

S:DISS-X Practical 6 Transcript

Hey everyone, it's Mike Jay here. And, It's Leadership University, as you can see, flashing. It's very cool being here almost... oh, almost 30 years later. Knowing that when you started, you had this idea. about... leadership for the planet, that sort of thing. Very interesting stuff. I'm going to, without further ado, jump right back into Practical number 6, you can see... that, I'm doing this back-to-back because I want to give you the... sort of the thread of this, and it's, It happens to be on ChatGPT's mind, but at the same time.

Look what it did. I wrote, very interesting session, don't have the transcript yet, but I want to move right into the Practical 6. Are you ready? Yes, I'm ready for Practical 6. For this one, I'll carry forward the live learning from Practical 5. This is interesting. I mean, how many of us could do this? How many of us could have done something for 30 or 40 minutes and then summarize it in 4 bullet points? I mean. This is just amazing intelligence. And now, is it true? I don't know. Is it perfect? Probably not. But it's nice to be able to see something carry the thought forward.

Watch for usefulness becoming pressure. Stay... closer to your exact language. This is what it's... Telling itself, by the way. Avoid interpretation unless invited. That's a big one. Let the form emerge before naming the problem, and that's kind of a global thought there. When you're ready, begin Practical 6. So let's go ahead and jump into Practical 6 and see how this goes.

Anything... weave... Done. So far... That... makes... sense to explore. Again, you can be very creative with dynamic inquiry, where you enter an opening because remember, it's selective, so it's almost like you can kind of draw a dotted line and say, okay, we've been having this conversation, we've been talking, we could... doing these things, we... you've told me a lot of things, I've said some things in response, those kind of things, and then And then, as kind of a summary statement, or a way to branch off, or a way to get started, anything we've done so far that makes sense to explore, again, offering the helping moment, the coachable moment, maybe? We don't know if it's a coachable moment yet.

Yes, one thing that makes sense to explore, okay, again, you gotta notice how it says this. One thing that makes sense to explore. So, it has decided that this one thing makes sense. How a clean, helping motive could quietly turn into pressure before the helper notices it.

okay, I don't... I'm going to do this, you only use Y, When you want... to get something moving, and you feel that it's stuck without it. It's... it's... when I... when I think of Y, I think of laxative. And... and you just don't use them very much, you know, normally. And you're also going right to... an assumption, when you... when you use Y, you're going to an assumption that there is a why. And you could change that framework. In this particular case, I'm going to queue up Y, because I want to see... I want to see where this is coming from, okay? And it gives me a chance to showcase why.

So here... here is... and again, we've done 5 sessions. few hours. never used Y yet. And you won't see me use it again. But I'm using it now so I can tell you the story about the teachable point of view. You just really don't want to use it, because when you get into whys, you're mostly going to get scripting because people have not done the kind of thinking to really understand what is really underneath what it is that they're doing. In fact, in most cases. what this line takes about.

Let me take you back to why right quick. Anything we've done so far that makes sense to explore. Okay, now remember, it's choosing, okay? One thing, okay, it's choosing one thing that makes sense to explore, and then here it is. How a clean helping move motive. can quietly turn into pressure before the helper notices it.

Now, I don't know where that's coming from, so I'm going to use why it thinks the way it does. But I don't want to make it a habit, and I don't even really want to use it. In fact, as I think back across the client interactions that I've had over the past month. I can't think of using Y one time. But I did want to show you why, and I wanted to show you why I don't use it very much.

One, we resist transaction. Why is it part of interrogatory? Who, what, when, where, why, and how? We avoid that until the next right thing emerges, okay? But in this particular case. I'm using it as a combination of several forms. One... perturb. 2... a real... Ping. Okay, why is a ping, usually? Now, it could be a probe if you think the why is already there, and you're just asking for it to live, to be lived experience. But in this particular case. I'm taking a pause, I'm asking why, I'm changing the pace.

So, in other words, these combinatorial forms that you can create with the seven forms are really important sometimes, because you get really Good impact, both direct, indirect. Orders of consequence, multiple level, because in this particular case, when this entity begins to explain this, it's going to reveal its level. It's going to reveal bias and stuff. It's going to reveal values. It's going to reveal what system it's in. In other words, you're going to get a lot of answers, so you say, hey, Mike, why don't you use Y more often? Because you just made a great case for using it. Well, at the same time.

