad example of this occurred in Detroit, in the 1960s, when a special force of officers was put together to try to act proactively against crime in the inner city. At first the new strike force ("S.T.R.E.S.S") was welcomed by the people in the neighborhoods, as they suffered from a great deal of crime (Georgakas and Surkin, 1975, Ch 8). Very quickly, however, the citizenry began to fear the S.T.R.E.S.S. officers more than the criminals. The officers, almost all white from outside the mostly African American neighborhoods they patrolled – apparently caught up in racial profiling and stereotyping - continually over reacted to calls, hassling people, who had nothing to do with the complaint, and collectively shooting more people than the rest of the Detroit police force combined. Eventually, the unit was disbanded after it mistakenly got into a shootout with fellow officers who were on a stake out.

By contrast, officers who are integrated into the community and work with it, with many of them stationed around the community (and have both sufficient professional training and independent oversight of their actions to keep them honest and impartial) are likely to be knowledgeable of the community and its people, well informed of community developments and concerns and supported by the community. This type of "community service" or "neighborhood patrol" policing tends to be effective both proactively, in ameliorating situations that tend to cause or promote crime, and after the fact in catching perpetrators and retrieving stolen property. The key is that the patrolling officers meet and collaborate with concerned community groups, leaders and people in developing plans and taking action.

A good example is the experience of turning a low income housing project plagued by crime in Indianapolis, IN into a relatively secure area (Sachs, 1994a). The transformation was accomplished by having the police meet with housing project management (which agreed to initiate and work with a tenants association, run by the tenants), the tenants association, and neighborhood organizations in the surrounding area. In addition, the mostly white police officers teamed up with local black ministers to go door to door to survey the largely black tenants on their concerns. Plans were mutually developed with the various participants agreeing to take responsibility for various actions. Management hired a new security service and agreed to evict tenants quickly who were arrested for selling drugs (a major part of the crime problem). With the approval of the tenants, the police blocked off some vehicle accesses to the project to make it easier to monitor activity (important because much of the crime was caused by outside drug sellers and buyers coming into the project which had been a convenient place to

do business). The police also obtained agreement of the prosecutors office to take swift action against those charged, and from federal authorities to act quickly against those arrested for gun possession. Tenants took responsibility for informing the authorities of criminal activity and situations which might lead to crime. Within a few months, the housing project had become so crime free that the major concern of the tenants was that the police would consider the area so secure they would stop working with the tenants and crime would return to the project.

At its best, community policing becomes a team effort among police or peace keeping forces, local citizen groups, social institutions and services, and individual citizens (Coleman, Holton, Jr., Olson, Robinson and Stewart, 1999). For example, if there is a drug problem around a school, it may be advantageous to take a team problem solving approach to the drug problem by bringing together representatives of, and having ongoing meetings and other communication among, school personnel, parents, students, police, relevant public and private social services and neighborhood residents and organizations. Where violence and/or crime in an area are found to be caused by intergroup hostility or conflict (which is a problem in both domestic and international peacekeeping situations) a variety of conflict resolution and peace building techniques can be employed (Shapiro, 1999). These can be carried out either by the police or peace keepers (if adequately trained both in the techniques and how to apply them in a culturally appropriate ways for the people involved) in collaboration with others or by special facilitators or service organizations. Thus peacebuilding may be carried out effectively by having peace keepers collaborate directly with facilitating and peacebuilding groups and the community involved.

Policing is most successful when it functions, not as a totally independent force, seeing its role in isolation from other community functions, but as an integrated participant in community team work that empowers community people in all of their peaceful purposes. Police operating in this manner not only help keep the peace (which is a prerequisite to successful community development), but play an important role in helping people take charge of their lives and develop their communities humanely, while encouraging further participation by the citizens involved. Furthermore, the problem solving oriented interagency collaboration with community member involvement in these cases is a good general model for overcoming the overly narrow foci that agencies tend to have when operating isolated from each other in hierarchical systems, causing conflicting policies, duplication of effort, unmet needs and often inadequate and inappropriate service. Moreover, attempts to set up interdepartmental coordinating committees in hierarchically structured and functioning organizations often suffer from organization ego generated turf struggles, and turf protecting influenced compromises that are not the best solutions to problems. When problem solving focused consensus building team process is employed, the results are usually much better holistic courses of action. This is even more the case when each of the participating groups or organizations functions on an inclusive participatory basis, so that the coordinating teams develop synergy from bringing their diverse perspectives, approaches, experiences and talents to bear to create a well working unified solution to problems (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, Ch. 9).

Communication between the People and the Agency: American Indian and Related Experience

To insure appropriate and effective services and/or regulation, community dialogue with administrators is also needed beyond the local level. American Indians, beginning with the Nixon administration, gained a communications channel within each of the federal agencies that dealt with them in a major

way with the establishment of an Indian Desk, to act as a liaison with Native nations and organizations (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 3, Section 1). At first, many of those who held the position had significant other duties in the agency, which in some cases prevented them from doing much as a contact person. Even when these people were quite active, the position often was assigned only to the person, so when they left, no one replaced them. Only when the position was institutionalized, given enough time and resources, did it become continually effective. Moreover, just having a liaison is insufficient. Especially where there are cultural differences between the community members and the bureaucrats, and unique circumstances in the concerned community, the liaisons need to know enough about the people they are a contact point for to be effective, as do others in the agency who deal with the population in question. Thus some agencies, such as some parts of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), have trained their relevant personnel in “Indian 101”, and hired qualified Indians to work in the agency.

Coordination of operations among a number of programs working with the same population or geographical area is a strong need in many cases, to avoid contradictions, duplications, and other problems. Thus, in the spring of 1975, the extremely complex Department of Health Education and Welfare established the HEW (later HHS) Intra-Departmental Council on Indian Affairs, supplementing it in 1979 with the American Indian Advisory Group, chartered to function for two years. Similarly, in January 1979, the Department of Agriculture established an agency wide Native American Taskforce. The purpose was to improve the effectiveness of the Department's programs as they apply to Indians. The Task Force was chaired by the Assistant Secretary for Rural Development, and included the Assistant Secretaries for Conservation, Research and Education, Food and Consumer Services and International Affairs and Commodity Programs. The Taskforce reported to the Secretary quarterly, beginning in March 1978. Policy Issues that the Chairman believed to be beyond the role of the taskforce would be referred to the Secretary for consideration by the Program and Budget Review Board. All agencies of the Department were authorized and directed to cooperate with the Task Force and to detail personnel on a temporary basis, as might be requested by the Chairman.

In principle, coordinating bodies of this kind can be extremely helpful if they are permanently institutionalized. However, for them to be effective, the leading members (or a sufficient number of the members) of the coordinating body must have an understanding of the concerns and cultures of the people in question, their current situations, and the relation of the relevant programs to the developing situations of the concerned communities.

In the case of the Department of Agriculture Taskforce, the high position of the members provided them with appropriate organizational authority to be effective, but since each of the members had a number of concerns, of which Native American affairs were but a small part, there was no assurance that the understanding and orientation of the Task Force members would be appropriate (and would not merely strengthen the perpetuation of misguided paternalistic policy and implementation). While this might have been corrected by appropriate staffing, the possibility of that occurring, and continuing, depended upon who the Secretary, Chair or other key members happened to be. Experience with Indian Desks shows, as organizational common sense would hypothesize, that this crucial matter needed to be institutionalized in the official make up and formal charge to the coordinating body. While such formal arrangements do not assure the appropriate operation of any entity, they can greatly increase the likelihood that it will operate as intended, and provide a touchstone for review and correction of its functioning.

Since Indian affairs were the purview of numerous federal department and agencies, it was appropriate to establish coordination at the top of the executive branch, both to insure consistent policy without contradictions or duplications across federal programs, and to provide Indigenous Americans with input and dialogue at the center of executive policy. After an appropriate, but short lived start with the National Council of Indian Opportunity under the Johnson Administration, this was first institutionalized during the Clinton Administration, with two vehicles.¹⁰ First, an annual meeting was launched in which all federally recognized tribes were invited to the White House for discussion of Indian affairs, with key people from the various departments regularly involved in Indian affairs participating. It has proved to be a useful vehicle for enhancing government-to-government relations, and for enhancing holistic consideration of Indian affairs, as well as for discussing specific major problems. To make this discussion truly inclusive, it would be useful to include representatives of "urban Indians," since more than 60% of Native Americans now live off reservation, mostly in cities (while most federal agencies and programs are primarily focused upon reservations). It should be noted that the first of these annual meetings, followed by the National Indian Listening Conference, jointly sponsored by the Departments of Interior and Justice with participation from Housing and Urban Development, with the heads of all three departments in attendance, led directly to a series of reforms both within departments (e.g. the creation of the Office of Tribal Justice in the Justice Department) and at the top of the administration that have institutionalized Indian relations.

The most important of these initiatives was the establishment of the second national coordinating vehicle, The Working Group on American Indian and Alaska Natives as part of the Domestic Policy Council. The Council (as of January 1997) was composed of 20 high ranking members of executive departments (such as the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Rural Development, the Chief of Staff of the Department of Commerce, and the Principle Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs of the Department of Energy) and other agencies (such as the Office of Management and Budget), plus designated staff in each agency, and was chaired by the Secretary of the Interior.

There was, however, one major problem with the organization of the Working Group as it was constituted at the end of the Clinton Administration. Its being headed by the Secretary of the Interior presented the Secretary with a conflict of interest between his responsibilities to his department and the requirements for coordinating Indian policy as a whole. He had pressures from a number of constituencies in his department, along with concerns for maintaining his power and authority to function effectively as department head. Moreover, the Secretary of the Interior as an equal with other department heads, had to work cautiously and diplomatically with other departments. As a result of this dual difficulty, energy was drawn away from the Secretary's insuring that the BIA and other Interior agencies dealt adequately with current major issues, while communicating well with the tribes. This meant that the Working Group was unable to move swiftly or effectively to solve major problems that crossed departmental and agency jurisdictional boundaries in such crucial fields as gaming and the handling of toxic wastes.

Moreover, little was done to improve the extremely varied quality of tribal communications infrastructure, so that all tribal governments and their members could receive up to date information from, and provide timely input to, all federal agencies (as could be achieved by developing adequate internet linkages). What needed to be done was to move the coordination (and chairing) of the Indian Working Group entirely into the White House as part of the Intergovernmental Working Group with equal status for tribal governments with state and other governmental entities. There it would be able to

operate from above the level of the departments with a clear institutional interest in, and the full authority to, effectively coordinate Indian policy and its implementation in dialogue with the tribes. The council was moved to the Domestic Council of the Whitehouse during the Obama administration, but the Secretary of the Interior continued to be its chair ("Executive Order - Establishing the White House Council on Native American Affairs," 2013).

As it was, despite its limitations, under the Clinton administration the Working Group was the initiator, after appropriate consultation, of a number of reforms and took enumerable steps to see that government-to-government relations were operating on a regular and proper basis throughout the executive branch. These steps included the establishment of permanent Indian desks or offices in all agencies that regularly dealt with, or had an impact upon, Native Americans, and the drafting of several presidential memoranda for the heads of agencies and departments, first, "directing them to engage in continuing government-to-government relations with federally recognized tribal governments," and then requesting the departments and agencies to report what government-to-government procedures they had instituted, as a step in "insuring that the President's directive is properly implemented (May 23, 1997, White House Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies from Erskine Bowles, Chief of Staff to the President and Bruce Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy concerning Executive Memorandum on Government-to-Government relations.)."

There are some Indian examples at the state level of policy voice into government, and coordination of policy, that may have a general application to many, if not all, major interests (e.g. consumers of public health services, farmers, small businesses, etc.) (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 3, Section 2). In the state of Washington, for instance, the concerned tribes formed the American Indian Health Commission for Washington State to provide policy advice and collective communication with the state on health matters. The Commission communicates regularly with a variety of state and local health agencies, while each Washington tribe appoints its own representative to the Indian Policy Advisory Committee in the Washington Department of Social and Health Services. The department also has appointed a liaison person for Native American/Alaska Native issues who is actively involved with the Commission, playing an instrumental role in avoiding and solving problems.

In Washington, Indian policy as a whole is coordinated from the top of the executive branch, by the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs (GOIA). The Office recognizes that tribes have different needs, priorities, and objectives that are broader than economic development in purpose. It acknowledges that two-way communication and training are essential to its many efforts. GOIA has enhanced government-to-government relation between state agencies and tribes through promoting dialogue, increasing the number of qualified Native Americans employed in state government, and providing education to agency staff on Indian issues and communication. The resulting collaboration has brought about advances in policy in economic development, natural resources management, and social and cultural issues. Those concerned about health care (or some other policy area) for the population in general (or for specific groups, such as low income people) could organize in a similar manner, and the state, or a set of its agencies could organize similar channels of communication.

Other Special Cases and the Need for Affirmative Action

While some aspects of the American Indian input into government example is a special case, it should be noted that there are other special cases that may need vehicles that normally are not open to all in the same way. In many nations for example, there are Indigenous nations who have, and in many cases still

are, undergoing depredations from, or with the acquiescence of, government that need to be brought to an equal position with other citizens. While the general principle needs to be to treat people on an equal basis, where for whatever reason people are not equal, placing the social order out of balance, than some type of affirmative action may be needed as a temporary measure, until balance is restored to the social-economic-political system. Thus, after the freeing of slaves in the United States, the federal government established the Freedmen's Bureau ("The Freedmen's Bureau, 1865-1872", <http://www.archives.gov/research/african-americans/freedmens-bureau/>) while to attempt to overcome the disadvantages faced by poverty, the Equal Opportunity Act was passed to undertake "a war on poverty" during the Johnson administration, and various affirmative action program programs were put into place to attempt to overcome the continuing disadvantages that many people faced from past, and in some cases, continuing, discrimination. Similarly, In India, when the caste system was officially ended, but its deleterious effects for some citizens continued, a system of affirmative action was established for members of what had been the untouchable caste (MacKenzie and Weisbrot, 2008; Davies, 1996); Cloward and Piven, "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty," 1966; and Chandola, 1992-93).

Any special program to correct inequities is only legitimate so long as those inequities have not been redressed, and only to the extent that it moves to redress them. Otherwise new inequities are created (or old ones continued). The Indigenous principle is that a major social goal is to create and maintain harmony in the community (and between communities, and with the environment). And when harmony and balance – or as the Dine would say, "beauty" have been lost, efforts need to be made to restore them (Kluckhohn and Leighton, 1974; and Downes, 1972, particularly chapters 2, 3 and 8).

