other forms of obsessive behavior. Social processes that have remembered irresolvable conflicts need maleable memories for a synthesis of negotiable positions.

Our predicament was that we were there to facilitate recall, recognition and design. The more our tapes revealed the self-destructive selection of their memories of their own trajectories, the more we were seen as the destroyers. Yet, we believed that it was precisely in going beyond this self-destructive editing of memory via tape which would facilitate the design process. In this case neither we nor the video could enter the tightly defined limits of the social conditions we were in. We left, out of mutual agreement not to be the scapegoats we had become.

We concluded, from this experiment, that facilitating social change with video must somehow entreat people to change as they get insights into their patterns of communication, a process controlled by the sets of limits imposed by the hierarchical contexts of the very institutions seeking change. You cannot pay attention simply to the content of information, feedback, etc., but must also pay attention to hierarchies of contexts as limiting information, feedback and change. In hierarchies of contexts, the hierarchy makes the difference between adaptive change, within the limits of the hierarchy and a change of the hierarchical limits themselves.

The uncertainty, fear and depression created by the environment was partially the result of trying to relate to the situation with anachronized epistemologies and partially because our ontologies force us to face it alone. Continued fixation to ontologies of loneliness and 'one at a time' epistemologies, or the schizoid-like reactions of constantly changing levels (e.g., attacking the messenger as the message or making it just an intellectual exercise) will not do. The positive feed condition is analogous to our technological situation, in as much as the damage done by technology will require new forms of technology to alter the destruction. The positive feed is 'our problem' and our environment and is needed to make a new set of generalizations that will control (negative feed) that ecology. Our current ontologies, epistemologies and socially structured relations do not suffice in our communications and control of the pace of change.

The paradox described above, of needing the feed to create a new sense of being, knowing, relating, etc., but feeling very uncertain and uncomfortable was related in subsequent video experiences and has brought our jobs to a temporary halt. Our events were microcosms of the conditions we live.

We felt we were creating attitudinal changes and that did not suffice to help people deal with problems that were located in the social contexts (e.g., institutions, peer groups, networks, families, etc.) their 'problems' were embedded in. We have come to the position that information and 'new' information structures do not in themselves 'make you free'; that relevant changes in social contexts are where the resistance lies. The current ways of 'knowing' and 'being' that keep us locked in fantasies and illusions that are destroying our ecology (as us) are the rigid, long feedback loops that communicate the control over our environment - our social institutions.

The 'new' ways of 'knowing' and 'being' that our environment created and re-presented are basically short-term feedback loops that are necessary so we can relate our experience to new designs. But they are not sufficient to create new forms of social organization (longer feedback loops, that will sustain the ongoing change of those new habits of communication about us and how we know and change our ecology).

Our current trajectory is to work with whole networks over longer periods of time, helping them to help us design new ways of living and relating that can be sustained by ongoing social processes. We feel it is necessary to go beyond aggregates of loosely connected people to groups that have sustained supportive relations that will create new collective consciousness.

randy sherman