

# Leadership and Decision-Making in Waldorf School Governance, and the “Cups” and “Scales” of Good Process

**Peter Lawton**

*City of Lakes Waldorf School, Minneapolis, MN, USA*

**ABSTRACT.** This article is a philosophical exploration of Waldorf school governance. It forwards the proposition that good pedagogical governance is found in the balance of archetypal dialectical tensions, most importantly the balance between an institution's need to make decisions in accordance with its educational mission and the need to provide the type of institutional leadership that reinvigorates or reimagines that same mission. Leadership is conceived as a largely social-emotional and volitional, artistic, and spontaneously creative endeavor, while decision-making is characterized as a largely intellectual, managerial, and deliberate exercise. The article further proposes that, if good governance is the balance of dialectical tensions, then good institutional procedures or processes are the means by which that balance is achieved. In addition to providing the time, space, and procedural know-how for both leadership and decision-making activities, good institutional processes provide the means for achieving their balance and integration. This is achieved, the article proposes, by nesting a bit of deliberative decision-making within spontaneously creative leadership activities and a bit of spontaneously creative leadership within deliberative decision-making activities. The article explores these “nested” processes through the metaphors of cups and scales, which correspond to leadership and decision-making activities respectively. A procedural “cup” provides a stationary “vessel” that collects dynamic energies, while a procedural “scale” provides a dynamic “movement” that weighs and balances relatively static perspectives and/or paradigms.

*Keywords:* Waldorf school governance, leadership, decision-making, school governance procedures, school governance processes, brainstorming, problem-solving.

**ZUSAMMENFASSUNG.** Dieser Artikel ist eine philosophische Untersuchung der Führung von Waldorfschulen. Er stellt die These auf, dass eine gute pädagogische Leitung im Gleichgewicht archetypischer dialektischer Spannungen zu finden ist, vor allem dem Gleichgewicht des Bedarfs einer Einrichtung, Entscheidungen in Übereinstimmung mit ihrer Bildungsmission zu treffen, und des Bedarfs, die Art von institutioneller Führung zu sichern, die diese Mission wiederbelebt oder neu erfindet. Führung wird als weitgehend soziales, emotionales, willentliches, künstlerisches und spontan kreatives Unterfangen verstanden, während Entscheidungsfindung als weitgehend intellektuelle, verwaltungstechnische und bewusste Übung bestimmt wird. Der Artikel schlägt ferner vor, dass gute institutionelle Verfahren oder Prozesse das Mittel sind, mit dem dieses Gleichgewicht zu erreichen ist, vorausgesetzt, dass gute Regierung das Gleichgewicht dialektischer Spannungen bietet. Gute institutionelle Prozesse stellen Zeit, Raum und Knowhow für Führungs- und Entscheidungsaktivitäten zur Verfügung, um Gleichgewicht und Integration zu erreichen. Nach dem Artikel passiert dies, indem ein bisschen deliberative Entscheidungsfindung in spontan kreative Führungsaktivitäten und ein bisschen spontan kreative Führungsaktivitäten in deliberative Entscheidungsfindung eingebettet werden. Der Artikel untersucht diese „einbettenden“ Prozesse mithilfe von den Metaphern von Tassen und Waagen, die Führungs- bzw. Entscheidungsaktivitäten entsprechen. Eine prozedurale „Tasse“ stellt ein stationäres „Gefäß“ bereit, das dynami-

sche Energien sammelt, während eine prozedurale „Waage“ eine dynamische „Bewegung“ bereitstellt, die relativ statische Aussicht und/oder Paradigmen wiegt und ausbalanciert.

*Stichworte:* Waldorfschulverwaltung, Leitung, Entscheidungsfindung, Verfahren der Schulverwaltung, Schulverwaltungsprozesse, Brainstorming, Problemlösung

Warm Thou our hearts,  
 Enlighten Thou our heads,  
 That good may become  
 What from our hearts we would found  
 And from our heads direct  
 With single purpose  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Rudolf Steiner

Make use of the ancient principle:  
 Spirit is never without matter,  
 Matter never without spirit.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Rudolf Steiner

Good school governance may be found in the balance of archetypal dialectical tensions. In religious terms, we may understand good governance as the balance between spiritual and material forces. In philosophical terms, we may understand it as the balance between what is ideal and real. In anthroposophical terms, we may understand it as the balance between antipathy and sympathy. And in psychological terms, we may understand good school governance as the balance between *consciousness* and *experience*, with the term “consciousness” being employed to refer to fully conscious thought, and “experience” referring to un- or semi-conscious sensation and emotion.