The Legitimate Role and Function of Interest Groups

Normally, sufficient channels need to be created for all citizens to have input into decisions that affect them *on an equal basis*. In a mass society, it is impossible for every individual to participate directly. Thus there is a legitimate role for interest groups to represent people, to aggregate separate voices so that they can be heard, providing that the power of the groups is directly proportional to the number of people they represent, times the strength of their interest, and the groups themselves are representative of their members – ideally operating according to principles of participatory democracy. To be sure that all interests (and each person has numerous interests), and that all people and interests are fairly represented in a balanced way, it is desirable to have as many groups as possible. As Rousseau (1950, Bk. II, Ch. 3), has said, the closer the number of interest groups comes to the number of people, the more perfectly representative the system is likely to be. Thus the interest group system, as well as the offices of government, needs to fit the Indigenous principle of a broad diversity of power, which needs to be as balanced as possible with the actual interests of people.

In a properly balanced system, interest groups can play an important role in transmitting the will of the people to the legislative and executive bodies – the latter necessarily needing to be given leeway in filling in the details of legislation, in a complex world – often through rule making authority within broad guidelines set by the legislature – as well as serving as major proposers of legislation on the basis of the expertise that arises from their specialization, and input from citizens. This function can be carried out through all of the usual methods of lobbying and petitioning (which can be practiced more easily, and rapidly, in the age of the internet, so long as it remains neutral and equally and freely accessible) and e-mails, and the lobbying process is kept completely transparent, and guided by an enforceable set of ethics to prevent, so far as possible, any sort of bribery (which can be any kind of

favor, not only monetary payment, or the giving of gifts, and ought to include regulations requiring a sufficient time to pass after a person in legislative or executive decision making position leaves office, before s/he can work as a lobbyist, or be employed by an organization a legislator or official directly makes decisions concerning, such as deciding to whom a government contract should be awarded). However, it is also advisable to establish additional arrangements for all the significantly concerned groups to take part in a consensus decision making process to develop a proposal for a decision by a government body.

The EPA in the late 1980s, for example, initiated a process for developing regulation by bringing all the interested parties (primarily representatives of environmental groups, business and the agency) together to participate in consensus decision making. Any of the parties could withdraw from the process at any time. But if they accepted the final agreement, they could not challenge it in court. As in traditional tribal governance, the process of dialog takes time, but usually results in better decisions than competitive processes because of the attempt to accommodate all of the concerns and interests of those affected to create a viable policy. By contrast, decisions in competitive processes tend to be the result of the ability of the individual contenders to force the inclusion of as much of their position as possible in the final outcome, with compromises being determined more in terms of including the diverse agendas of strong pressure groups than in achieving a well working policy as a whole.

The setting of new standards for the contents of gasoline in 1991 used this new inclusive process (Smith, 1991). Often, when the process fails to produce a consensus it is still useful, because agreement is invariably reached on many of the issues, leaving only a narrow range of questions, which have already been well framed by the discussion of the concerned parties, for decision by the agency. Several states, including Indiana, California and Florida have taken such an inclusive approach to promoting energy conservation and pollution reduction in the generation of electric power (*Citizens Power*, 1992; and Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, pp. 299-395).

In the past, there had been no incentives for power companies to operate efficiently or to encourage customers to conserve energy. Using an inclusive process, power companies, environmental groups and consumer group representatives have sat down together along with state officials to develop regulations that meet the primary concerns of all the parties (Clark, 1975, Ch. 3; and Osborne and Gaebler, Ch 10). This resulted in measures that save consumers money and reduce energy use (thereby reducing pollution) through allowing power producers to benefit financially from encouraging consumers to be energy efficient.

This involves recreating one of the strengths of traditional Indigenous societies, finding means or incentives (which can be moral, political and social as well as economic) to encourage people to act in the general interest, by making it in their personnel interest to do so. But this can only be effective to the extent that the structure and functioning of the incentives in practice actually encourages the socially desirable behavior (or in an organization, organizationally desirable behavior). Sometimes common apprehension of not finding a solution to a major problem can be an effective inducement to take part in a consensus building process, if all the concerned parties understand that their views and interests will be respected and included in the outcome. For example, Search for Common Ground assisted some communities in the United States in defusing the very divisive issue of abortion, by bringing together the full range of concerned people in each community in problem solving dialogues (Search for Common Ground, http://search.freefind.com/find.html?id=77561039&pageid=r&mode=ALL&n=0&_charset_=&bcd=%C3%B7&query=Abortion).

For such inclusive processes to function properly, particularly in government, there are a number of requirements. First, the process must be truly inclusive, involving all the interested parties on an equal basis. Otherwise, it is only a vehicle of hierarchical, special interest driven, competitive government. For example, during the Presidency of the first George Bush, Vice President Dan Quayle's Competitiveness Council ("EPA, Quale, Committee Head for Showdown," 1991) involved only big business leaders and government personnel in blocking new federal regulation that business did not want, regardless of its impact on the rest of the country. Equally bad was the older practice of having the Business Advisory Council, composed of the leadership of big business, meet regularly with the top officials in the Department of Commerce and various cabinet members in exclusive sessions, paid for by the Department, at the Homestead in Hotsprings, VA and other expensive resorts (Fritschler, 1969, p. 46). The George W. Bush administration is widely known for including only a narrow range of interests and actors – including oil companies - in its decisions, and of exacerbating divisiveness in U.S. politics.

Second, the power of the parties in the process needs to be reasonably equal, to the extent of their interest, in order for the outcome to be equitable. If, for example, in the early 1990s EPA gasoline content decision making process, the oil industry could have gotten most of what it wanted by going directly to Congress, than it could have perverted the consensus process in its favor by threatening to pull out of the discussions if it did not receive most of what it wanted at the expense of everyone else.

Third, there need to be reasons, or incentives, for those interested to participate and the consciousness of the parties must be such that they are open to participating. For example, if the petroleum companies had had sufficient power to get the regulations they wanted in a satisfactory time through EPA, and didn't care about the wellbeing of the other parties, the companies would not have bothered to join in the consensus process. However, even if they were generally significantly more powerful politically than the other parties, the oil companies would have joined in the consensus decision process, with only a small advantage, if the delay and/or uncertainty of not participating had been sufficient.

Where parties are in an ongoing relationship, as were members of traditional Indian communities, they may well find it in their long-term advantage to join in a collaborative problem solving process by consensus, rather than bargaining competitively. Thus employers and labor unions, having from experience gained sufficient trust in jointly managing team process for mutual benefit (for example, that resulting greater productivity leads to increased profits and wages), sometimes find it advantageous to work out labor contracts by mutual problem solving. This may be useful, not only for obtaining a better deal for both parties, but for maintaining the trust necessary to continue to carry out effective team process in the workplace.¹¹

The point is, that well working consensus decision making involves the creation of a close relationship with the other parties in which each party gains its own ends by helping the other parties attain their goals. It also involves people really listening to each other, and dialoguing with each other (to produce a flow of meaning), rather than deafly shouting at each other, which constitutes too much of contemporary discourse over issues, solves nothing, but has a tendency to escalate the shouting, even to breaking into violence. Experience taught Native peoples the value of inclusive decision making and reharmonizing processes to keep the peace, and nonviolent conflict resolution and training has been successfully applied in the United States, particularly with young people, to reduce violence. (Center for Nonviolent Communications, 2013, <http://www.cnvc.org/>). Experience with nonviolent conflict resolution, and with instituting team process in workplaces, demonstrates that what is necessary to get

people to appreciate and use mutually respectful means of communication and decision in contemporary society is cultural and educational. Most people prefer such modes of interrelating once they come to understand them and learn the skills involved in using them.

Currently, government in the United States and much of the world faces a series of related crises both in internal operations and external relations. Some of these difficulties relate to the way in which we conceptualize and operate governmental processes. By failing to recognize the extent to which governance is, in principle, a collaborative and empowering enterprise, we have greatly increased the costs of its operation, limited its effectiveness and distanced it from the people. Thus, reforms that equitably increase citizen and employee participation in the operation of governmental bodies, build team work among governmental agencies and in other ways debureaucratize government operations are useful developments¹² consistent with traditional principles of band and tribal governance. To accomplish this it is necessary to develop a collaborative culture, even as American Indians, and Indigenous people around the world, did millennia ago, and an important aspect of this is making all organizations participatory, especially workplaces, for several reasons, including that a major element in learning to be participatory is to participate in consensus decision making.

Developing a Collaborative Culture

What is important for the general development of more collaborative culture is that the emergent participatory organization is based on the idea of joint decision making on the basis of mutual respect: of problem solving in order to meet everyone's need on a mutual basis. In a complex age, teams need to be composed of different people with different ways of perceiving and thinking and different talents, and often different expertise. Thus, team members quickly learn to listen to each other and support one another. Diversity is a virtue. The strength of the team is the uniqueness of the individuals that compose it, and the team can only succeed through inclusiveness: through taking everyone's concerns into account. Conflict becomes an opportunity for mutual advancement. Moreover, in the current age of increasingly rapid change, to be an effective team member, one needs to be continually open to new ideas and insights: work, and indeed life, become a process of continuing education. Furthermore, the complexities of decision making in the workplace increasingly mirror the complexities of decision making in the world in general, including in major areas of public policy such as balancing the requirements of the environment, the economy, etc. Therefore, team process in the workplace encourages holistic thinking, considering all aspects of a problem or situation in making the best practicable balanced decision which is increasingly the approach necessary in making good public policy decisions.

It is obvious, and confirmed by research, that if a person is immersed every day at work in such a culture, that this will tend to make them more thoughtful, concerned collaborative neighbors and citizens at every level from the neighborhood to the planet.¹³ Studies show that people who are more involved in decision making at work tend to be more involved in the community. Moreover, people whose work requires them to carefully study issues and to approach difficulties through problem solving after listening to all points of view and considering all sides of the problem will approach public problems in a more knowledgeable and intelligent manner, will tend to elect people who will proceed in the same way in government (and in political campaigns), and will encourage the media to speak to them on a higher level.

In addition, if workplaces require people who are group problem solvers, then there will be pressure on education to provide just such employees. Indeed, there have been a number of pressures on education to move in that direction for some years, and that is precisely the thrust of the current "child needs centered" educational reform movement (which compatibly with the principle of mutual respect of team process for treating intrinsically equal people individually according to their uniqueness, works to focus education on meeting the learning and related support needs of each student in order that they can attain the collective goal of receiving appropriate education, although much of the driving force of that movement has other, though quite compatible, sources, Sachs 1987; and Sachs 1991). Moreover, at least in Europe, the organizational revolution is bringing with it the rise of collaboration between the public and private sectors in education which is increasingly part of the new educational reform movement in the U.S., though it is not yet well developed in America (Smith, 1995, Chs. 5 and 7).

In Germany for example, the large number of young people who do not go on to college are engaged in vocational education programs in collaboration with businesses, insuring that school education provides the relevant skills for participation in work and the job market, and providing apprenticeships with businesses that provide opportunities to explore possible future carriers, while giving the participants concrete practical experience that is helpful in giving citizens an understanding of practical problems. To the extent that the businesses involved have become participatory, that will tend to increase the participatory education of students. Furthermore, to the extent, and *only to the extent*, that such education is sufficiently, and sufficiently equally, provided for all young people (currently a major failing in the United States with its "savage inequalities" of educational opportunities, Kozal, 1991 – and more recently the situation has only gotten worse), and is paired with appropriate public policy to create and maintain adequate job opportunities for everyone, the relevance and meaningfulness of the participatory education experience (Sachs, 1992) should be a significant force for overcoming youth alienation at school and in general.

The change in consciousness that such changes in education and workplace social process and culture would create, if adequately developed, would tend to have a significant impact on moving the balance of opposed forces favoring and opposing positive socio-economic-political transformation that the United States has been experiencing for some time in a positive direction in almost all areas, and positive movement in each area will generally tend to increase the likelihood of positive movement in the others (although the correlations are complex, and not totally or equally reciprocal). For example, the kind of mutual respect, in team process and related education, for each person (organization, group, culture, etc.) and approaching problems holistically with concern for mutual gain in the process, should set an appropriate basis for dealing positively and effectively with the problems of diversity that are extremely divisive in contemporary America and internationally. This should tend to be the case both because the consciousness involved focuses attention on long run self-interest, that must include the needs of others, and because the new workplace system tends to move toward more equal compensation at work (while encouraging an outlook that favors public policies that move toward moderation of extreme differences of income, when possible, at the lower end through providing opportunities for becoming more equal rather than through direct transfers¹⁴).

Similarly, the kind of long term inclusive (and long term self-interest), holistic, thinking of the new workplace and related education tends to move people toward finding ways to use technology that are helpful, or neutral toward human beings and the environment precisely because such thinking orients

one toward considering the full range of factors and long term consequences of actions, which is increasingly essential given the short run thinking that continues to create vast environmental problems (Sachs, 2008). Conversely, appreciating the need to think in this way from dealing with environmental issues, tends to encourage thinking in this way generally, and reinforces this aspect of the new workplace/education culture. This kind of thinking, which also includes considering problems from the points of view of everyone involved, requires seeking out the full range of views and relevant information, which is made easier by the new information technology if it remains open and neutral, which in turn has a democratizing tendency when used in this way. Conversely, while the gestalt of the new culture approves of *appropriate* monitoring of human activities in order to gain useful and *empowering* information for making mutually respectful decisions, the entire approach mediates against using the technology (or older means) for increasing hierarchical control, except in specific cases when doing so is appropriate, and perhaps empowering (e.g. using monitoring technology to allow persons with destructive tendencies to work or go to school rather than to be confined in jail or mental institutions).

Moving to Reinvent Government

Finally, the rise of the participatory workplace has begun to produce a new approach to government and public policy making and administration that goes beyond traditional left-right, conservative-liberal, and other, dichotomies toward producing more dialectical, innovative problem solving (pragmatic rather than dogmatic) and harmonious (by being inclusive) approaches to the whole field of governance (although, as of fall 2014, a strong counter trend of polarized often more ideological politics stemming from growing income inequality is quite visible). There are currently many versions and expressions of this rising approach (or set of approaches). One of the best known is set out by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler in *Reinventing Government*, 1993,¹⁵ which is a very significant work because it documents the rise of a new approach on the American political scene. Where traditional American conservatives (i.e. traditional liberals such as Milton Friedman and Ronald Reagan) and New Deal Liberals (e.g. Hubert Humphrey and Lyndon Johnson) are caught in an either/or argument on many issues, the "new politics" attempts to integrate the concerns of both positions.