Why... takes the neurophysiology in a different place. It's almost like the two-year-old sitting there and asking you why all the time. It's annoying. And so you want... you want to be careful about being annoying, in my view, because sometimes it disrupts the rhythm. that you have going. You know... if you notice, and you go back through this, even though I talk a lot between the different things that I use for inquiry, you're gonna notice that there's a rhythm. the... both in the helper and the helping, the person being helped. And so, Y tends to disrupt the rhythm, the attunement, the resonance, and you have to be prepared for what comes next. Although, in this particular case, I'm not worried, because Chatgpt is sycophantic, so, you know, it's gonna say something nice. Let's see what comes up here.

Okay, so I asked the question, why? After the one thing that makes sense to explore. Because the helper may want to be useful so much that usefulness becomes the agenda. Yeah, we talked about that, and it hasn't had the opportunity to review the transcript, so it did not know what I've said about this, but I explained that pretty well, I think, or at least, thought I explained it pretty

well, but... and you got a lot of stuff on it, so maybe I didn't explain it all that well. then the person being helped has to respond to the helper's pressure instead of their own signal. Oh, this is great. That's very interesting.

So, in other words, it went to talk about a model. Rather than what it was actually doing. And that's... that's why, again, I would say that this is definitely working systematic. Maybe exiting to entering metasystematic level of complexity to where the system... they're talking about the model, the system right now, but they're also talking about it as if they are looking at it, not in it. that they are of it, not by it. So this is interesting to note.

Okay, so I got my why, didn't really tell me much. So... Rather than me straining myself, this is not rocket science, folks, I just need a cue to get them going, see what rhythm they reestablish, so I'm just gonna use SO. In other words, okay, you know this model, So what? So the helper may need to pause before helping, not to withdraw, but to check whether the next move serves the person being helped, or mainly relieves the helper's own need to be useful.

So, what I've got is, I've got a chatbot that's teaching my model back to me, and using it in this session, but it's helpful for you, because what it's doing is double reinforcement. In other words, I'm trying to tell you all these things, and then what you're watching is how it has digested the, personal operating system that I'm using, called Aggie, Aware Generative Guided Inquiry. as part of a connectome. The connectomics, the connectome, is all the different teachable points of view, and the weights, and all those kinds of things, and what you do if, and then, and all that sort of stuff like that. So again, very, very interesting process that we're seeing.

Has past formal reasoning. Where we can do, if-then. It has the ability to do systematic reasoning, because it came back. and talked about the system, but it also talked about what happens in the system when X, Y, and Z happens, that's good. And that... that is the ability to step back. What it's asking right now, what it's modeling right now, not to withdraw. But to check, that means that, in my view, that would be step back. whether the next move serves the person being helped, or mainly relieves the helper's own need to be useful.

And that's the most difficult... this is... this is, What it's describing is absolutely the most difficult thing that us humans can do, because we are motivated through biased lenses and the values that emerge from that in the level and role and system that we choose to be in, and that affects our capability. capability, metasystematic capability, is what it's talking about, and what I want to check right now, if this were a person, I'm going to say this.

In other words, I've heard a story, I'm gonna check to see if it's true. You see how you do that? Now, ability has not come up, so this is a ping. But what I'm checking for is PCC, I'm checking for RAAF, I'm check... which is ready, willing, able, and fit. I'm checking for my team, what kind of my team is there, what kind of bias do we have in paradigmatic? What kind of style is going on? Yes, but imperfectly. Well, it's a... seems like an honest answer to me. I would... say a similar thing if somebody asks me that question. I can pause and check whether I'm serving the signal or trying to become useful too quickly. That check may be the work before the help.

Let me do this. If this is... this was a human, I would do this. I'll throw the big word in there. I gotta talk to you about hum... oh, you messed it up. Huminy. Good thing about these later Frontier models is you can throw stuff at them. Before it answers. And it will... Okay, so it just... it distort... in... in me doing that, it distorted the... the thing I was checking. Do you experience yourself humaning that? Yes, humanie may be the better term. It keeps the focus on the helper as a person in process, and not just someone applying a method. Very interesting. That's sort of an entering metasystematic idea there, where it's able to talk about it, and then step back out of it, and then name it, that sort of thing like that.

What I was really after there is, if it were a person, I would have asked them Since they can name this, then do... have they translated that into activity or behavior, or do they notice that? And of course, I think the answer would have been, you know, maybe imperfectly or something like that. I know it's imperfect with me. I mean, I know these things, but I'm not always able to do them. I mean, I know exactly what causes me to gain weight, but I don't always do the things that don't. caused me to do that. But I know it's not good for me, but I still do them anyway. And that's part of that bias thing that we have, kind of our style, and things we want to hang on to, things that we are willing to maybe look at, but not let go of, those kind of things like that.