Good school governance is never exhibited purely in the structures we impose through the force of our collective consciousness, but neither is it found solely in our un- or semi-conscious experience of dynamic energies. Good governance is rather an impulse that seeks to integrate and balance *stable structure* and *dynamic energy*. And the institutional organs that regulate and equilibrate structure and energy, spirit and matter, and consciousness and experience are good organizational procedures or processes.

A simple example of a naturally occurring dialectical tension in schools and other similar cultural institutions is the one that occurs between the needs of individual stakeholders and the requirements of the organization itself. Another dialectical tension may be found in the demand that an institution *make decisions* in accordance with its mission and the need to provide the type of institutional *leadership* that reinvigorates or reimagines that same mission. This dialectical tension is engendered in the lines “what from our hearts we would found and from our heads direct” from the “Foundation Stone Meditation” by the founder of Waldorf education, Rudolf Steiner (1996). Good governance is not solely a heart-founded, un- or semi-conscious, volitional or socio-emotional, or spontaneously creative effort. Nor is it an exclusively head-directed, conscious, intellectual, managerial endeavor. Rather, good governance is an ingenious amalgamation of both.

The volitional and socio-emotional activity of *heart-founding* and the conceptual activity of *head-directing* are related to leadership and decision-making respectively. However, in the dialectical spirit of Yin/Yang<sup>1</sup> or Collins and Porras’ (1997) the “genius of and,” both leadership and decision-making are heart-founding *and* head-directing activities simultaneously! Good school governance seeks to balance and integrate these and other archetypal dialectical tensions. And again, the organs by which institutions achieve this balance and integration are good institutional processes.

## Leadership and Decision-Making

Disregarding half of the leadership/decision-making dialectic, school leaders often default to thinking and speaking about school governance largely in terms of decision-making and, specifically, *who* is allowed to participate in the decision-making process. School leaders often think and speak about the dynamic processes by which decisions are made only secondarily and as a necessary consequence of the need to effectively and expediently arrive at decisions. When school leaders do consider the processes involved in decision-making, they often default to describing them in the materialistic language of manufactured consent. For example, leaders frequently speak of “achieving buy-in” or “getting people on board.” In the language of electoral politics, these may be understood as *mobilizing* activities. In politics, mobilizing activities seek to secure votes. On the contrary, genuine *organizing* activities allow for the true transformation of the electorate, which is a process that unfolds from within them as much as it is coaxed from the outside. In terms of a school’s mission, the processes by which decisions are made are often more transformative than any decisions themselves because the experiences good processes provide have the potential of being actually transformative for stakeholders. And it is the stakeholders who ultimately embody and enact a school’s mission. Without them, an institutional mission is only a dead and disembodied collection of words.

Decisions are like *realizations*, *materializations*, or “crystallizations” of the school’s mission. And these crystallizations ideally occur through processes by which the collective and creative will of the individuals who embody and enact the school’s mission is instantiated. Indeed, a good decision-making process is critical to good governance. Good decision-making, however, is only one half of a health-sustaining governance dialectic, the other half being something we might alternately call development, evolution, transformation, initiation, or *leadership*. Contrary to decision-making, which is a process through which the school’s mission is instantiated or *materialized*, leadership is the process by which the school’s mission is reinvigorated, re-imagined, or, to use a Christian term, resurrected. While decision-making is a process of *crystallization*, leadership is a process of *ephemeralization*.

While decision-making activities yield “frozen” or “solidified” materializations of the school’s mission, effective leadership activities return the mission to its natural gaseous, dynamic, and aspirational form. Good processes sit between leadership and decision-making activities and may be understood as liquids ready to be transformed into either solids or gas. Or both! Making decisions and providing leadership are not dichotomous or mutually exclusive activities, although they are often treated as such. Decision-making and leadership are properly understood dialectically, as two aspects of a whole, as two elements that bring each other into existence, as two “species” in perfect symbiosis.