For example, conservatives argue that government needs to be small, doing little regulation and providing few services, because doing more involves government becoming bogged down in an undemocratically unresponsive, inefficient, costly bureaucracy. Conversely, liberals argue that government must provide many services and engage in considerable regulation because there is a public need that can only be met by government. The new politics agrees with both, saying that there are many public needs that government is required to make representative decisions about, but that since the conservatives are right about the ills of bureaucracy, government needs to act in debureaucratizing, maintaining representative ways to guide public policy, but not necessarily carry out all policies itself. Thus where conservatives would remove government from involvement, or contract that involvement out as a matter of principle, and liberals would insist that government undertake the function in question and carry it out itself, under the new politics, government would have a responsibility to make policy about the matters in question, but decide case by case whether to carry it out itself.

To have the time and energy to make and change such policy efficiently, at low cost, responsively, and appropriately, government would often engage in "steering rather than rowing" (Osborne and Gaebler, 1993, Ch. 1): setting the policy and reviewing its being carried out, but selectively deciding where it

was better to carry out the policy directly, contract out administration, and/or create mechanisms and incentives to achieve the policy goals with minimal need for direct administration (e.g. rather than providing job training directly or by contract, providing vouchers to eligible people usable at accredited training programs, to cut bureaucracy, increase individual choice, and keep training relevant and efficient through choice driven competition, which could involve either or both private and/or public providers).

The most interesting aspect of *Reinventing Government* is that the work is not just a theoretical tract, but a first attempt at mapping new approaches and methods which in the 1990s were actually being applied in the U.S. Thus it presents a partial documentation of the consciousness related with team process (but also having other sources) beginning to appear significantly in public affairs.¹⁶ Though a more inclusive and holistic consciousness was only beginning to emerge, usually only in part, and with resistance by some people, there are numerous signs that its emergence was (and beneath the surface of the extreme political struggles of the Obama administration years), may be a growing trend. For example, A 1996 survey research showed the emergence of "transformational values" in 25% of the U.S. adult population: a new subculture, who wish to rebuild neighborhoods, reduce family and street violence (usually by prevention rather than by getting tough), clean up and protect the environment (accepting the costs of doing so) - often feeling nature as sacred - and favoring a decentralization of power based, generally, upon more participatory decision making. In addition, surveys of people extensively engaged in computer networking tend to show the rise of participatory and empowerment oriented attitudes (Ray, 1996).

A similar trend was noted in the rise of "the new historicism" school of literary criticism among scholars of literature, which Veesser, 1989, describes in part, "As the first successful counterattack in decades against this profoundly anti-intellectual ethos, New Historicism has given scholars new opportunities to cross the boundaries separating history, anthropology, art, politics, literature, and economics. It has struck down the doctrine of noninterference that forbade humanists to intrude on questions of politics, power, indeed on all matters that deeply affect people's practical lives--matters best left, prevailing wisdom went, to experts who could be trusted to preserve order and stability in 'our' global and intellectual domains."¹⁷ It remains to be seen if, in the current world and national political struggles, these developments, and other cultural changes mentioned in the introduction to part II of this book, will manifest in a more inclusive participatory society, essentially applying Indigenous governance principles appropriately for the current period, with an eye to future developments. But there is no question that these developments are examples of what is needed to move significantly in that direction.

It should be noted that the development of the new consciousness has been, and almost certainly will continue to be, a dialectical rather than a linear and/or zero sum process. Many forces are involved coming from different directions. While the organizational revolution, supported by the information revolution, have been the most important of the positive forces for larger change, similar thinking and processes have also been developing essentially independently, from other sources, to react synergistically with the main organizational thrust, such as a growing use of collaborative decision making in professional organizations beginning before the coining of the term "team process" and the increasing use of conflict transforming (Lederach, 2003; and Lederach, 2003a) or similar participatory dispute resolution processes in many settings that have a variety of roots spanning the peace movement, traditional and new age spiritual paths and professional mediation and arbitration, to name only a few.

The Positive in the Negative

It is important to note that the so called "negative" forces and developments have also been playing a role in the development of the new consciousness and processes related to it. For example, the rise of increasingly serious and wide spread environmental problems has spurred environmental consciousness. Increasing polarization in communities has fostered the broader application of inclusive, participatory dispute resolution processes. And worsening crime rates and violence in the 1980s encouraged the application of community policing. Indeed, the driving force behind the organizational revolution, which author Stephen Sachs analysis indicates as the most important single development and force for positive transformation, is itself largely the product of increasingly prevalent dysfunction with the traditional organization paradigm combined with the pressure of increased worldwide competition in the market, and pressure to conserve limited resources in the public and nonprofit sectors, and to find better ways to get things done.

The question, then, is, is this new form of organization really emerging, or is it just a current trend? After all, if we are in the midst of an organizational revolution, we aren't very far along as yet, and in any case revolutions often do not end up where one would think they are going. Moreover, there are counter trends in contemporary organizations, such as downsizing, use of new information technology to increase top down control, and growing differences in income between top executives and beginning employees in large American firms, as well as increasing concentration of wealth in a few hands.

There are a number of reasons to think that the general model is in fact emerging, even though some of the details may not end up as we would now perceive them, and doubtlessly there will be new developments. First, participatory organizations are far more effective than hierarchical organizations. Indeed, the tightness of the world economy in the 1980s and 1990s was driving the revolution, worldwide (though faster in some locations than others). However, the trend toward the internationalization of business (including the increasing portability of capital), and further concentration of capital in fewer hands (Korten, 1995; and McChesney and Nichols, 2013), has been a counter trend, first lessening the pressure of competition, and thus lessening the pressure to make organizations more effective by increasing their democratization. Secondly, democratization in all sectors, is viewed by many in top hierarchical positions as a limitation upon, if not a threat to, their power and position (e.g. the attempts by a number of billionaires, including the Koch Brothers to repress voting, greatly weaken unions, and, in part by buying key media, influence public opinion by spreading propaganda, and limiting the availability of information and views that run counter to their perceived interests, Mayer, 2010; and Carroll, 2013). Should these forces succeed, the result could well be a world dominated by hierarchically managed international cartels. Fortunately, this trend is also feeding a counter movement, that includes the rise of movements and groups such as Occupy and Moveon.Org, in the United States, and broad protest movements around the world.

The change in reward systems, including the spreading of ownership of capital (as well as the decentralizing of decision making and hence power in the organization) *if fully enough developed* would mitigate much of that danger. To prevent undo monopolization, and to allow the development of diversity of ownership of capital and power, will require enlightened public policy. The increasing growth of multinationals now makes that impossible to be achieved by single nations. Thus it is imperative that appropriate transnational methods for doing this be developed. However, the spreading of "free trade" agreements such as NAFTA, has primarily benefited multinational cartels, and has yet to

get many people to move from senses of national interest, to join in a new sense of global interest (Korten, 1995).

But what of the counter trend to the rise of real participation in the workplace through downsizing, increased scrutiny and control of employees, etc. to deal with inefficiency in hierarchical organizations in the face of tight market competition? The answer seems to be fairly clear from both theoretical analysis and practical experience that such tactics (and they are tactics not true strategies) may be beneficial in short run situations, but they are counter productive in the long run. There are two problems with downsizing. The first is that downsizing is usually not just a method for making firms more efficient by trimming labor. It is usually taken to reduce costs, which it does, but generally involves reducing output (production or service) and hence reduces both income and market share (Smith, 1995, Ch. 2 and 9). A company in financial difficulty from failing to make timely progress in solving operational problems may have no choice except to cut back on its operations, but if it does nothing more, it only makes a momentary gain while reducing its competitive position and market power which weakens the firm's ability to do well in the market in the future. Moreover, large scale reduction of the workforce almost always leaves remaining employees feeling expendable and wondering if they are soon to be fired. Hence employee morale and commitment go down, lowering productivity and quality of effort, which is a direct disadvantage for any organization. Moreover, in an age where quality of product and employee attentiveness to operations are increasingly critical factors, the negative effect of lowered morale and commitment become increasingly damaging over time.

The same is true of increasing the use of top down control techniques, that also have the disadvantage that someone has to be paid to do the monitoring. One of the advantages of switching to team process, where employees have a real stake in the outcome of their work, is that supervising costs can be reduced very substantially as teams move to self-monitoring out of commitment, using all the information that they can obtain to find ways to improve their performance. In the team process organization the increased information about performance provided by the new information process becomes a vehicle for empowerment and new energy, where in a hierarchical control setting, the gains that can be made from using the increased information are limited by the direct financial and indirect human costs of obtaining and applying that information. Moreover, experience shows that committed people with sufficient education regularly make better decisions about how to use that information to improve their own work than outside managers or experts who are not directly involved in the work process, precisely because those involved in a process are in a position to know it better than any one else (Lesieur, 1958).

The coming into being of the information age is clearly an important factor in favor of an organizational form that is based upon problem solving and networking (Drucker, 1989; Drucker, 1993). The industrial age made it possible to make huge numbers of the same thing, though not with the quality of individual craft work. The computer now makes it possible to mass produce different things, with the variation programmed into production and instantly adjustable, with many of the products more finely made than was traditionally possible with individual craft work. This means that we are increasingly entering an age where all business, including manufacturing, is service oriented. This is the reason for the rise of the customer orientation, first in business, and increasingly in government and non-profit organizations (e.g. the broad popularity of TQM: total quality management). The required customer orientation fits perfectly with the outlook of participatory organizations, and the customization to each particular need requires the decentralization and possibility of direct customer contacts of a participatory networking organization.

But there is one potential complex of problems to be overcome here. First, the high tech, problem solving, participatory organization requires highly educated employees. Second, it is becoming possible to undertake increasing volumes of all kinds of work with less and less labor input. Therefore, it is possible that if the current uneven quality of schools in the United States continues to produce only a limited number of qualified potential information workers, and if public policy continues to encourage firms to hire fewer employees working many hours, rather than many employees working fewer hours (e.g. Having firms, rather than the general public or individuals, pay for health care and other benefits per individual, and not per work period or per dollar in direct compensation, encourages paying overtime rather than hiring new employees) it is possible that the U.S. could become a widely divided two class society of high income information workers and unemployed (or seriously underemployed and low paid) people. It appears, therefore, that the participatory organization is likely to emerge in some form that is beneficial to its members. But the extent to which the new developments will be beneficial to national societies and to the planet depends upon foresight and sensitivity in public policy from the neighborhood to the world.

It is now clear that as the world moves into the information age, it is experiencing the rise of a participatory form of organization. This rise has taken place over several stages for a considerable time. We cannot be sure what the final result will be, but there is a clear trend which, if it continues in its current direction, may not only make organizations more efficient and working life more humane, but has the potential to contribute significantly to the creation of a more peaceable culture, and hence to a more peaceable world, founded upon a participatory society and culture.

Building the Foundation: Participatory Culture

Ultimately, ownership-control arrangements and regulations, and organizational structures are not enough to insure participatory organizations or fully representative and open public discussion in the wider society. A culture of respect for all people and the positive value of all participating, hearing all views, and appreciation of the synergy that arises from inclusive dialogue, are a critical foundation for a participatory community or society.

Thus, there is also an educational aspect of inclusive participation (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 4, Section 1). This involves first, learning the value of diversity, combined with a focus on solving problems, based on fact finding and analysis, rather than ideology, and taking part in a common process to find the best policies or actions, and avoiding blaming people, which is divisive, in the course of choosing courses of action. Second, is developing a set of skills. This begins by developing the ability to problem solve analytically, rather than jumping directly from a problem to a solution: learning to effectively illuminate problems, identify and understand options, and make or create the best choices among the alternatives, or by combining elements of them. Since this is a collective problem solving process, next come a set of communicating and interacting skills. The first of these is learning to listen empathetically, so as to appreciate and honor each person's perspective (regardless of whether one agrees with their views), and listening clearly, so as to hear accurately what they are really saying (rather than what one may assume they are going to say - as often happens when people debate: therefore the aim is to dialogue and not to debate: to share concerns, not to argue for positions). Next, is speaking supportively, always honoring the other persons, acknowledging their concerns (whether or not one agrees with their opinions). If someone's behavior or performance is a problem, one needs to speak to suggest improvement (usually after praising the person's [group's] positive behavior, rather than criticizing). The idea is to focus on the positive to the extent possible, so that the feeling of

mutuality of the group or community is maintained and strengthened, in the common effort of creating the best practicable decisions.

To promote and maintain the quality of the process, it is important to enhance the participants' ability to act and speak to encourage everyone to participate and to support the process of participation: It is usually best, especially for leaders, to begin by presenting problems, to ask everyone how they see them, rather than presenting solutions, so that everyone is included in deciding. Everyone can help facilitate the process by drawing others into it, especially those who have said little or nothing, and helping find other ways to see the question at hand when the discussion gets bogged down, or participants fall into arguing instead of dialoguing. The idea is to come together to identify and solve problems or develop a plan toward some goal. Thus the group must begin by hearing how everyone sees the problem or goal, collectively defining it, so that there is a proper basis for proceeding to consider alternative ways for finding (or creating) solutions or plans, and having heard everyone's thoughts on what to do, to collectively choose or create the best way, including everyone's concerns and ideas in the process. The main job of group leaders is to act as facilitators, to help the process move ahead in a good and inclusive way (as traditional tribal leaders usually did), rather than attempting to move the group toward specific decisions. Some of these skills are more essential in small group decision making, than in mass processes, but all of them are important in every arena of public discussion.

In the information age, education for participatory democracy also needs to include learning how to find information, particularly on the internet, and especially to know how to evaluate what are and are not good and accurate sources of information, ideas and approaches to issues and problems. The most important learnings are how to learn, how to perceive, think analytically – understanding the need to see issues and problems from the full range of relevant perspectives, and how to find the information that one needs. But it is also necessary to learn at least basic civics: how political, economic and social systems function; have some knowledge of geography: human, political, economic, environmental, etc., as well as attain the skills and information needed for everyday living and working. For a participatory society, it also helps to learn that life is a never ending process of education.