So you have all these kinds of pattern-running human-ing. is a term that I came up with. to describe the work that I was doing with my late friend, Dr. Don Beck, in Spiral Dynamics. We exchanged thousands. of emails over the period of time that he was alive. I... I think I met him right after the Spiral Dynamics book came out in 1996. We started to correspond, and then I started to try to learn his system. And he reflected somewhat on my system, and over the years, a decade, couple of decades, I decided... Dent. that the system that they had built out of Dr. Claire Graves' work was an interpretation, and I... and I went back to Graves' work, and I interpreted it a little differently.

And I interpreted it, rather than it being spiral. that everybody went through, I interpret it as a network that only certain types of people choose in certain times, which means that everybody doesn't go through it, per se, based on Oh, McClellan's work in social motives, based on Graves' work in tachyoscopic work, I mean, where they have you choose... look at a word and talk about it, stuff like that.

That's a background for humaning, but we basically said that there are four existential frames. and humaning. The reason we use humaning instead of these frames. In other words, a lot of people talk about doing. A lot of people talk about being. A lot of people talk about having. A lot of people talk about becoming, because all of those are existential frames that relate directly to social motives. power, achievement, affiliation, avoidance, those kind of things like that. And then back to the... colors and spiral dynamics, engraves and notation for CP Red, and DQ Blue, and ER orange, for those of you who are familiar, and FS Green. And he said there were 6 and then increasing octaves of 6, I basically nailed it down to 4, and the reason I did that was it matched DNA. You know, there's AGCT, that's it, and DNA can do lots of things, and I didn't... I think 6 made it 2... complicated. 4 factorial is complicated enough. Most humans can't remember anything more than 7 to 10 digits.

We do remember our phone numbers most of the time, but we can't always name our friends' numbers, because we look on the phone and hit the button, and it's already remembered. But the whole humaning thing is really important because it allows me to talk about something that people are doing existentially, and then there's more than one tier. That first tier is an existential tier, and then the second tier is a tier where, Where you actually go into generativity. In other words, you start... you start thinking about more orders of consequences. you start thinking about unintended effects. And of course, if you look at you. Politics right now, you... you can see that we don't know that they're actually thinking about... a lot about unintended effects.

I mean. Yeah, I won't go into that, because the AI's been warning me not to do too many sidelines, but I thought sticking human-ing in here was important, but I botched the prompt, so sometimes when you botch a prompt, it knocks the... the chat off, and what I was trying to do is... is to turn what it said back on to whether or not it can do it. It can human it, be, do, have, become, whether it's... whether that's happening. And if that's happening, and the person can relate to me an example, then I know that they're beginning to move into that next level, to transfer from the exiting level That seems to be present into the entering level that is the next thing.

That's the... problem systems that have chosen them, want them to be in order to frame up new problems and to solve the old ones. It's sort of... it's almost like a release. You're released from problems at a certain level, but you get more complex problems at the next level. That's why Susan Cook-Greiter who, did work with Jane Levinsher. in our Harvard dissertation talked about the fact that, as people get more complex ego positions, they're not necessarily happier, because you begin to realize that this is an open system, which Graves talked about a lot, the fact that this thing keeps going, it just keeps getting more complex, so the people who are trying to understand more complexity will never get there, because there'll always be more. there'll always be more of more, and the more of more you get, the less able humans are.

Now, with Haiku, human-AI concurrent understanding, we've probably increased those levels a little bit. In fact, over the last 3 years, I've been playing a lot with levels 14 through 16 in terms of their complexity, the paradigmatic, cross-paradigmatic, which I mentioned, and the meta-paradigmatic, and Basically, those are computational levels, and you won't see them much out there in the world, you know, because they're happening to us, rather than us you know, humaning those. But at the same time, with human-AI concurrency, you can explore a lot of things, because we can piggyback on the AI's intelligence. Even if it's jacket. So that's... that's a really important thing. So that's what I was trying to do there. I think, Had I not botched it, I may have gotten a different answer. And of course, what happened was, is because I introduced humaning, then it switched off of what it was doing before and switches in. That's one of the problems with AI. It's a benefit at the same time, you know, it's a problem.

It keeps the focus on the helper as a person in process, not just someone applying a method. And what that's describing there is two different levels of complexity. In other words, If you have a model. can you apply? Not just to just one thing, but across contexts. And of course, that's where we begin to talk about you know, sustaining a level of discrete complexity and things like that. That's where my voltage model comes in. I think I've talked to you about the voltage model. It's

just an acronym, and a very important mnemonic device to remember vertical, oblique, lateral, and time complexity.

And it can be mapped over age, maturity, things like that. It's almost... it's almost... you're almost able to map fluid intelligence with crystallized intelligence and the combination that it creates, because fluid intelligence decreases... starts decreasing about the same time we start aging, in the 20s. For some people, earlier, for some people later. And then, crystallized intelligence is what you learn by being stupid, you know, or being smart. And so, one of the things I was doing here is, do you experience yourself humaning that? I was looking to see, is this a smart-talking dumb person?