If we imagine these two facets of good governance – decision-making and leadership – as achieving some measure of equilibrium, that balance might be represented graphically by something like the classic Yin/Yang symbol. The lighter Yang represents decision-making, i.e., the upholding and maintenance of the school’s constantly changing and evolving mission, and the darker Yin represents leadership, i.e., the constant re-imagination or refinement of that mission.

---

1. In ancient Chinese philosophy, Yin and Yang represent opposite yet interconnected forces. Yin and Yang cannot exist without each other; they give rise to each other as the absence of light gives rise to night and the absence of darkness gives rise to day. Yin and Yang constitute the materials and energies out of which the universe and everything within it is created.

Waldorf school leadership bodies such as colleges of teachers,<sup>2</sup> boards of trustees, and various committees ideally have dual roles, and these roles are in a dialectical tension with each other. The dual roles. – inseparable as day is from night – are decision-making and leadership. School governance bodies ideally work (seemingly impossibly) in two directions, facilitating processes by which the school's mission is simultaneously crystalized through decision-making activities and ephemeralized through leadership activities. In simple terms, good school governance is attained by processes through which the school's mission is simultaneously upheld and reinvented!

## Consciousness and Experience

Implicit in this exploration of leadership and decision-making in Waldorf school governance is a core idea. The idea is that we engage with the world in two distinct ways – through *consciousness* and *experience*. Put slightly differently, humans think in two qualitatively different ways. According to many psychologists, our thinking is the result of a dual-process, one largely unconscious and one more conscious. Psychologist Daniel Kahneman (2013) refers to these two processes as System 1 and System 2 thinking respectively. System 1 thinking (S1) is variously described as automatic, instinctive, intuitive, emotional, and un- or semi-conscious. On the contrary, System 2 thinking (S2) is effortful, reasoned, logical, and fully conscious. Social psychologist Jonathan Haidt (2013) provides a useful metaphor for S1 and S2 thinking, that of an elephant and its rider. The elephant symbolizes System 1 thinking, and the rider System 2. While it is beneficial to intentionally employ System 2 thinking to a greater extent in complex decisions such as those having to do with school governance, Haidt estimates that S2 thinking accounts for as little as 1% of our everyday thinking! Also implicit in this exploration of governance is the author's belief (and experience!) that one of the main challenges generally facing school discourse is the conflation of S1 and S2 thinking. Reports of S1 experience are often overlaid with S2 interpretation and value judgments, and S2 evaluations frequently exclude from consideration S1 experiences that invalidate a priori assumptions. One of the main theses forwarded here is that the processes that facilitate the activities of decision-making and leadership work best when they leave time and space for *both* System 1 and System 2 thinking. Institutional processes are most effective when they encourage and facilitate the expression of both experience and consciousness *and* when they provide a methodology for their ultimate balance and integration.

In anthroposophical or Waldorf-school parlance, the word we might use to describe this procedural, dynamic, in-between realm of integration and balance is *feeling*; experience and consciousness we might call *willing* and *thinking* respectively; and we might encompass these three domains – thinking, feeling, and willing – with the conception of a *soul*. In the language and logic of the article, experience (i.e., willing) is related to leadership; consciousness (i.e., thinking) is related to decision-making; the integration and balance between leadership and decision-making is related to good institutional procedures or processes (i.e., feeling); and these three domains taken together encompass the school's mission or what we might think of as its institutional "soul." System 1 heart-founded thinking, of the kind acquired through movement, through the senses, through the sensation of emotion (as opposed to the more conceptual aspects of emotion), and through more experiential or will-infused forms of thought, such as imagination or intuition, has a *revelatory* character. On the contrary, the fully conscious manipulation of experience's revelations through various System 2 head-directed thinking activities, such as those involving organizing, sorting, relating, evaluating, and analyzing, has an entirely different complexion. While experience has a sleepy and sympathetic nature, consciousness has a more fully awake and antipathetic character. Experience concerns phenomena that stream *into* us, while consciousness concerns phenomena that flow *out* of us.