Insuring the Dispersion of Power

A crucial aspect of traditional Indigenous societies, and a necessity for any well working democracy is the wide dispersion of power, in all its forms, so that in practice people can have an approximately equal voice and influence, with essentially equal access to sources of information, and whatever services, including education, are necessary to provide for basically equal participation, not only in decision making, but in society, so that all have an equal opportunity in life, including in developing carriers, in the economy, etc. On the political side, as we have been discussing, in the postmodern age this requires not only political, but ultimately virtually all institutions, to operate on the basis of inclusive participatory democracy, with political authority widely dispersed – including no undue power or concentration of power in any office or agency – and with all political and governmental functions carried out with transparency (except in limited cases where secrecy or protection of privacy is legitimate) and subject to review and appropriate corrective action for any improprieties that may occur.

As to the structure of government, there are a variety of forms that meet the basic American Indian principles of participatory democracy and practical effectiveness in the current era. The need for

dispersion of political power within (as well as external to) government has already been mentioned, which in a nation of any size needs to involve a federalism in which the central government sets the basic guidelines of policy in order to insure coordination of policy and protection of basic rights, and within those guidelines the states or provinces doing the same within their jurisdiction, while so far as is practicable, policy ought to be carried out at the local level to meet local conditions and which is potentially more democratic because the geographical distance between the people and the government is closest, with the voting power of people the greatest as there are fewer of them in local jurisdictions, and the ratio of people to their elected officials is the smallest.

There are some caveats to this. We are in an age where the most important decisions need to be made at the national and international level, because local and regional economies and environments are more closely interlinked than ever before, really constituting national and international economies and environments, while with the development of electronic communications, citizens may know more about what is happening, and what their representatives and administrative officials at the higher levels are doing, particularly at the national level, than at the lower, and especially the local level. Also, in the smaller arenas of the states and localities, there are often a smaller number of interests and points of view, that at times can lead to more skewed policies, and a higher likelihood of people being discriminated against and having their rights violated than is likely to occur with higher level decision making. Thus, in the current era, decentralization needs to be balanced with sufficient higher level decision making and vehicles for review of the lower levels, compared with a century ago, and even more so since the time of contact. Indeed, one of the reasons for writing the U.S. Constitution and abandoning the Articles of Confederation, which closely followed the examples of the Hodenosaunee, Wendot, and Muscogee federations in having strong legislatures, requiring a consensus agreement to make decisions, a weak executive, and almost all domestic authority in the states, was even then the need to have national decision making power in many fields, including commerce.

Concerning the structure of the national government (and also the lower level governments) a number of different forms and variations on them fit the basic principles of participatory democracy and dispersion of power, with the need to be effective. Some argue that a parliamentary form of government is more democratic than a Presidential model with a separation of powers and checks and balances, as the parliamentary form usually encourages multiple parties, and, hence more views in the legislature that need to be taken into account to develop decisions, while governments can be changed more quickly at need, or change in public view. However either type system can work quite democratically and effectively if elections are frequent and fair enough, the system of communication amongst the people and between the people and the government are open and equally available, and if power in all forms is sufficiently equal and balanced. Moreover, in a two party system that is not overly polarized, the aggregating of the variety of citizens' views can take place in the public discussion and election process, with candidates attempting to encompass the views of sufficient people to win the election. (As in a participatory society the political parties need to function quite democratically, the same would tend to be the case in primary elections, providing a large number of people vote, which is likely the case in highly participatory societies, but often a problem in less participatory "democracies", such as the United States, where voter turnout is usually low in primaries, and non-presidential elections - and indeed not very high even in Presidential elections).

There are also other considerations, depending upon the circumstances. For example, France moved from a standard parliamentary system to a strong presidential system, in the 1950s, because of widely fractured public opinion represented by numerous parties having difficulty agreeing on policy decisions

and able only to form fragile governments that fell frequently, unable to keep governing coalitions together (Atkin, 2004). The Articles of Confederation, in addition to the above reason, were replaced by the Constitution also because of the need for a stronger executive and a need to have a legislature that did not require unanimous approval of all bills, as it was too difficult to build a complete consensus (as well as the need to have the national government be able to finance itself by raising its own taxes). But a presidential system can also have an overly strong president, or executive agencies may have too much power. There are critics of the U.S. government in the period of the war on terror who charge that too much power has accrued to the President, while there is considerable concern that the National Security Agency (NSA) and other security services have undue surveillance power that seriously undermines democracy.

Whatever the form of government, it needs to operate in a balanced way internally to reflect democracy. Leaders in traditional Indigenous societies are facilitators, who, because they have been selected for their virtues, including wisdom, may be influential in guiding discussion, but are not themselves the decision makers in what should be a collective process. The same ought to be the case in contemporary government. The United States Congress, for example, to meet these principles would need reforms. As of the end of 2013, the leadership has too much power to control the legislative process. For example, in the House of Representatives, the Speaker and the Rules committee can control what comes to the floor for a discussion and vote, indicating what parts of a bill can and cannot be amended, and how long discussion can take place. While efficiency is necessary to realize democracy, and it may be appropriate for an elected small body or single person to initially set the agenda, their decisions ought to be overruleable by simple majority vote. Among other issues in the Senate, the ability of any senator to put a hold on a bill or a presidential nomination, preventing the measure from coming to the floor, and the filibuster - though reduced in its application in 2013 - requiring a 60% majority of the entire Senate to stop discussion and allow a vote, are too extreme. It is wise to have devices to protect minorities, and to briefly slow discussion so that measures are not rushed through without sufficient consideration, but a majority of the entire body (not just of those who are present and voting) ought to be sufficient to overcome any hold, filibuster or similar blocking or delaying procedure.

Over all, so long as whatever form of government is used is democratically chosen and removable in a fair and equal participatory process, and power within government and the society as a whole is balanced, the extent to which there is a participatory culture with a democratic civil society and open communications system with equal access is more important than governmental form. That means that terms of office need to be appropriately short, but need to be long enough, and perhaps staggered, to provide needed continuity. Also, the Indian origin practice of recall elections, along with citizen initiative (a petition by enough citizens places a legislative measure on the ballot, as exemplified by California's propositions), and legislature initiated referendums on pieces of legislation are good practices for well-balanced participatory political systems. (Note that these, and other "democratic" practices often do not work well where there is an imbalance of power, especially concerning money).

Insuring a Dispersion of Economic Power

Extremely important to the proper functioning of a participatory (or any) society is a dispersion, and approximate equality, of economic power, as philosophers as diverse as Aristotle and Marx have pointed out. Aristotle set forth in *The Politics*, Book IX, Ch. 2, one needs to emphasize the middle. A stable and well working society, in the best case would have a middle class with more members than

the poor, and more wealth than the rich. Liberal democratic theorists have usually indicated the importance of a sizable and strong middle class for a well working democracy, while Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels went one step further saying that the ultimate society needed to become a classless society (Tucker, pp. 133-135, 505, 535, 593, and 665). A well working participatory society needs to have a balanced economy, without any person, group or class of people having so much more wealth than others, or so much control of economic institutions, that they are able to have an unfair lobbying, political advertising, control of or advantage in the media, or other economic leverage, that would give them more say than everyone else. Similarly, it is important that there not be a large group, or class, of people who are so much poorer than everyone else, that they cannot participate on an essentially equal basis. Moreover, It is important that there not be such great differences in wealth, essentially in class, that it causes a such a wide difference in interest and outlook that it creates distinct and largely incompatible factions within society, so that it is difficult or impossible to find the common interest (Rousseau, 1950, Bk. II, Ch. 11).

Maintaining a balanced, egalitarian, economy is precisely the American Indian tradition, in which all citizens were considered family, who needed to be included in the reciprocity of tribal relations, as is shown in Chapter 1. Even the somewhat more hierarchical, but still quite participatory, Northwest Coast tribes largely used their excess wealth for potlatches, huge giveaways that redistributed much of the excess (and destroyed some of it) (Goldman, 1937, 180-209). Thus even they were consistent with the usual Indian nation practice of harmonizing community economy. As the Comanche state it, the principle was to remember our relationships, which involves responsibility, bringing about reciprocity, which results in redistribution.

Approaches to Maintaining a Balanced Economy

The best way to achieve and maintain a balanced equalitarian economy varies with the circumstances and conditions of society. In the post-industrial age we need to use different means than those that were effective in smaller, traditional Indigenous societies. A number of approaches have been proposed. Some favor centralized planning based on need, to take money and greed out of the distribution process. To date, however, centralized planning, as used by the Soviet Union, much of Eastern Europe, and North Korea, proved to be very inefficient, breaking down into an oligarchic form of state capitalism, with monopolistic state owned companies attempting to manipulate and lobby the system for their own benefit (Rusmich and Sachs, 2003, Part I). Communist China has modified central planning, including a considerable amount of private enterprise operating under a somewhat regulated market, but while this arrangement has led to considerable economic development, the Chinese government itself is concerned that this has been accompanied by great inequalities in wealth and living standards (Li and Piachaud, 2004), while huge development projects have caused direct harm to large numbers of people in the short run, and to the environment, with further human harm in the longer term (Jacobs, 2013; Johnson, 2013; Wong, 2011; and Wong, 2011a). One might speculate that perhaps with improved computing, and including significant feedback, centralized economic planning might become feasible. However, this would be a modification of a top down hierarchical approach, and like the implementation of the cybernetics approach to organization in the 1940s, which added feedback as part of improving hierarchical organization communications, would likely only somewhat improve a defective hierarchical approach, where what was needed was a switch to inclusive participatory decision making. In the case of planning, what would be needed would be a switch to decentralized planning, with the role of the center as facilitator and coordinator.

The opposite approach to attempting to achieve a balanced economy has been that of capitalist libertarians, who seek to remove the political advantage of wealth from the economy, by minimizing government regulation and provision of services, and “leaving everything to the market,” which is seen as producing and maintaining an equilibrium when not interfered with. This seems appealing, especially if one begins with strong antitrust legislation to initially limit participation in the economy to small businesses. But there are several fundamental problems to this approach that make it unworkable, at least in industrial and post-industrial society (Rusmich and Sachs, 2003, Part II). First is the fact that markets are created by governments, and operate according to the rules and procedures that governments do (or do not) establish. The economic outcome, including which firms succeed and fail is greatly influenced by what the rules are.

Second, while smaller firms may tend to be more efficient than larger ones, events continually occur (some planned, others serendipitous) that increase the market power of some firms, and reduce that of others, giving firms with more market power more advantage over others than the natural advantage of being below a certain optimal size provides. A firm with more capital can advertise more to sell more than poorer competitors, or can keep prices lower longer to win a price war – driving competitors out of business – or can buy in larger volume, attaining lower prices, etc. Thus in a minimally regulated market, there is a natural tendency for some firms to gain market power, leading to their gaining additional market power, leading to a concentration of capital, unbalancing the market, and ultimately moving it towards monopoly and oligopoly, which create major differences in wealth and power, undermining democracy. Moreover, the capitalist libertarian approach, by emphasizing the profits and losses of individual firms, very greatly fails to take into account the very important areas of externalities (costs and benefits to society and people that do not show up on a firm’s balance sheet). An example of an externalized cost is harmful pollution, that injures people and the community, without payment by the polluter, unless, contrary to the libertarian approach, the pollution is taxed or regulated. Similarly, public goods, such as education and other services, are not adequately provided for in the Libertarian approach, as private firms and charitable acts will not adequately supply them sufficiently, and on an equitable basis. This is often necessary to provide the equal opportunity necessary for people to participate in the economy on an equal basis: a requirement to keep the economy in balance and to maintain equal inclusive political participation.

In the Twenty-First Century, a market of relatively small businesses is usually necessary for a participatory economy, but government action of various kinds is necessary to keep the market in balance – preventing oligopoly and monopoly from arising – while providing necessary public goods and regulating to minimize the costs of externalities (Rusmich and Sachs, 2003, Part II). A market of relatively small business can achieve the economy of scale of large enterprises, by forming networks or cooperatives to purchase in bulk, as IGA (Independent Grocers Association) supermarkets do. The stores are individually owned, but agree to buy certain products from the association, while stores in the same marketing area coordinate sales and advertising (IGA, 2013). Similarly, small firms can band together to collectively provide research, as the Mondragon Cooperatives, discussed above, do through the federation’s research division. Alternatively, firms could subscribe to research organizations for the right to use their products or patents, and/or research could be undertaken or funded by public organizations (government or nonprofit), as the U.S. government has long done in the United States (e.g., National Science Foundation, www.nsf.gov; Research.gov; “U.S. Government Sponsored Collaborations,” 2013, Siemans).

The Role of Taxes in Balancing the Economy

An important instrument for maintaining a balance of relations in contemporary society in terms of keeping wealth relatively equal is the taxing system. The main two vehicles that are usually appropriate for doing that are a sufficiently graduated income tax and an inheritance tax that becomes high enough beyond a situationally proper level to prevent fortunes large enough to begin to significantly unequalize wealth from being built across generations. Normally, it is preferable to use these graduated taxes, set according to people's ability to pay, rather than to use regressive sales and excise taxes, though sales and excise taxes can be used as incentives against socially undesirable behavior – such as high sales taxes on tobacco to discourage its use, and taxes on carbon dioxide emissions to encourage more efficient use of fossil fuels, and switching to renewable energy, to counter global warming. Also, reasonable sales and excise taxes, often as user fees, can be used to have people pay their share of public goods they use, such as fees for playing on a public golf course. However such taxes or fees ought not to be so high that they tend to discriminate economically against lower income people.

Income taxes can be used for regulatory purposes, particularly in granting deductions or tax credits for certain desirable purposes, such as a tax credit for installing solar electricity on a building, to counter global warming or assist people in isolated areas, away from power lines, to have electricity. However, the use of income taxes for regulatory purposes ought not to go so far as to make the tax code overly complex, nor should it be allowed to provide unwarranted advantages to particular interests, and certainly not to the point of creating large differences in wealth, or otherwise unbalancing the economy. If in a particular case the tax code cannot be used for regulatory purposes without creating significant injustices or imbalances, than it should not be used for regulatory purposes.

