

This will get at some of the other criteria that would allow you to differentiate between whether you thought that a particular innovation was just adaptive or might in fact be transformative. The first is the idea of reconciling paradox. It appears that most problem domains that are very difficult to breakout of, most complex adaptive systems that are very resilient and refuse to change, also have embedded in them a series of paradoxes.

Interestingly enough, trying to come to terms with these paradoxes, these either-or kinds of choices begins deep in the self. You remember last time when I was talking to you, I said, "*There is no us-and-them.*" If you're really going to act as a system entrepreneur, you have to see the problem that you're addressing as inside yourself as well as outside yourself.

Before we get into looking very squarely at how we determine how paradoxes are involved in our problem situation, let's take a step backwards and look inside ourselves at the ways in which we carry some of the problem, in terms of our own attitude and perceptions. This is something that which we call the nemesis exercise.

Nemesis is an interesting concept. It comes from the Greek idea of divine justice. In Greek mythology, nemesis is a personification of divine justice. The word originally meant *the distributor of fortune whether good or bad in due proportion to each man according to his deserts*. People are rewarded and punished based on how they behaved. People should get their share of both, but the proportion of good or bad that happens to you should, in part, be dependent on your conduct. It was the goddess nemesis who made that decision.

This was a concept that evolved over time and went from that to a notion of a resentment caused by any disturbance of this proportion. The sense of justice could not allow this to pass unpunished. Nemesis became, in a sense, the idea that if you got more than your fair share of the good or more than your fair share of the bad—mostly more than your fair share of the good—you should be punished, that is, you would meet your nemesis.

In Greek tragedies, nemesis was chiefly the avenger of crime and punisher of arrogance. Those who thought they could get away with leading bad lives and those who thought of themselves as too good or too important were in danger of meeting their nemesis. She

was sometimes called, Adrasteia meaning "*one from whom there is no escape.*" The Greeks felt that, ultimately, you would meet your nemesis; but if you got things out of proportion and you felt too good about yourself and you've taken too much of a portion of good onto yourself, then you were just cruising for a bruising or waiting for a fall because you would meet your nemesis and it would defeat you.

The aspects of nemesis are much like what CG Jung called the shadow, and if you want to think of this from a psychological point of view—and the Greeks were deeply psychological as well as social—Jung's notion of the shadows is a good place to start. Jung had this assumption that we're all born with about the normal distribution of human emotions. We're all equally capable of anger, resentment, happiness, arrogance, bliss, kindness, cruelty...we have it all. That's just the human animal. We have it all.

Through a socialization process—and this differs not only from culture to culture, but from family to family—some of these traits are valued more than others. In a culture where your aggression is approved of, those people who learned to express aggression forcefully, colourfully, where approved of and those who have trouble expressing

aggression were negatively sanctioned or disapproved of.

On the opposite tendency, in cultures which didn't approve of aggression and felt that people should be kind and sensitive to others, people who were able to show this kind of kindness and sensitivity were approved of and aggression was disapproved of. When this happens in our own families, gradually over time, we may have some aptitude and be born with a slight tendency to be able to do one thing better than other but we mould ourselves according to expectations.

If we're brought up in a family where aggression is disapproved of, we systematically suppress our anger and what Jung argues is that, after a while, we lose the memory that we have it at all. We suppress it so much that we can't remember and we don't think we have aggressive tendencies because in fact, we've suppressed it.

Jung says that then it becomes like our shadow: a part of ourselves that we don't own but is always there again, like nemesis in some ways waiting to get us. One of the signs that we've done that is when we meet people, we find intensely irritating in ways that we can't really explain to ourselves.

We often say so-and-so just grates on my nerves or so-and-so makes me see red. You don't really quite why you have such an excessive reaction to that person. Jung argues that we have an excessive reaction to that person because they are a personification of our shadow. In other words, they are people who freely express things that we have repressed in ourselves, and that we have not allowed to exist. When we see them being freely expressed, we become incensed and very angry. For example, you may find when you're trying to work with someone that you just find that you can't get along with them—that they just aggravate you so much, it makes you see red all the time and you decide to break off working with them.

In my own experience, I had an experience of that working with a female colleague many, many years ago and I reacted against her. I felt that she was being very pushy, very aggressive, and quite arrogant and it made me see red. I stopped working with her. Then, later on in my life, I recognized that I didn't mind those qualities so much in men but I minded them very much in women.

That was part of what led me, then, to the insight that the reason that I didn't like them in women, and I didn't mind them in men

was because, as a woman growing up in my own family culture, you weren't supposed to behave that way. The men could behave that way. That was fine, but women weren't supposed to. I had suppressed it myself. I wasn't aware that I had it and it upset me when I saw it in other people.

However, as we know, innovative—really good breakthrough collaboration—requires some conflict. What I was really doing was ruling our really good collaboration with half of the human race. Ultimately, my reaction to that shadow quality in myself blinded me or maimed me to the potential of something that could really be good for me which was a collaboration. I was unable to take advantage of a whole set of opportunities because of that shadow-like quality.

The Greeks felt strongly that ultimately, inevitably, if not reclaimed, we'd meet our nemesis that would defeat us: a lack of proportion would not go unpunished. In that case that I was quoting, I was punished by losing a place where I could have enjoyed working, where I could have, in fact, perhaps made a difference, had a really creative collaboration. And I couldn't do it because of the fact I was limited by the shadow or this nemesis piece and it got me in that particular situation.

The poet Yeats said a great quote about growing up in Northern Ireland. "*Great hatred, little room maimed me from the start. I carried from my mother's womb a fanatic's heart.*" [This was] an us-and-them mentality, which was associated with hatred, with seeing that all evil was on the other side—in this case, the British in Northern Ireland.

Because he's a master of words, he says it maimed him. It was like losing an arm or a leg. It made him a weaker person in terms of what he was able to do because he carried this fanatic perspective. Again, thinking back to the Greenpeace video that we saw: a fanatic's heart being exhibited in that boy; but you can also see that aspect of us-and-them, the aspect of the other that we have rejected because in fact, it's in us, but we have suppressed it and we don't know it's there and causing us to behave in ways that are likely to make our initiative, the thing we're trying to accomplish fail.