Bootstrapped to the above description of how leadership and decision-making activities are mediated by good processes is a seemingly impossible prescription – that the activities of leadership and decision-making be separated *and* integrated. Consideration of the paradoxical question of how two phenomena can be kept

2. The College of Teachers is the name given in many Waldorf schools to the committee of teachers and staff members responsible for the school's pedagogy and mission. In a simple sense, a College of Teachers fills both the roles of principal (or headmaster) and superintendent in other educational settings.

apart *and* combined leads to the philosophical nature of this particular contemplation. The “answer” the article provides is as follows: one of the ways that leadership and decision-making activities may be kept separate and integrated is by nestling a bit of leadership in decision-making activities and vice versa.

## Good Process

If good school governance entails the balancing of dialectical tensions, such as balancing the needs of individual stakeholders and the institution, balancing pedagogical ideals and material realities, or balancing the need for leadership and decision-making, then a good process is the means by which that balance is achieved! Good processes balance Yang and Yin, antipathy and sympathy, consciousness and experience, the upholding of the school’s mission and its constant reinvention, etc. Good process is what happens inter-dynamically *between* Yin and Yang, between antipathy and sympathy, and between decision-making and leadership; it contains both and integrates both. As such, a good process is not predominantly S2 intellectual, managerial, or head-directed in its methodology. Nor is it primarily S1 socio-emotional or volitional, spontaneously creative, or heart-founded. On the contrary, a good process impossibly and ingeniously straddles heart-founding and head-direction like a tightrope walker balancing on a thin wire.

This procedural tightrope balance is accomplished in two ways. First of all, a good process provides the time, space, and procedural know-how for *both* heart-founding and head-directing activities. And second of all, but just as importantly, a good process provides the means by which these two activities may be integrated or harmonized. This integration is achieved in part by nestling a bit of head-directed decision-making within leadership activities and a bit of heart-founded leadership within decision-making activities.

To employ several metaphors, good processes provide procedural “cups” and “scales.” Within S1 heart-founded leadership activities, good processes contain small S2 head-directing “cups” that draw out and capture creative energies. And within S2 head-directed decision-making activities, good processes provide small S1 heart-founding “scales” that weigh and balance various perspectives and/or paradigms. In popular terms, cups and scales are integral to the activities of *brainstorming* and *problem-solving* respectively, although the approaches promoted here are more holistic than many traditional understandings. Procedural cups and scales are, of course, not physical objects (although they may have physical components). Rather, they are what we might call process “technologies,” understandings, capacities, habits, best practices, ways of doing business, etc. In S1/heart-founded/leadership activities, the Yin cup provides a *stable “structure”* capable of “capturing” and “holding” *dynamic energies*, while in S2/head-directed/decision-making activities, the *dynamic “movement”* of the Yin scales “weighs” and “balances” relatively *static ideas*.

## Procedural “Cups” and “Scales”

A procedural “cup” is a tiny bit of decision-making nestled inside a larger leadership process, a smidge of intellectual, managerial, S2 head-direction inside what is otherwise a socio-emotional and volitional, artistic, S1 heart-founding activity. A cup is a small stable structure surrounded by dynamic energies and, as previously mentioned, it is not a physical object but what we might call a process technology or procedure. The “cup” essentially *decides* (from the Latin *caedere*, to cut) what in the larger S1 heart-founding process to capture and collect and what to leave aside. *What* a cup collects has as much to do with what it takes in as what it keeps out. Into the cup goes *experience* in the form of un- or semi-conscious movements, emotions, or revelatory ideas (more on this below). Out stays *consciousness* in the form of mental operations such as analysis, evaluation, interpretation, argumentation, explanation, prediction, etc. Experience has a *revelatory* character; it arises un- or semi-consciously, emerging fully formed in our bodies, hearts, and minds as if out of thin air. Experiences are nothing we work out through conscious thinking per se, through problem-solving, through applying rationality or logic, through experimentation or trial-and-error, or through theorizing or hypothesizing.



Experiences may be *physical* or *mental*. Physical experiences are phenomena we experience bodily or emotionally. To the extent that we don't overlay this phenomena with interpretation or other S2 conceptual content, our physical and emotional experiences are *revelatory*. We might say that our lived experience is revealed to us moment by moment! What we might call mental experiences, contrary to physical experiences, are phenomena we "experience" purely in our minds or souls. Like physical or emotional experiences, mental experiences emerge fully formed either from mysterious spaces deep within us or from distances beyond our senses' reach.