Appropriate Regulation and Services

Just what regulations and public goods (including investments in human capital, community infrastructure and institutions, as well as services) are needed or desirable depends on the particular circumstances, but there are a few general guidelines. To the extent that it is practical, it is advisable to regulate via incentives, rather than by commands (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, Ch. 10), and, that so far as practical, the emphasis on services and human capital investments ought to be empowering people, and only providing income – or its equivalent (such as food, or food vouchers) either as a temporary supportive part of empowerment (e.g. while people are receiving education or skill training), or where empowering people to earn income is not feasible or appropriate, as with people who are sufficiently disabled or ill, or have earned their pensions (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992, Ch. 2). To provide equal opportunity with empowerment, and to keep the economy and human relations in balance, education and health care need to be easily accessible (including being inexpensive), of sufficient and essentially equal quality for all, with sufficient social insurance equally available in ways that are empowering and do not create dependence, to support people hit by the accidents of life, such as illness, injury, loss of employment from a change in technology, shift in the market, etc.

In the increasingly technologically advancing age, as automation reduces the amount of labor required to operate the economy, the number of hours of work each week need to be reduced so that, supported by adequate and readily accessible education and job related training, full employment can be kept, with incentives for businesses to hire more employees rather than require overtime (e.g. instead of taxing, or requiring provision or payments, by firms for the healthcare or health insurance, and unemployment insurance of each employee, these programs should be paid for out of general taxes).

Similarly, so that people who are partially disabled, are older, or otherwise need a shorter or less physically or otherwise strenuous work week, can continue to be and feel contributors to society, appropriate part time work could be made available. As the regular workweek becomes shorter, that would create opportunities for additional enterprises (private or public as would be appropriate) and increased employment in education and recreation that would enhance the quality of life.

Furthermore, in a participatory society people can feel a part of society, in which people support each other, on an individual and institutional basis, and feel that they are contributors to it, both through contributing their voice to decision making, and through taking actions with a social benefit. Therefore, it would often be beneficial to have all citizens able to do so (and adjustments could be made to find ways for as many people as possible to be able to participate in some way) by taking part in a period or periods of public service, which could include military service, to the extent that was necessary.

For a Twenty-First Century economy to function well, there is a legitimate need to raise capital for business and government. Selling stock and issuing bonds are often legitimate ways for businesses to do that (while governments may tax and borrow money, often through bonds). Similarly, charging reasonable interest rates related to the cost of money and level of risk is normally proper, except where higher or lower rates would be more appropriate public policy (such as providing low interest loans for investment in designated low income areas, for example see: “California Enterprise Zones,” 2013). However one problem that is widespread in contemporary economies that needs to be prevented by regulation, which might include taxation, is avoiding parasitic speculation that very often skews markets, artificially impacting prices – sometimes considerably – creating wealth disparities, and at times involving huge and very expensive scandals (such as the mortgage crisis that set off the 2007 Great Recession, and speculation on commodity prices, including oil, Aluminum and food, Grossman, 2013; Kocieniewski, 2013; Sanders, 2012; Econ Matters, 2011; Maystre, 2011; and “UNCTAD: High Frequency Trading and Speculation Leads to Higher Prices,” 2012). A graduated income tax quite high at the top may dampen speculation, as well as help keep executive salaries relatively low, by making it more advantageous to leave money in a business, and having less money available to speculate with. Another proposal is to have a small tax on every stock, security or commodity trade to discourage pure speculation (“Financial Speculation Tax,” (2013). Northland Democratic Club, http://www.northlanddem.org/Financial_Speculation_Tax.php; “Financial Transfer Tax,” 2013).

Returning to Harmony: Dealing with Torts and Crimes

Native societies worked strongly to create and maintain harmony and balance, and used a variety of means to return to harmony when relations within a person or between people or groups were out of balance (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 4, Section 2, and Ch. 1, section 2). When dealing with acts that western society today considers crimes and torts (civil injuries), the emphasis was on restoring harmony between the parties. This might involve punishment or compensation for harm as part of the harmonizing process. So far as possible, when someone had committed an offence, the emphasis was upon reintegrating the wrongdoer back into society as a good citizen. Only in extreme cases, where reintegration seemed unattainable and the offender was considered sufficiently dangerous, was a perpetrator exiled or killed.

By contrast, in the United States and numerous western societies the emphasis in crimes long has been first in retribution, applying appropriate punishment, and most often only secondarily, if at all, providing restitution to victims, and rehabilitation for offenders. This has usually left victims of crimes,

and sometimes their communities, unrestored from the harms of crimes, while there often have been high recidivism rates among those convicted of crimes, who have often been greatly limited in their ability to obtain desirable employment. As with the history of organizations in the west, discussed above, there have long been some modifications occasionally introduced into the corrections model in North America to deal with shortcomings in the corrections model, such as providing psychological services to convicts, and half way houses to provide employment and ease convicts reintegration to society. More recently, an alternative approach, restorative justice, has been applied in the United States, beginning in the 1970s, in different forms and to different extents, that derives directly from American Indian experience (Zehr, 2002, on Indigenous origins, pp. 4, 11-12, and 43; and Ross, 1996).

Empowering and Healing

Restorative justice, when fully applied, is an attempt to restore solid relationships among all those who have suffered loss from a criminal act, the victim, other members (individuals and/or groups) of the community, and if possible, the offender (Zehr, 2002). For the victim, involvement in the process is very often quite empowering and healing. Victims have the opportunity to know what is being done about the harm done to them, and perhaps be able to discover why the harmful act was committed, while being heard through telling their story. As with participatory decision making, simply having a voice in many instances is extremely important to the speaker. Often the victim is able to receive restitution from the perpetrator, either concretely, or symbolically. Where concrete restitution is not possible, the restorative justice process can be augmented by victims compensation from the government or community, as exemplified by the California Victim Compensation Program (CalVCP: <http://www.vcpcb.ca.gov/victims/>), that helps pay bills and expenses resulting from certain violent crimes. Victims of crime who have been injured or have been threatened with injury, in many instances, are eligible for assistance. It may also be possible for the victim to receive an apology from the perpetrator.

For communities, restorative justice provides an opportunity to be involved in matters of concern to them, which is not possible in standard western judicial proceedings, where the full responsibility is with the state (government at whatever level) (Zehr, 2002, pp. 17-18). Crime affects communities, making them stakeholders, as secondary victims, when it occurs in their midst. Having a role in a criminal proceeding allows the community and its members to form forums to address issues of crime, support victims in their midst, while building a sense of mutual accountability and strengthening the bonds of community. It encourages community members to take on their obligations for the welfare of their members, encompassing victims and offenders, in the course of fostering conditions that promote healthy communities, much the way citizen participation in community policing, discussed above, can be empowering in building healthy communities and reducing crime.

Restorative justice has been found to be extremely important for a high proportion of offenders, in several dimensions (Zehr, 2002, pp. 16-17, 47-57). While it is not always proper for offenders to be directly involved with victims in a restorative justice process, they can still be involved indirectly, when that is the better course of action. The participation of offenders, in what ever form, is important as it pressures offenders who admit their guilt to face up to what they have done, and to see the impact of their behavior. Depending upon the circumstances, this also often provides an opportunity for offenders to move toward making things right, at least with an apology (which usually is not accepted unless it appears genuine, with understanding of the harm inflicted, which offender' participation confronts them with), and in many instances with restitution. In cases of minor offenses involving property damage, or

minor injuries, this may involve the perpetrator repairing the damage, or earning the money to pay for the repair or compensation. All of these aspects of offender participation tend to enhance rehabilitation, and recidivism rates are generally lower for offenders who have gone through a restorative justice process than an adversarial criminal justice process (Melton, 2005, pp. 119 and 165 note 8). This is partly the case because one aspect of restorative justice is to consider and take steps to assist the offender in attaining rehabilitation, and where appropriate, reintegration with the community. This may involve such actions as the offender participating in substance abuse programs, undertaking counseling or psychological treatment, undertaking anger management, nonviolence training, or other appropriate education, and supervised probation or half way house living (either alone or following incarceration, where that is appropriate).

Principles of Restorative Justice

In situations where the offender is also a victim (though their offense is not an appropriate response to their victimhood, which the restorative process needs to effectively lead s/he to understand), steps also need to be taken to correct that injustice, as the ultimate aim of restorative justice is to return all the parties, and at times the community, to balanced, harmonious relations. To do this requires examining each case holistically, to understand the full set of relations involved, and to work to bring them into harmony so far as possible. This is more complex than the normal workings of western criminal justice systems that focus narrowly on the offenders act in isolation, though mitigating (or aggravating) circumstances may be taken into account in sentencing. A key to working well with offenders - as with everyone else - is to speak and act with respect: to support, not criticize people, but to criticize inappropriate and harmful behavior and work to correct wrong thinking (while honoring a person's views and experience, so far as practicable in a mutually respectful dialog), to try to assist people in moving to be more fully who they really are.

Thus, the underlying principles of restorative justice flow as follows (Zehr, 2002, particularly Ch. 2; Pranis, Stuart and Wedge, 2003, Ch. 1 and 2). Crimes and equivalent harms are a violation of people and of interpersonal relationships. Since we are all related, interconnected, the violation creates an obligation on all parties, including the offender, to put things right - restore proper relationships - so far as possible (and where relationships were previously imperfect, to improve them, which may be illuminated by a harm).

Restorative justice processes may take any number of a wide variety of forms and be applied for different purposes (Zehr, 2002, particularly Ch3). In Twentieth Century North America, much of their use has been as alternative sentencing programs, following a standard judicial process to determine guilt (Zehr 2002, Ch. 3). This has had some special applications in the development of drug courts, that can focus on rehabilitation in alternative sentencing (Farole, Jr., Puffett, Rempel, and Byrne, 2005), in family courts, in dealing with domestic sex crimes (Johnston, 2013) and in Juvenile courts and restorative programs, where young people are widely considered generally more open to social and psychological reeducation (Hantzopoulos, 2013; Hanly Duncan and Dickie, 2013; and Pavelka, 2013). In addition, restorative justice is sometimes also used more broadly as the process for handling crimes, as remains the case in some Indigenous nations, as exemplified by Navajo peace making courts (Bluehouse and Zion, 1996; and Zion and Zion, 1996).

Moreover, following the Indigenous model, restorative justice can be utilized in dealing with all harms and injuries, civil as well criminal, and is so used outside the legal system in some institutions,

including workplaces and schools ("Uses Outside of Criminal Justice," <http://www.restorativejustice.org/press-room/06outside?searchterm=restorative+justice+in+workpl>, 2013; Restorative Justice in the Workplace," 2011). One example is the application of the Native Hawaiian problem solving process, *ho'oponopono*, a form of restorative justice, by a variety of social services, beginning in Hawaii in the 1970s (Shook, 2002). Although varying slightly in form, *ho'oponopono* follows the same basic principles of the Indigenous and restorative processes previously discussed. It is "a method for restoring harmony that was traditionally used within the extended family. According to Pukui, it literally means 'setting to right...to restore and maintain good relationships among family, and family and the super natural powers' (Shook, 2002, p. 10)." While first used to solve a case involving traditional Hawaiians, the practice quickly spread in Hawaii to include non-Hawaiian clients and practitioners in a variety of social service activities involving resolving conflicts and restoring relationships. *Ho'oponopono* was applied, for example, to resolve, family and business disputes, and was applied as an alternative mental health strategy to solve clients psychological and psychiatric problems (Shook, 2002, 96-97). Since the 1980's, *ho'oponopono* has been applied internationally, with many variations, as a method of conflict resolution in many settings (Sumrall, accessed January 4, 2014; Brinson & Fisher, 1999; ADR Resources: accessed January 4, 2014). (while a version of *ho'oponopono* has become internationally popular as a meditation method for individuals to attain inner harmony, ancient Huna.com, 2011, <http://www.ancienthuna.com/ho-oponopono.htm>; and <http://www.bing.com/search?q=ho'oponopono&form=APMCS1>, accessed December 28, 2013).

Thus, restorative justice practices are related to the whole expanding field of conflict resolution and conflict transformation, which encompasses a large number of participatory processes for solving interpersonal and inter group (or institution) problems, as well as a number of inclusive participatory strategic planning methods. Good examples of large and small scale participatory processes for transforming conflict into collaboration, and to prevent open conflict through inclusive dialogue are the work of the previously mentioned organizations, the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (<http://ncdd.org/>), the Network for Peace Through Dialogue (<http://ncdd.org/>), and Search for Common Ground (www.sfcg.org), while an excellent example of a participatory strategic planning process employed to restore community harmony and empower effective community actions is the Indigenous Leadership Interactive System (ILIS), discussed above.¹⁸ The rise and expansion of these participatory processes, particularly since World War II, is an indication of the increasing relevance of traditional Indigenous principles, values, and ways of being for the wider world of the Twenty-First Century.

In the fully participatory society, applying Indigenous values, restorative justice would be the general approach used to find justice in both the criminal and civil law, and it would be used informally, in various forms, as appropriate, in many institutions and organizations for dealing with inappropriate behavior. It is important to note that restorative justice uses punishment and compensation, when and as appropriate, as criminal and civil courts in the west have been doing for centuries. The difference is that restorative justice is broader, focusing on people and the full set of relations involved in each case or situation.

The Principle of Place: Applying Principles and Programs Appropriately For Each Situation

It is important to be aware that, like any social institution or device, restorative justice has to be instituted according to the culture and needs of the specific situation to which it is being applied, and adjusted appropriately as the circumstances change. Miller (2001, pp. 156-162), for example, reports

that the attempt to apply the Maori family group counseling model, favored by the Canadian government for sentencing diversion programs for First Nations, to the Sto:lo nation in British Columbia, functioned rather poorly, with much community resistance, because it did not fit the traditions and situation of the community, leading to a revised approach, beginning with discussions with people in the Sto:lo community. Indeed, participation by the people involved is usually critical to developing a well working program. Miller (2001, pp. 194-199) reported that one of the major reasons for the failure of the South Island Justice Project, a diversionary project among Salish communities in British Columbia, was failure to consult with the people of the communities, who agreed with the principles of the project, but found the top down approach of developing and implementing it caused it not to meet the needs of the community.