But whereas physical experiences seem to appear to us from the *outside*, mental experiences give the impression of arising or emerging from *within* us. Whereas physical experiences appear in the form of *sensations, feelings, or observations*, mental experiences arise in the form of *mental-pictures, imaginations, or intuitions*. We primarily express these experiential – or, we might say, will-infused – thoughts verbally or in writing, and they're generally descriptive or explanatory in nature. But they don't have to be. We may also express our mental experiences in the form of more narrative or poetic examples of speaking or writing. Or we may communicate them completely non-verbally or non-textually. For instance, mental experiences may be captured in the form of movements or pictures. As an example, this article started out as a series of doodles that I later "translated" into words.<sup>3</sup>

As already mentioned, what a procedural cup takes in has as much to do with what it keeps out. Drawn into the "cup" and captured are *experiences*. Excluded from the cup is consciousness in the form of mental operations. Into the cup goes experience in the form of 1) sensations, feelings, observations, etc., what in our contemporary world is sometimes called data, and 2) mental pictures, imaginations, and intuitions. Kept out of the cup are conscious thinking activities per se in the form of analyzing or synthesizing, interpreting, problem-solving, editing, arguing or debating, agreeing, speculating, proselytizing, etc. In other words, out stay countless rational or rhetorical activities that seek to *organize, relate, or evaluate* the contents of the cup. The mental activities of organizing, relating, and evaluating are, indeed, as important and elemental to good processes as nerves are to the human body. They are, however, S2 head-directing activities in want of S1 heart-founded material to direct! Experiential, heart-founded material is generated through leadership activities that "ephemeralize" the school's mission, that return the mission to its natural dynamic, aspirational, "gaseous" state. Thinking about what is going into a procedural cup as it goes in, in the form of organizing, relating, evaluating, or other S2 intellectual activities, is to interrupt the flow of creative energies (e.g., experience, revelation, intuition) and potentially pollute the contents of the cup. Interpreting the results of experience in the midst of its expression is tantamount to planning the next thing you want to say as your conversation partner is speaking! After appropriate space and time have been given for the encouragement and collection of experience, *then* the contents of that experience may be evaluated, ordered, related, equilibrated, organized, etc.

Procedural cups may work *explicitly* or *implicitly*. For instance, a procedural cup may explicitly occupy a "space," drawing experiences to it like a planet exerting gravitational pull. The most explicit way a cup occupies space is as a dedicated meeting or agenda item that invites open dialogue and sharing. In one sense, the opportunity afforded by the dedicated time and space is the cup. Explicit cups also include various process technologies, such as taking turns, passing talking sticks, or leaving a few seconds of silence between speakers. Other techniques include the use of open documents, message boards, or other physical idea-collection systems. They further include communal exercises designed to help groups get into an S1 heart-founding "head space," which may be understood as a state of mind that effectively promotes the sharing of experiences of the kind described above and that subdues the natural urge to evaluate, organize, sort, or engage in other S2 head-directing activities. Based on his years of experience leading democratic decision-making processes in Waldorf schools and other anthroposophical initiatives, Heinz Zimmerman (1996) designed group exercises to promote just such an S1 heart-founding mood, one that promotes conversations that might variously be described as artistic, socio-emotional, even spiritual. Zimmerman's suggested warm-ups include various physical, social, and mental group exercises. Other S1 heart-founding warm-up exercises

---

3. Click here for the full text of the article alongside some of the original "doodles" that inspired the text, as well as illustrations inspired by the text after the fact.

might include participating in guided meditations, engaging together in artistic activities, sharing experiences in nature, and many others too numerous to mention here.

The most powerful and impactful ways procedural cups collect experience, however, are not explicit but *implicit*. Perhaps the most precious and potent procedural “cup” is the implicit willingness of the participants in a process to leave an open space on an agenda or elsewhere not knowing what will fill it. And in countless individual acts of audacity, each participant plans for something unplanned and offers up their own small “cup” every time they actively and selflessly listen to another. This may be the single most audacious aspect of anything considered here—the pure act of will involved in planning for something unplanned!

Moving from an examination of procedural cups to scales, a procedural “scale” is a tiny bit of leadership nestled inside a larger decision-making process, a smidge of socio-emotional and volitional, artistic, S1 heart-founding in what is otherwise an intellectual, managerial, S2 head-directing activity. Decision-making is essentially an S2 head-directed activity. As such, it evaluates, organizes, and relates the contents of S1 heart-founding activities. A popular name for this analytic and synthetic process is *problem-solving*, although the approach promoted here is more holistic than many traditional problem-solving models. We explored previously how the procedural cup is a small stable structure surrounded by dynamic energies. On the contrary, a procedural scale is a small dynamic movement surrounded by more static ideas. While a procedural cup collects both physical and mental *experiences* in the form of movements, emotions, or revelatory ideas, a procedural scale both *weighs* and *balances* these experiences. The scale’s weighing function is *analytical*, while its balancing function is *synthetic*. Analysis involves the identification of constituent “parts,” and synthesis involves creatively putting those parts back together again to make a completely new and original whole, something often greater than the sum of the original parts!

The scale’s synthetic balancing function is explored below. But first, with regard to its analytic function, a scale weighs. The conceptual equivalent to weight is value and, as such, procedural “scales” *evaluate* ideas. Weight is to physical objects what evaluation is to ideas. Just as weight measures not a physical quantity but a force (i.e., gravity) acting between two physical bodies, evaluation measures *relationships*. And just as a body’s weight is determined relative to another body, the value of an idea cannot be “weighed” or evaluated except in relation to another idea or set of ideas. That is to say, evaluation measures one idea *relative* to others. As alluded to in the section explaining procedural “cups” above, *what* a procedural scale generally weighs in school governance is experience in the form of revelatory ideas, thoughts, or truth claims, and the weighing process yields *values*.

*How* a procedural scale evaluates is by analyzing, judging, comparing and contrasting, measuring, etc., one idea relative to another. On the one hand, ideas may be evaluated relative to underlying principles. That is to say, they may be evaluated relative to fundamental, a priori, self-evident, or agreed-to principles. On the other hand, two or more independent ideas may be evaluated relative to each other. In a setting such as school governance, the value a procedural “scale” assigns is generally not quantitative or numerical (e.g., 45% of this idea is true or good, or this idea scores 72 on some measure or index), but qualitative or categorical. An example of qualitative or categorical evaluation based on an idea weighed against an underlying principle might be, “This truth claim is more or less consistent with the fundamental principle, while that one is not.” An example of a qualitative or categorical evaluation based on an independent idea weighed against two or more independent ideas might be, “The first truth claim was arrived at intuitively; the second is based on such and such theoretical framing; while the third came from expert testimony.”

It is perhaps self-evident that in order for procedural scales to properly function, it is imperative that the underlying principles or agreements (i.e., criteria) against which ideas are being evaluated are transparent, comprehensible, and enjoy unanimous (or near-unanimous) consent. When underlying or fundamental principles are not implicitly self-evident or explicitly agreed to, scales simply cannot function properly. Returning to the weight metaphor, if an object cannot be weighed in the weightless environment of outer space, then one might reasonably ask how competing ideas can be valued if there is no agreed-to criteria to evaluate them against? What, readers may ask, happens when there are no self-evident principles or agreements against which to evaluate various ideas? Well, what happens is confusion, chaos, conceptual

and rhetorical mayhem, a void of clarity and direction all too happily filled by the latent illiberal and authoritarian tendencies always lurking just below the surface in each of us as individuals and the institutions to which we belong. In cases where the underlying principles are unstated, unexamined, or unknown, their absence from discussions should alert participants – like a big red flashing light – to the need to discover or “uncover” underlying principles and shared agreements. The absence of foundational, widely accepted criteria may demand that participants set aside current topics of discussion in favor of more elemental topics capable of yielding the necessary guiding principles.