The importance of involving everyone involved in applying a principle, process, or program extends across the full range of human activity. Among the fields discussed in this chapter, for instance, organizational democracy demonstrates this again and again. Lesieur, (1958), for example, describes the change that occurred in a book manufacturing plant when the Scanlan Plan (a team participation process on the shop floor, offering teams that saved the firm money a share of the savings) was instituted. Just prior to its initiation, the plant engineers had come down to the book binding department and made a study, on the basis of which they designed and installed, over a long holiday weekend, an assembly line to replace the tables on wheels that workers rolled from station, moving books through the various stages of the binding process. On their return, the book binding employees were angry at the change, for two reasons. First they knew from experience that it would not work well (which it did not), and second, they were annoyed at being imposed on them. With the initiation of the Scanlan Plan at that time, one of the engineers came down to discuss the problem of improving the production process with the book binders. He first had to gain sufficient trust among the binders for them to be willing to engage in a meaningful discussion. He achieved this by pointing out some problems in what the engineers had designed, and admitting that the engineering study on which the assembly line was based was undertaken at an unrepresentative time. He then had to find appropriate communication methods. On finding that the binders could not readily work with blueprints, the engineer brought the binders an adjustable model of the assembly line. Then the book binders dialogued with the engineer to develop a flexible production system to fit changing conditions in the shop, that fit the employees work needs, and that was up to the technical standards of engineering. Thus production efficiency and employee morale and commitment increased.

Similarly, author Stephen Sachs found in interviewing Indianapolis police officers about the initial launching of the community policing process, discussed above, that the officers were unhappy with its being forced on them from headquarters. Again, the complaint was two fold. The officers did not appreciate a major change in their work being forced on them. But they also quickly observed that there were problems in the implementation, that were immediately obvious to them, but not to the top brass who did not work the streets. Among the problems was that the incentives for police officers were not change with the shift from a rapid response patrol model to a community relations approach. Officers, now ordered to spend time observing the neighborhoods they worked in and talking to residents about crime and safety related issues, were still being evaluated on the of how little time they spent on any task, and how quickly they moved on to the next call. It was only when the top officers in charge of the program talked with those carrying it out that the contradictions were removed, and the new program began to function well with a corresponding rise in how the police people involved felt about it.

This brings us back to the two part principle of place, which is fundamental to everything discussed in this paper. First, each location in place and time is different, so that appropriate general principles have to be applied in accordance with the specific needs of each situation. Second, each person needs to be respected and has a different way of seeing, or perspective, that needs to be included to make good decisions - decisions that people will own and support, so that the community will include everyone, and all will feel included, leading in turn to all citizens supporting, and being concerned about the community as a whole and each other, which is essential for the harmony and wellbeing of one and all.

End Notes

1. A summary of early, absentee and mail voting in the United States is available from the National Council of State Legislatures at: <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/elections/absentee-and-early-voting.aspx>, downloaded September 27, 2013.

There is also the question of the voting system. The United States has, with a few local exceptions, has always used a system of voting for individual candidates, with the candidate with the most votes winning the election (and in some state and local elections, a runoff between the top two candidates, if there are more than two, and no one achieves a majority in the initial election). The system tends to support having only two parties, which while promoting stability, does not necessarily lead to representative outcomes. Where there are more than two candidates, having the person with the most votes win may not bring about a representative result, and this is sometimes the case even with a run off between the top two candidates. What may be more representative - though it takes some education to get people to understand it - is a preferential ballot in which each voter votes (or may vote) for all the candidates in order of preference, telling the voter, in effect, if your first choice is eliminated for too few votes, what is your second, third, fourth, etc, choice. If someone gains a majority on the first round, they win. But if not, the candidate with the lowest votes is eliminated, and those who voted for that person as first choice have their second preference vote used. If now a candidate has a majority, then they are the winner. If not, the candidate now with the lowest votes (among those still in the race) is eliminated, and their next choice not already eliminated is counted, and so on for as many rounds as it takes until someone achieves a majority.

For example, there are four candidates who on the first round win the following percentage of the vote: A (a conservative) 29%, B (a liberal) 27%, C (a liberal) 25%, D (a socialist) 19%. D is eliminated, and his second round votes are counted with the following result: A 31%, B 33%, C 36%. No majority yet, so A is eliminated, and the next still in the race votes for A are counted resulting in B 55% and C 45%, so B is elected, and over all is probably the most representative candidate.

2. As author Stephen Sachs observed in a year of fieldwork in 1973-74, the Yugoslav system of social and workers' self-management operated moderately democratically in practice at the local level, but the political system became increasingly less democratic as one moved upward from the local to the national level, because as one moved further and further beyond the local level the leadership of the oligarchic (but not totalitarian) League of Communists increasingly was also the leadership of other major organizations. The main problem at the local and enterprise level, which also frustrated democracy at higher levels, was cultural, as most of the cultures of Yugoslavia did not have democratic traditions, and general education taught participatory democracy only in theory, with no opportunity to experience it in school, while managers, technical experts and those with higher education were taught to make decisions, rather than act as facilitators. The Yugoslav experience demonstrates the

requirement of participatory democratic structures to develop and function on the basis of participatory culture and education, if they are in fact to function participatively, as is discussed below. Rousseau, who learned much from American Indians, makes this point in *The Social Contract*, including in Chapter XII.

3. Mass movements, such as Arab spring, in both the short and long run, may or may not be effective in bringing democratizing equalitarian change. The issue here is not what makes for a successful movement, or whether a particular movement is successful, but whether such movements have a democratizing tendency, which the Arab Spring movements have had, regardless of whether the democratic movements, for example, in Syria have been lost in the collapse of the country into a terrible civil war, or become greatly reduced in Egypt, amid political developments including the army reasserting power. Moreover, while such movements have their ebbs and flows, from a long term perspective, the beginning score of years of the Twenty-First Century, appears to be a period of increase in such movements.

4. The dysfunctional aspects of hierarchy in organizations are discussed in Argyris, 1957, "The Individual and the Organization, A Problem of Mutual Adjustment." For more detailed analysis of some of the aspects of the psychological and other problems encouraged by hierarchy see Coch and French, 1953, "Overcoming Resistance to Change;" Blauner, 1964, *Alienation and Freedom*; Walker, 1950, "The problem with the Repetitive Job; Morse, 1953, *Satisfaction in the White Collar Job*; and Melman, 1958, *Decision making and Productivity*.

5. For example, see. Roethlisberger, 1941 "The Hawthorne Experiments."

6. For an example of the cybernetics or communication approach to organizations see, Galbraith, 1973, "Information Processing Model", in Galbraith, *Designing Complex Organizations*, Ch. 2, reprinted in Shafritz and Ott, 1992, pp. 308-315.

7. Discussed in Thomas and Logan, (1982) Campbell, et al, 1977; Mollner, 1984; Gutierrez-Johnson and Whyte, 1977, pp. 18-30; Gutierrez-Johnson, Compensation, Equity and Industrial Democracy in the Mondragon Cooperatives," *Economic Analysis and Workers' Self-Management*, 12, pp. 267-289; Oakeshott, 1975, pp. 290-296; and Medanie, 1983.

8. Vanek, Jaroslav (1971), Ch. 4. Additional information is available from the World Bank Country Economic Report by Schrenk, Ardalan and Tatawy, *Yugoslavia*.

9. Unpublished research in the 1980s by Stephen Sachs.

10. Such coordination was first attempted very late in Lyndon Johnson's Administration, with the launching of the National Council on Indian Opportunity (NCIO). The model used had several advantages. NCIO consisted of the Secretaries of the 7 U.S. government departments that dealt significantly with Indians (Interior, Agriculture, Agriculture, Commerce, Health Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity), six presidentially appointed Indian leaders, and was headed by the Vice President of the United States, who stood above the cabinet members. This avoided the problem in the later Clinton administration model of having the Secretary of Interior the chair, who had conflicts of interest on Indian Issues in his own department, and as an equal with the other department heads with whom he had to deal with diplomatically, was limited in his effectiveness. The problem with designating the Vice President as chair, is that it would depend who the Vice President would happen to be, so that it would be better to have the President appoint a chair, who might be the Vice President or a top White House Staff member, as appropriate in the particular case. NCIO achieved some important accomplishments. It was

short lived (1968-1974), however, underfunded and understaffed, and, because of the politics of the time, the council rarely met, though its staff was quite active (Britten, 2014). After, and to a considerable extent during, the Nixon Administration, until the Clinton Administration, federal Indian Policy was coordinated on an ad hoc basis (Harris, Sachs and Morris, 2011, Ch. 3, Section 1).

11. There are numerous examples of effective employee involvement programs collapsing because of bad feelings arising over collective bargaining. A classic example is that of ARMCO steel plant in Ashland, KY. The collaborative effort of the plant's team process was a major factor in its achieving the lowest cost in the world for steel production. But because management failed to appreciate, and take into account, labor's concern on a major issue, the team process arrangement fell apart, reducing the plant's ability to keep production costs low and product quality high. See, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Management Relations and Cooperative Programs (1990), *ARMCO Steel's Quality Plus Program at Ashland Kentucky*, briefly reported in "Keeping Current," 1990, p. 8. On Nonviolent conflict resolution and training, for example go to Search for Common Ground: http://search.freefind.com/find.html?q=Abortion&id=77561039&pageid=r&_charset_=&bcd=%C3%B7&scs=1&query=nonviolent+training&Find=Search&mode=ALL; or the Fellowship of Reconciliation Peacemaker Training Institute: <http://www.forusa.org/programs/pti/default.html>. On parallel development of respectful interpersonal relations and decision making in participatory workplaces, see Bernstein, 1980; and Sachs, 1991; and Sachs 1994.

12. See the discussion of reforming government in Osborne and Gaebler, 1991., which grows out of the movement for workplace democratization, involving institution in a modern context of the traditional tribal and band principles of inclusive consensus decision making.

13. Carole Pateman, in her classic work, *Participation and Democratic Theory* (1970) first shows that theorists such as John Stuart Mill have long considered every day participation in workplaces an excellent education for citizenship in a democratic polity (Ch. 2, particularly, pp. 28-35). She supports these theoretical predictions with pragmatic evidence, concluding (p. 105):

Yet we have seen that the evidence supports the arguments of Rousseau, Mill and Cole that we do learn to participate by participating and that feelings of political efficacy [necessary to make people believe that participating is worth while, and thus essential to motivating them to participate] are more likely to be developed in a participatory environment. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that the experience of a participatory authority might also be effective in diminishing tendencies toward non-democratic attitudes in the individual.

Pateman's findings continue to be supported and reinforced by recent research. For example, Richard S. Beth, "How Transformationalists Think About Transformation: Themes and Implications," *Proceedings of the 1995 American Political Science Association Meeting*, p. 63, having indicated that active participation (such as occurs on teams in participatory workplaces) tends to develop "a mindful engagement with experience in the participants that tends to make them reflective upon their relations with others, and self-reflective about their own development and action," Beth goes on to report:

Fourth, mindful engagement with experience in the context of political practice would also foster transformation into less authoritarian or dominative forms of people's sense of, and relation to, leadership. As respondent (e1) pointed out, the process of transformation is inherently political in that it involves the transformation of power relations. When leaders proceed in mindful engagement

with other participants, it will tend to transform their awareness of, and relation to, those participants toward more facilitative and collaborative styles of leadership...

Nor is it only leadership that would be transformed by the practice of responsive engagement with members. The development of group members' own sense of empowerment, or understanding of themselves as capable of participation, would also tend to transform their responses to all these kinds of leaders toward more participatory and less authoritarian forms, which in turn would require leaders to engage in less dominative styles of action.

Further empirical support is given by Jane Junn, "Participation in Liberal Democracy: What Citizens Learn from Political Activity," pp. 28-29:

The objective of this analysis was to demonstrate empirically a particularly important hypothesis of democratic theory, that citizen participation has an educative or transformative effect on individual citizens. The results from the estimation of simultaneous equation models hypothesizing reciprocal causality reveal that citizens who are active in politics and social life are in fact more knowledgeable about politics as a result of their participation.... The findings provide support for the hypothesis that taking part in political and social life makes a difference; citizens learn about politics by being part of it. In this sense, political knowledge is not only important for democracy in its *role for* making good decisions, but instead, knowledge is also the *result of* democracy.

14. The reason for this tendency toward overcoming undesirable inequalities, when it is possible and appropriate to do so, through increasing the means for achieving reduction in difference, rather than by legislating its reduction directly, follows from the empowering action and achievement oriented gestalt of workplace team process, and the similar empowerment oriented approach of the related child needs oriented educational reforms. That is, the cultural orientation in both cases is towards empowerment for achieving ends, to the extent that that is appropriate, rather than providing the desired benefit to passive recipients. This can be seen in slightly different form in the principle of "regulating with, rather than against, the market," when possible, discussed in Osborne and Gaebler, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*, Ch. 10, favoring approaches that use incentives rather than commands, to the extent practicable, as this tends to move away from a control, toward an empowerment oriented, approach.

15. An examination of the text of Osborne and Gaebler (1993) will show that it stems directly from the kind of thinking engendered by the rise of team process in the workplace, though from that beginning it necessarily (to be consistent with such thinking) extends beyond it in considering matters of public policy, as is seen in comparing the author's 10 principles of governance with the new work place principles. In Osborne and Gaebler's version of the new politics, government needs to proceed, so far as is practicable, as: 1) catalytic government: steering rather than rowing; 2) community-owned government: empowering rather than serving; 3) competitive government: injecting competition into service delivery; 4) mission-driven government: transforming rule driven organizations into purpose oriented units; 5) results-oriented government: funding outcomes, not inputs; 6) customer-driven government: meeting the needs of the customer, not the bureaucracy; 7) enterprising government: earning rather than spending; 8) anticipatory government: preventing rather than curing; 9) decentralized government: moving from hierarchy to participation; 10) market-oriented government: leveraging change through the market.

16. This is well spelled out in Will Marshall and Martin Schram, *Mandate for Change* (New York,: Berkeley Books, 1993), and exemplified by the designation of Vice President Gore to head a "Reinventing Government" commission to lead reform the federal bureaucracy (See Vice President Al Gore, *Creating A Government that Works Better and Costs Less: The Gore Report on Reinventing Government* (New York: Random House, 1993). Since the 1990s, a strong "conservative" reaction has become a strong force in American politics, running completely counter to this line of thinking, and these types of policies. But this emergent thinking remains in the population, and may well be a harbinger of change in the longer run.

17. See H. Aram Veesser, *The New Historicism* (New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc., 1989). The relation of this approach to the emerging consciousness is evident in some of the editor's comments:

Conventional scholars--entrenched, self-absorbed, protective of guild loyalties and turf, specialized in the worst senses--have repaired to their disciplinary enclaves and committed a classic *_trahison des clercs_*. As the first successful counterattack in decades against this profoundly anti-intellectual ethos, New Historicism has given scholars new opportunities to cross the boundaries separating history, anthropology, art, politics, literature, and economics. It has struck down the doctrine of noninterference that forbade humanists to intrude on questions of politics, power, indeed on all matters that deeply affect people's practical lives--matters best left, prevailing wisdom went, to experts who could be trusted to preserve order and stability in "our" global and intellectual domains." (IX)

A newcomer to New Historicism might feel reassured that, for all its heterogeneity, key assumptions continually reappear and bind together the avowed practitioners and even some of their critics: these assumptions are as follows:

1. That every expressive act is embedded in a network of material practices;
2. That every act of unmasking, critique, and opposition uses the tools it condemns and risks falling prey to the practice it opposes;
3. That literary and non-literary "texts" circulate inseparably;
4. That no discourse, imaginative or archival, gives access to unchanging truths nor expresses inalterable human nature;
5. Finally . . . that a critical method and a language adequate to describe culture under capitalism participate in the economy they describe.

... The New Historicists combat empty formalism by pulling historical considerations to the center stage of literary analysis. . . . New Historicists have evolved a method of describing culture in action. (xii)

The motives are clear. By forsaking what it sees as an outmoded vocabulary of allusion, symbolization, allegory, and mimesis, New Historicism seeks less limiting means to expose the manifold ways culture and society affect each other. . . . New Historicism renegotiates these relationships between texts and other signifying practices, going so far (as Terence Hawkes has observed) as to dissolve "literature" back into the historical complex that academic criticism has traditionally held at arms length. It retains at the same time, those methods and materials that gave old fashioned literary study its immense interpretive authority .

... By discarding what they view as monologic and myopic historiography, by demonstrating that social and cultural events commingle messily, by rigorously exposing the innumerable tradeoffs, the competing bids and exchanges of culture, New Historicists can make a valid claim to have established new ways of studying history and a new awareness of how history and culture define each other. (xii-xiii)

The emergence of indicators of consciousness change that are appearing across a wide spectrum of fields and activities fits Jean Gebser's finding that the world is moving from "three dimensional" to "four dimensional" consciousness (*The Ever Present Origin* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1953). Interestingly, it also fits the pattern of more positive outcomes in moving from the "fourth world" to the "fifth world" of the Hopi prophecies as described in Thomas Mails, *The Hopi Survival Kit* (New York: Stewart, Tabori and Chang, Media Holdings, Inc, 1997).

18. For more information and resources concerning conflict transformation and resolution visit, among others: Peacemakers Trust, the Canadian charitable organization dedicated to research and education on conflict transformation and peacebuilding at: <http://www.peacemakers.ca/>; the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (NCDD) at: <http://ncdd.org/>; The Alliance for Conflict Transformation (ACT) at: <http://www.conflicttransformation.org/>; and the National Conflict Resolution Center (NCRC) at: <http://ncrconline.com/>.

References

- "1992 Presidential Debate with George HW Bush, Bill Clinton & Ross Perot, "(2008) C-SPAN, October 06, 2008, <http://MOXNews.com/> and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jg9qB_BIjWY.
- Adizes, Ichak (1971). *Industrial Democracy: Yugoslav Style, The Effect of Decentralization on Organizational Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- ADR Resources (accessed January 4, 2014). [http://adrresources.com/adr-news/328/hooponopono-hawaiian-traditional-dispute-resolution-philosophy'](http://adrresources.com/adr-news/328/hooponopono-hawaiian-traditional-dispute-resolution-philosophy)
- ancient huna.com (2011), <http://www.ancienthuna.com/ho-ooponopono.htm>.
- Argyris, Chris (1957). "The Individual and the Organization, A Problem of Mutual Adjustment," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2.
- Aristotle (1985). *The Politics*, Translated with an Introduction, Notes and Glossary by Carnes Lord. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Atkin, Nicholas (2004). *The Fifth French Republic*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barber, Benjamin R. (1984). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Becker, Theodore Lewis and Christa Daryl Slaton (2000). *Future of Teledemocracy*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Bernstein, Paul (1980). *Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Beth, Richard S. (1995). "How Transformationalists Think About Transformation: Themes and Implications," *Proceedings of the 1995 American Political Science Association Meeting*. Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association.

- Blauner Robert (1964) *Alienation and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blinder, Alan S., Ed. (1990), *Paying for Productivity: A Look at the Evidence*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Bluehouse, Philmer and James Zio (1996). "Hozhooji Naat'aanii: The Navajo Nation Justice and Harmony Ceremony," in Neilson, Marianne O. and Robert A. Silverman, *Native Americans, Crime and Justice*. Boulder: CO, Westview Press, 1996, pp. 181—182.
- Boothe, Ivan (2012), "The Occupy Movement: What Democracy Looks Like," *Nonviolent Change*, 26: 2, winter 2012.
- Bourdieu, P. and L.J.D. Wacquant (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bowen. Glenn A. (2008). "An analysis of citizen participation in anti-poverty programmes," *Community Development Journal*, 43:1, January 2008 pp. 65–78.
- Brinson, J. and T.A. Fisher (1999). "The Ho'oponopono Group: A Conflict Resolution Model for School Counselors." *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 24:4, pp. 369-382.
- Britten, Thomas A. (2014). *The National Council on Indian Opportunity: Quiet Champion of Self-Determination*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Brown, Lee P. (1989). *Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Cahn, Edgar (2000). *No More Throw-Away People: The Co-Production Imperative*. Washington, DC: Essential Books.
- "California Enterprise Zones," (2013). California Department of Housing and Community Development, <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/fa/ez/>.
- California Victim Compensation Program (CalVCP) (2013). <http://www.vcgcb.ca.gov/victims/>.
- "Campaign Finance: Comparative Summary" (2009). Washington, DC: Library of Congress, <http://www.loc.gov/law/help/campaign-finance/comparative-summary.php>.
- Campbell, Alastair, et al, (1977). *Worker Ownership: The Mondragon Achievement*. London: Anglo-German Foundation for the Study of Society.
- Citizens Power* (1992). 18: 2, Fall 1992, published by Citizens Action Coalition, 3951 N. Meridian St., Suite 300 Indianapolis, IN 46208.
- Carroll, Rory (2013). "Activists protest Koch brothers' links to purchase of Los Angeles Times," *The Guardian*, May 14, 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/may/14/los-angeles-times-los-angeles>.
- Cartwright, D. and Z. Zander, Eds. (1953), *Group Dynamics*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Center for Nonviolent Communications, 2013, <http://www.cnvc.org/>.
- Chanel 97, City of Stockton, CA, downloaded October 11, 2013, <http://www.stocktongov.com/government/departments/manager/pub97.html>.
- Chandola, M. Varn (1992-93). "Affirmative Action in India and the United States: The Untouchable and Black Experience." 3 *Ind. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev.* 101, [http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/iic13&div=7&id=&page=\(1992-1993\)](http://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/iic13&div=7&id=&page=(1992-1993)).
- Clark, Wilson (1975). *Energy for Survival*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

- Cloward, Richard A. and Francis Fox Piven, "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty," *Nation*, May 2, 1966.
- Coch, L. and J.R.P. French (1953). "Overcoming Resistance to Change," in Cartwright, D. and Z. Zander, (Eds.), *Group Dynamics*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Coleman, Veronica, Walter C. Holton, Jr., Kristine Olson, Stephen C. Robinson and Judith Stewart (1999). "Using Knowledge and Teamwork To Reduce Crime", *National Institute of Justice Journal*, No. 88, October 1999.
- Davies, Gareth (1996), *From Opportunity to Entitlement: The Transformation and Decline of Great Society Liberalism*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1996.
- Dewey, Caitlin (2012). "How the Middle East uses social media, in four charts," *Washington Post*, December 19, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2012/12/19/how-the-middle-east-uses-social-media-in-four-charts/>.
- Dowling, William F. (1973). "Job Redesign on the Assembly Line: Farewell to Blue Collar Blues?" *Organization Dynamics*, 2, pp. 51-67.
- Downes, James F. (1972) *The Navajo*. New York: Holt Reinhart and Winston, Inc.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1989). *The New Realities*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1993). *Post Capitalist Society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Econ Matters, "Is Speculation the Reason for High Oil and Gasoline Prices (2011). Econ Matters, May 6, 2011, <http://www.econmatters.com/2011/05/speculation-does-not-explain-high-oil.html>.
- Elizar, Daniel (1973). *American Federalism*. New York: Thomas Crowell Co.
- Emery, F.E. and Einar Torsrud (1969), *Form and Content in Industrial Democracy*. London: Tavistock Institute.
- "Executive Order - Establishing the White House Council on Native American Affairs" (2013). Office of the Press Secretary, Press Release, June 26, 2013.
- "EPA, Quale, Committee Head for Showdown" (1991). *The Indianapolis News*, November 21, 1991. pp. A1 & A4.
- Executive Order 13647 of June 26, 2013 Establishing the White House Council on Native American Affairs, 39539 Federal Register / Vol. 78, No. 126/Monday, July 1, 2013/Presidential Documents.
- The Fair Elections Act (2013). http://dianerussell.nationbuilder.com/fair_elections_act.
- Farole, Jr., Donald J., Nora Puffett, Michael Rempel, and Francine Byrne (2005). "Applying the Problem-Solving Model Outside of Problem-Solving Courts," *Judicature*, 89:1, July – August 2005.
- Fellowship of Reconciliation Peacemaker Training Institute: <http://www.forusa.org/programs/pti/default.html>.
- "Financial Speculation Tax," (2013). Northland Democratic Club, http://www.northlanddem.org/Financial_Speculation_Tax.php.
- "Financial Transfer Tax" (2013). CEPR, <http://www.cepr.net/index.php/issues/fst/>.
- Fischer, Louis (1990). *American Constitutional Law, Third Edition*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press.

- "The Freedmen's Bureau, 1865-1872", African American Heritage, U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, <http://www.archives.gov/research/african-americans/freedmens-bureau/>.
- Friedland, Lewis A. (1996). "Electronic Democracy and the New Citizenship," *Media, Culture and Society*, 18, pp. 185-212, Reprinted on CPN, <http://www.cpn.org/crm/contemporary/electronic.html>.
- Fritschler, A. Lee (1969). *Smoking and Politics: Policy Making and the Federal Bureaucracy* New York: Appleton Century Crofts.
- Galbraith, Jay (1973). "Information Processing Model", in Galbraith, Jay *Designing Complex Organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- Gebser, Jean (1953). *The Ever Present Origin*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Georgakas, Dan and Marvin Surkin (1975). *Detroit I Do Mind Dying: A Study in Urban Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Goldman, Irving (1937). "The Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island," in Mead, Margaret, ed., *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, pp. 180-209.
- Goldstein, Herman (1988). "Toward Community Oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements and Threshold Questions," *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, pp. 6-30.
- Greene, Jack R. and Stephen D. Mastrofski, eds (1988). *Crime and Delinquency*. New York: Praeger.
- Greenstone, David and Paul E. Peterson (1973). *Race and Authority in Urban Politics: Community Relations and the War on Poverty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grodzins, Morton (1966). *The American System: A New View of the Government of the United States*. New York: Rand McNally.
- Grossman, Richard S. (2013). *WRONG: Nine Economic Policy Disasters and What We Can Learn from Them*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gutierrez-Johnson, A. (1978). "Compensation, Equity and Industrial Democracy in the Mondragon Cooperatives," *Economic Analysis and Workers' Self-Management*, 12, 1978, pp. 267-289.
- Gutierrez-Johnson, A. and William Foote Whyte (1977). "The Mondragon System of Worker Production Cooperatives," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 31: 1, October 1977, pp. 18-30.
- Hanley Duncan, Susan and Ida Dickie (2013). "Family group conferencing: A pilot project within the juvenile court system in Louisville, Kentucky," *The Prevention Researcher*, 20/1, pp. 11-14, http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/integratedresearchsvcs/pr_201302/#/16.
- Hantzopoulos, Maria (2013). "The Fairness Committee: Restorative justice in a small urban public high school," *The Prevention Researcher*, 20: 1, pp 7-10, http://www.nxtbook.com/nxtbooks/integratedresearchsvcs/pr_201302/#/12.
- Harris, LaDonna, Stephen M. Sachs and Barbara Morris (2011). *Recreating the Circle: The Renewal of American Indian Self Determination*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

- Howard, John and Stephen Deutsch (1970). *Where It's at: Radical Perspectives on Sociology*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers. <http://www.bing.com/search?q=ho'oponopono&form=APMCS1>, accessed December 28, 2013.
- Hunius, Gerry G. David Garson and John Case (1973). *Workers' Control: A Reader on Labor and Social Change*. New York: Random House.
- IGA (2013) <http://www.iga.com/consumer/default.aspx>.
- Jacobs, Andrew (2013). "Plans to Harness Chinese River's Power Threaten a Region," *The New York Times*, May 4, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/asia/plans-to-harness-chinas-nu-river-threaten-a-region.html?ref=todayspaper>.
- Johnson, Ian (2013). "China's Great Uprooting: Moving 250 Million Into Cities," *The New York Times*, June 15, 2013, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/16/world/asia/chinas-great-uprooting-moving-250-million-into-cities.html?ref=todayspaper>.
- Johnston, Kirsty (2013). "Alternative road for victims of sex crime," *Fairfax New Zealand News*, December 22, 2013, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/9544771/Alternative-road-for-victims-of-sex-crime>.
- Junn, Jane (1995). "Participation in Liberal Democracy: What Citizens Learn from Political Activity," *Proceedings of the 1995 American Political Science Association Meeting*. Washington, DC: The American Political Science Association.
- Kids Health from Nemours (2013). http://kidshealth.org/parent/positive/family/tv_affects_child.html.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde and Dorothy Leighton (1974). *The Navaho*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- "Keeping Current" (1990). *Labor Relations Today*, November/December, 1990.
- Kocieniewski, David (2013) "A Shuffle of Aluminum, but to Banks, Pure Gold," *The New York Times*, July 20, 2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/21/business/a-shuffle-of-aluminum-but-to-banks-pure-gold.html?_r=0.
- Korten, David (1995). *When Corporations Rule the World*, West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Kozal, Jonathan (1991). *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Kretzmann, J.P. and J.L. McKnight (1993). *Building Communities from the Inside Out: A Path toward Finding and Mobilizing a Community's Assets*. Chicago: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research/Acta Press.
- Kropotkin, Peter (2010). *Mutual Aid: A Factor in Evolution*. www.digireads.com: Digireads.com Publishing.
- Lawler III, Edward E., Susan Albers Mohrman and Gerald E. Ledford, Jr. (1992). *Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management: Practices and Results in Fortune 1000 Companies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lederach, John Paul (2003). *The Little Book of Conflict Transformation*. Good Books.
- Lederach, John Paul (2003a). "Conflict Transformation," Beyond Intractability, <http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/transformation/>.
- Lesieur, Frederick (1958). *The Scanlan Plan: A Frontier in Labor Management Cooperation*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.