Moving from a procedural scale’s *weighing* function to its *balancing* one, only in a purely academic or theoretical sense may ideas be evaluated against a *single* underlying principle. In any real-world, practical situation, ideas must be balanced against multiple underlying principles simultaneously! As American philosopher William James (1981) wrote: “The greatest enemy of any one of our truths may be the rest of our truths” (p. 38). In a conceptual landscape where ideas are evaluated not against one but multiple fundamental principles, a scale might achieve one sort of balance by assigning equal weight or value to each truth claim. While that might be perfectly appropriate in some circumstances (e.g., everyone’s emotional or “lived” experiences are equally valid), it is not what is meant by balance here. Procedural scales are generally not intended to provide symmetrical or arithmetic balance, but *aesthetic* or *moral* balance – the dynamic balance obtained in, for example, music, the sport of surfing, a life well-lived, or ... good school governance. Other words for the scale’s balancing function might be *blending* or *harmonizing*. The procedural scale’s balancing function provides the means of “holding” many different dynamics or truths simultaneously.

Perhaps the balancing, blending, or harmonizing function of procedural scales might be more aptly represented by the image of a graphic equalizer – you know, the green and red lights on an old-school stereo and the associated toggles by which the listener “balances” different high-, low-, and mid-range frequencies. Above we explored how procedural scales weigh. They do this by evaluating ideas *relative* to other ideas. But how do scales balance or harmonize multiple ideas? Like other S1 heart-founding “movements,” achieving balance is a largely undefinable, unnamable process that is revelatory in nature. Just as there is no simple algorithm for how to find balance in music, how to hang ten on a surfboard, or how to achieve balance in life, there are none for finding balance in the types of dynamics related to school governance. That is why the processes by which procedural scales balance or harmonize ideas are more socio-emotional and volitional, artistic, and S1 heart-founding than intellectual, managerial, and S2 head-directing. Of course, there are materialistic S2 head-directing processes for achieving “harmony” between ideas, and these include negotiation, compromise, majority rule, enforced uniformity, etc. However, these have less potential than more artistic, socio-emotional, S1 heart-founding processes for achieving synthesis, that is, for attaining some truth greater than the sum of the parts. And, by extension, head-directed “harmonies” are potentially less transformative for institutions and their stakeholders.

Following in the ethical tradition of American pragmatists like John Dewey, philosopher Steven Fesmire makes the compelling argument that the evaluation and balance of competing ideas and truth claims is essentially a *moral* process. According to Fesmire (2003), American pragmatists such as Dewey and William James understood morality as a fundamentally “imaginative” process, one “conceived on the model of aesthetic perception and artistic creation” (loc 93). Aesthetic perception and artistic creation are hallmarks of System 1 heart-founded thinking. While aesthetic and artistic balancing and harmonizing processes cannot be explicitly explained or expressed in simple formulas, they may be alluded to through the use of analogy. For example, the process of harmonizing ideas may be compared to other balancing processes, such as those related to music, dance, art, math, nature, narrative, and so on. Unfortunately, exploring any one of these analogies could fill its own book not to mention a library! Any comprehensive exploration of how balance is achieved imaginatively, artistically, or aesthetically is well beyond the scope of this essay.

## Conclusion

Readers may have noticed in the article’s consideration of good governance a false image, namely, the picture of a school now doing “leadership” and now doing “decision-making,” of the expression of an S1 un- or



semi-conscious experience devoid of some S2 conscious interpretation, or some act of pure S2 thinking untainted by S1 experience. Perhaps we all intuitively recognize how unrealistic this picture is. In reality, the relationship between experience and consciousness has a more fractal, even chaotic, character. Perhaps the relationship between experience and consciousness is not best symbolized by the traditional Yin/Yang symbol but by some Jackson Pollack interpretation of it. For example, even in our most active listening moments, that is, even when we're fully experiencing or “living into” what a friend, loved one, colleague, or student is saying, we flicker back and forth from sympathetic experience to antipathetic consciousness much like a fluorescent light blinking on and off so quickly that it gives the appearance of a state of constant “on.” Even the most talented and experienced meditators whose goal is to remain as long as possible in a revelatory, purely experiential state of being admit to falling prey to conscious thoughts, which pull them again and again out of the present moment. Similarly, our most ambitious attempts at active-listening are often interrupted by a movement, an image, a word that triggers our consciousness, that pushes the “go” button on some time machine that instantaneously transports us to some other non-physical, non-experiential dimension of consciousness. In that moment, even though our outward appearance remains relatively unchanged, we have left the conversation, we have left our partner in dialogue – we have left the physical world, really – and have been transported to a world of almost pure consciousness.