- Li, Bingqin and David Piachaud (2004), *Poverty and Inequality and Social Policy in China*. London: Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Mails, Thomas (1997). *The Hopi Survival Kit*. New York: Stewart, Tabori and Chang, Media Holdings, Inc.
- Mansbridge, Jane (1980). *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, Jane (2010). "Covert Operations: The billionaire brothers who are waging a war against Obama." *The New Yorker*, August 30, 2010, http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/08/30/100830fa_fact_mayer.
- Maystre, Nicholas (2011). *Econ Matters*, May 6, 2011, <http://www.econmatters.com/2011/05/speculation-does-not-explain-high-oil.html>
- McChesney, Robert and John Nichols (2013). "Dollarocracy: How big money undermines our democracy and how we can take it back," *The Nation*, September 16, 2013, posted on Common Dreams, <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2013/09/16-8>.
- McGregor, Douglas (1967). "The Human Side of Management," *Management Review*, 1967, reprinted in Ott, J. Steven (1989). *Classic Readings in Organizational Behavior*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- MacKenzie, G. Calvin and Robert Weisbrot (2008). *Washington and the Politics of Change in the 1960s*.(New York, Penguin Books.
- Mead, Margaret, ed. (1937). *Cooperation and Competition Among Primitive Peoples*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Medanie, Germal (1983). "Mondragon: Your Add Is About to Run Out," *Grassroots Economic Organizing Newsletter*, No. 10, September/October, 1983.
- Melman, Seymour (1958). *Decision Making and Productivity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Melton, Ada Pecos (2005). "Indigenous Justice Systems and Tribal Society," in McCaslin, Wanda D., ed (2005). *Justice as Healing: Indigenous Ways, Writings on Community Peacemaking and Restorative Justice from the Native Law Centre*. St. Paul: Living Justice Press.
- Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo*, 418 U.S. 241 (1974).
- Miller, Bruce G. (2001). *The Problem of Justice: Tradition and Law in the Coast Salish World*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Mollner, Terry (1984). *Mondragon: A Third Way*. Shutesbury, MA: Trustee Institute, Inc.
- Moore, Mark Harrison (1992). "Problem-Solving and Community Policing," in Tonry, M. and N. Morris (1992). *Modern Policing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morse, Nancy (1953). *Satisfaction in the White Collar Job*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Move On.org: moveon.org.
- Nalbantian, Haig R, ed.. (1987). *Incentives, Cooperation, and Risk Sharing: Economic and Psychological Perspectives on Employment Contracts*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield.
- National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, <http://ncdd.org>.
- National Council of State Legislatures (2013), "Absentee and Early Voting". <http://www.ncsl.org/legislatures-elections/elections/absentee-and-early-voting.aspx>.

- Naylor, Larry L. (1997). *Cultural Diversity in the United States*. Indianapolis: Greenwood Publishing
- National Science Foundation, www.nsf.gov.
- Network for Peace Through Dialogue, <http://ncdd.org/>.
- Neilson, Marianne O. and Robert A. Silverman, *Native Americans, Crime and Justice*. Boulder: CO, Westview Press, 1996.
- Oakeshott, Robert, (1975). "Mondragon: Spain's Oasis of Democracy," in Vanek Jaroslav, ed, *Self-Management: The Economic Liberation of Man*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc.
- Obradovic, Josip and William Dunn (1978). *Workers' Self-Management and Organizational Power in Yugoslavia*. Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh.
- Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler (1993). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ott, J. Steven (1989). *Classic Readings in Organizational Behavior*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Ouchi, William (1981). *Theory Z Corporations: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Pateman, Carole (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavelka, Sandra (2013). "Practices and policies for implementing restorative justice within schools," *The Prevention Researcher* 20: 1. pp. 15-17.
- Pinchot, Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot (1993). *The End of Bureaucracy and the Rise of the Intelligent Organization*. (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- "Pilot Program Saves County \$151,000" (1982), *Workplace Democracy*, 9:3, Spring 1982.
- Pranis, Kay, Barry Stuart and Mark Wedge (2003). *Peace Making Circles: From Crime to Community*. Saint Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Putnam, R.D. (1994). "Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital," *Journal of Democracy*, 6: 1: 6-78.
- Ravichandran, Padma and Brandel France de Bravo, MPH (2012). "Young Children and Screen Time (Television, DVDs, Computer)." National Research Center for Women and Families, <http://center4research.org/child-teen-health/early-childhood-development/young-children-and-screen-time-television-dvds-computer/>.
- Ray, Paul H. (1996) *The Integral Culture Survey*, Sausalito, CA: The Institute for Noetic Sciences.
- Raynor, Doug (1985). "W.L. Gore: Creating a Business Without Bosses," *Workplace Democracy*, 12: 2, Fall, 1985.
- Research.gov.
- "Restorative Justice in the Workplace" (2011). Mediation Services, April 27, 2011, <http://mediationserviceswpg.wordpress.com/2011/04/27/restorative-justice-in-the-workplace/>.

- Riddell, David (1970) "Social Self-Government in Yugoslav Socialism," in Howard, John and Stephen Deutsch, *Where Its at: Radical Perspectives on Sociology*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Ross, Rupert (1996). *Returning to the Teachings: Exploring Aboriginal Justice*. Toronto: Penguin, Canada.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques (1950). *The Social Contract and Discourses*. New York: E.P Dutton and Company.
- Roethlisberger Frederick J. (1941). "The Hawthorne Experiments," in *Management and Morale*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rusmich, Ladislav and Stephen M. Sachs (2003). *Lessons from the Failure of the Communist Economic System*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Russell, Diane, 2013, http://dianerussell.nationbuilder.com/fair_elections_act.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1977, 1981). "Some Reflections Upon Workers' Self-Management in Yugoslavia," *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora: Critical Thought on Greek and World Issues*, 4:1, March 1977. Reprinted as *Workplace Democracy Paper #4* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Workplace Democracy, 1981).
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1984). "Uncertain Verdict: In the Auto Industry the Participation and Quality of Worklife Programs Have Mixed Results," *Workplace Democracy*, 11:2, Fall, 1984.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1987). "Educating for Workplace and Economic Democracy," International Conference on the Politics of Economic Democracy, International Sociology Association, Research Committee 10.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1991). "Workplace Revolution, Education and Political Transformation," *Proceedings of the 1991 American Political Science Association Meeting*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1992). "The Putney School: John Dewey Is alive and Well in Southern Vermont," *Democracy & Education*, 6: 3, Spring 1992, pp. 35-41.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1994), "Building Trust in Democratic Organizations," *Psychology*, 31: 2.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1994a). "Los Angeles and Somalia: Community Service Policing and Community Empowerment," *Nonviolent Change*, Vol. VIII, No. 2-3, Winter-Spring, 1994, reprinted in The Consortium on Peace, Research, Education and Development, *COPRED Peace Chronicle*, 19: 2, December, 1994.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (1997). "The Interaction of Forces for and Against Political and Social Transformation," *Proceedings of the 1997 American Political Science Association Meeting* (Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 1997).
- Sachs, Stephen M. (2008). "Climate Change, Environmental Decay and Indigenous People: Indigenizing the Greening of the World." *Indigenous Policy*, 19: 2, Summer 2008.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (2011). "Remembering the Traditional Meaning and Role of Kinship In American Indian Societies, To Overcome Problems of Favoritism In Contemporary Tribal Government," *Proceedings of the 2011 Western Social Science Association Meeting, American Indian Studies Section*, in *Indigenous Policy*, 22:2, Fall 2011.
- Sachs, Stephen M. (2013). "We Face a Critical Moment As the World Moves Into a New Period," *Nonviolent Change*, 27: 1, Fall 2013.

- Sachs, Stephen M. (2013a). "Honoring the Circle, The impact of American Indian Tradition of Western Political Thought and Society," *Indigenous Policy*, 24: 2, Fall 2013.
- Sachs, Stephen M. and Nahoma Sachs (1974), "Political Participation in a Macedonian Village." Chicago: Midwest Political Science Association Meeting.
- Sanders, Bernie (2012). "Wall Street greed fueling high gas prices," CNN, February 28, 2012, <http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/28/opinion/sanders-gas-speculation/index.html>.
- Sanders, Senator Bernie (2013). <http://www.fedupusa.org/2012/09/senator-bernie-sanders-we-need-public-funding-of-elections/> and <http://www.sanders.senate.gov/legislation/issue/campaign-finance>.
- Schaur, Helmut (1973). "Critique of Co-Determination," in Hunius, Gerry, G. David Garson and John Case, *Workers' Control: A Reader on Labor and Social Change*. New York: Random House.
- Schillinger, Raymond (2011). "Social Media and the Arab Spring: What Have We Learned," *The Huffington Post*, September 20, 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/raymond-schillinger/arab-spring-social-media_b_970165.html.
- Search for Common Ground, <http://www.sfcg.org>.
- Search for Common Ground's defusing of the abortion issue, go to: http://search.freefind.com/find.html?id=77561039&pageid=r&mode=ALL&n=0&_charset_=&bcd=%C3%B7&query=Abortion.
- Shafritz, Jay M. and J. Stephen Ott (1992). *Classics of Organization Theory*, Third Edition.(Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Shapiro, Gary (1999). "The Neighborhood Facilitators Project in Bosnia Post-War Community Peacebuilding, from the Bottom Up, Excerpts from the Executive Summary" Parts I and II, in *Nonviolent Change*, 13: 3, Spring 1999, pp. 17-20, and 14: 1, Fall 1999, pp. 17.
- Shook, Victoria (2002). *Ho'oponopono: Contemporary Uses of a Hawaiian Problem Solving Process*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Simmons, John and William Mares (1983). *Working Together*. New York: Knopf.
- Simanovsky, Natalia (2012). "Multiculturalism in Canada: A Model for Other Countries," *Nonviolent Change*, 26/3, Spring 2012. This article was written for the Common Ground News Service (CGNews, www.commongroundnews.org), March 12, 2012, who distributed it with copyright permission granted for publication.
- Smith, Jeff (1991). "Traditional Foes Agree on Gasoline Formula," *Indianapolis Star*, 89: 73, 1991, pp. 1, 7.
- Smith, Hedrick (1995). *Rethinking America*. New York: Random House.
- Sumrall, Shannon (accessed January 4, 2014). Ho'oponopono, <http://www.healthsurvey.com/hoopono.htm>.
- Sewart, LaShonda M., Steven A. Miller and R.W. Hildreth (2014). "Participatory Budgeting in the United States: A Preliminary Analysis of Chicago's 49th Ward Experiment," *New Political Science*, Vol. 36, No. 2, June 2014.
- Taylor, Federick (1916). "The Principles of Scientific Management," in Jay M. and J. Stephen Ott (1992) *Classics of Organization Theory*, Third Edition. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Taylor, Federick (1947). *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Tausky, Curt (1978). *Work Organizations: Major Theoretical Perspectives*, Second Edition. Ithaca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Thomas, Henk and Chris Logan (1982). *Mondragon: An Economic analysis*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Time Banks, 2012, <http://timebanks.org/>.
- Time Dollar Institute, 2012, <http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/MoreCaseyInitiatives/ProgramProfiles/TimeDollarIntro.aspx>.
- Tonry, M. and N. Morris (1992). *Modern Policing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Trojanowicz, Robert (1990) and Bonnie Bucqueroux. *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati, OH.
- Tucker, Robert C. (1972). *The Marx Engels Reader*, Second Edition. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1972.
- “UNCTAD: High Frequency Trading and Speculation Leads to Higher Prices,” The Real News.com, November 1, 2012, http://www.therealnews.com/t2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=31&Itemid=74&jumival=8894.
- University of Foreign Military And Cultural studies (2012). *Red Team Handbook*. April 2012 Distribution, http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/UFMCS/repository/RT_Handbook_v6.pdf.
- "Uses Outside of Criminal Justice" (2013). Restorative Justice.org. <http://www.restorativejustice.org/press-room/06outside>.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Management Relations and Cooperative Programs (1990). *ARMCO Steel's Quality Plus Program at Ashland Kentucky*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Management Relations and Cooperative Programs.
- “U.S. Government Sponsored Collaborations,” 2013, Siemens, http://www.usa.siemens.com/en/about_us/research/home/government.htm.
- van Biezen, Ingrid (2003), *Financing political parties and election campaigns –guidelines*. Council of Europe Publishing, printed in Germany, http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/evaluations/round3/Financing_Political_Parties_en.pdf.
- Vanek, Jaroslav (1971). *The Participatory Economy: An Evolutionary Hypothesis and a Strategy for Development*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Vanek Jaroslav, ed. (1975). *Self-Management: The Economic Liberation of Man*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc.
- Walker, Charles H. (1950), "The problem with the Repetitive Job," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 28, May 1950.
- Weisheit, Ralph A., L. Edward Wells and David N. Falcone (1994) "Community Policing in Small Towns and Rural America", *Crime & Delinquency*, 40: 4, October 1994, pp. 549-567.
- Wilson, James Q. and George L. Kelling (1989). "Making Neighborhoods Safe," *Atlantic Monthly*, 263: 2, February, 1989.
- Wong, Edward, (2011). “Central China Hit by Drought, as Reservoirs Become ‘Dead Water’,” *The New York Times*, May 16, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/17/world/asia/17drought.html>.

Wong, Edward (2011a). "Three Gorges Dam Is Said to Hurt Areas Downstream," *The New York Times*, June 2, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/03/world/asia/03china.html>.

Zehr, Howard (2002). *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

Zion, Lames and Elsie B. Zion, "Hazho's Sokee' -- Stay Together Nicely: Domestic Violence under Navajo Common Law," in Nielsen, Marianne O. and Robert A. Silverman, *Native Americans, Crime and Justice*. Boulder: CO, Westview Press, 1996, pp. 170-178, pp. 96-102

Zsambok, Caroline E. (1995). *Advanced Team Decision Making: A Model and Training Implications*. ARI Research Note 95-02, Klein Associates, Inc., January 19, 1995, for the United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, October 1994, www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA289855.