While the normal, everyday relationship between experience and consciousness has a somewhat unintentional, unconscious, spontaneous character, there are activities that benefit from a more intentional, self-conscious, and process-laden approach. Such is the case with school governance, specifically the crucial activities of decision-making and leadership. Part of an intentional approach entails processes that encompass the two ways humans make sense of the world, arrive at communal decisions, and resolve conflict, namely, through System 1 experience and System 2 consciousness. Another part of an intentional approach involves processes capable of balancing and integrating S1 heart-founded and S2 head-directed thinking. The article explores one method for providing the time and space for the expression of both experience and consciousness, as well as a method for achieving their balance and integration. Separation and integration is achieved in part by nestling a bit of S2 head-direction within heart-founded leadership activities and a bit of S1 heart-founding within head-directed decision-making activities. The article explores these nested bits through the metaphors of procedural “cups” and “scales.” But before leaving this particular exploration, it is perhaps worth noting two naturally occurring processes that organically separate *and* integrate S1 heart-founding and S2 head direction. These two processes are *art* and *dialogue*.

Art is a process-reliant activity that encompasses both S1 heart-founding and S2 head-direction, that allows for both the spontaneous experience of dynamic energies and the imposition of stable structure. Such an approach is quite evident in, for example, improvisatory jazz, a medium in which revelatory free improvisation rests upon a rock-solid foundation of scales, techniques, and musical forms. Each scale or mode, each instrumental technique, each formal element, may be conceived as a procedural “cup” that allows for one type of expression and not another. And each improvisatory performance is an artistic and aesthetic “scale” that un- or semi-consciously weighs and balances literally infinite permutations and combinations. The musician's thousands of hours of solitary practice are predominantly the work of the System 1 “elephant,” with the System 2 “rider” providing gentle (and sometimes not-so gentle) course corrections. And the single hour of improvisatory performance is analogous to the S2 rider essentially closing their eyes and letting the S1 elephant go where it will.

True dialogue is another process-laden activity that organically produces the separation and integration of S1 heart-founding and S2 head-direction. When we actively listen to another in a conversation, we *experience* what they are saying, and that experience is predominantly revelatory in character. When we speak in a conversation, our *consciousness* is analyzing and synthesizing, and that analysis and synthesis is primarily imaginative, aesthetic, and artistic in nature. Nestled within active S1 listening is a tiny bit of conscious S2 decision-making that attempts to keep the listener in a will-full, experiential state of being as much as possible. And nestled within our S2 conscious speaking is a bit of S1 un- or semi-conscious weighing and balancing that, while remaining open to experience's revelations, attempts to synthesize a larger truth out of

many smaller, seemingly contradictory truths. In other words, nestled within active listening is a “cup,” and nested in contemplative speaking is a “scale.”

The activities of leadership and decision-making in Waldorf school governance are analogous to improvisatory jazz and the give and take that occurs in a true dialogue between individuals. Except the school’s dialogue partner in leadership and decision-making activities is not any one person or group but reality itself, or what we might call “the spirit of our times.” The speaker in the dialogue is not an “I” but a “we,” and that “we” is the School, as embodied by the stakeholders who embody and enact its mission. When we engage in leadership activities, we are listening to – *experiencing* – the cosmos, reality, the spirit of our times. And when we make communal decisions, we are speaking into – shaping from our collective *consciousness* – that same cosmos, reality, spirit. Good school governance seeks to balance and integrate experience and consciousness, as well as other archetypal dialectical tensions. Experience and consciousness are exemplified by leadership and decision-making activities respectively. And the institutional organs that work to achieve the balance and integration of experience and consciousness – of leadership and decision-making – are good *processes*.

## References

- Steiner, R. (1996). *The foundation stone: The life, nature, and cultivation of Anthroposophy*. Rudolf Steiner Press.
- Collins, J. & Porras, J. (1997). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. HarperBusiness.
- Fesmire, S. (2003). *John Dewey and moral imagination: Pragmatism in ethics*. Indiana University Press.
- Haidt, J. (2013). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. Vintage.
- Kahneman, D. (2013). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- James, W. (1981). *Pragmatism: A new name for some old ways of thinking*. Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Zimmermann, H. (1996). *Speaking, listening, understanding: The art of creating conscious conversation*. Lindisfarne Books.