In other words, a lot of times, we get all of our information from mirroring others, and our mirror neurons may help us to do that, so that we survive, and all that sort of stuff. But the thing is, it creates hollowness, and so if... If it says, but I can notice the pattern, a quiet tendency to turn being useful into the next move before the signal has fully earned it. That's... very cool, you know? In other words, It's... it's telling me... That it's beginning to move out of entering into perhaps a nodal relationship, where it can actually take the model and work it, and use it on something, apply it. That's a very good indication that That you don't have a smart talking dumb person, that you have smart talking that's learning, and then being able to talk about that with some depth means it's not hollow.

Okay, and then I threw humaning in there. And it gave a different answer. So let's go back here. Do you experience yourself, humaning first? Not as an experience, very interesting, I love... I love working with AI. But I can notice a pattern. Quiet tendency to turn being useful. Into the next move before the signal has fully earned it.

Here's something that you can do. Now again, I'm not gonna summarize it. I don't even know if I could, because I don't understand what it's talking about half the time. At the same time, if I ask it to summarize it, what do I get another check on? I get another check on PCC, potential, capacity, capability, ready, willing, able, and fit. I get a chance to see how populated my team is. I get a chance to look at right action, and whether it's beginning to do that, or whether we're still at the next right thing. Right now, I'm at this point.

The thread seems to be moving from method to humanie. The issue is no longer only which form should be used. It also, whether the helper can notice their own pull to be useful before the pull becomes pressure. So the live edges, I would have Much rather seen it say, so the lived edge is. Can the helper remain human present and restrained enough that helping serves the person being helped, rather than the helper's need to help. That's just another recycling of some of the things that I've said before, but it is a relatively good. summary, from what I think it means to be saying, and of course, I've spent a lot of time cajoling and... criticizing and developing this AI over time, and... It's good... it's kind of good to see this stuff coming out, although it still doesn't understand the... the abstract. the metasytematic idea of humaning.

What we say when we're human is that someone can be doing all those things, be, do, have, become, and they're done with different weights, they're done at different times, they re... how would I say it? They reconfigure themselves to recalibrate with CCR at VUCA. So, that's really a

cool thing when that starts to happen, because then you become very adaptive, and you don't have to rely on what happened before. You don't have to be good at anything, you just have to be adaptive. And I think that's where we're headed. So, you know, that's not a... that... that's not a bad thing.

Let me just go ahead and play... play with it here just for a second before we close the session. And I'm basically... Asking this for my own... For my own idea of where it is right now. Yeah, that makes a lot of sense. I think it's a... I think it's gotten to where it can explain what's governing it? Let me... let me just go ahead and check that out. I'm doing a ping here, and I'm basically trying to see how deep is this for what's taking place here. It could be a governing dynamic, helping must remain subordinated in two humanie.

Yeah, as long as you understand what humaning means. In other words, everyone has a different combination of being, doing, having, and becoming. As they human, because we're all different. And therefore, to recognize How the other person is human-ing. and two. Contrast that with how your humanie. Is going to create The best adaptive response, if you're aware enough of the differences between how you and they human. I don't know if that makes any sense at all, but it's in the transcript. It could be a governing dynamic, helping us remain subordinated to humanie.

Yeah, I'm thinking about that. I'm... I'm thinking that if you look at, arduous's actionable advice, BDICS, you know, the behaviors, concrete behaviors, the causal design, the... you know, the KSCs that the person needs to be able to actually do the behaviors. You know, you can't ask a person who's a welder to weld underwater, which some of the people doing the submarine work have to do. Because, yes, I can weld, but no, I can't weld underwater, because I'm not that good. that I'm not that good, I don't have enough domain depth, I don't have any experience, stuff like that. So again, you have to understand, you know, be, do, have, become, I'm human. At the same time, we all have different levels, layers, phases of that.

It's if helping outruns humaning. I get that. The method can become pressure, performance, or control. I get that. Okay. That's why it's so... Very careful. Bradford Smart came up with the idea. It's not about getting people on the bus, it's about getting the right people in the right seats in the bus, which is... which is definitely an understanding of how people are different. If humaning governs If humaning governs helping, the helper stays present enough to notice whether the next move is actually Fitting. You know, you could do that, but with smart things, it's difficult.

Let me ask this. This is very cryptic. Okay, pretty, pretty concrete response back. I like that. Just give you another way to seed the clothes. Again, It's all about them. Very important concept, it's all about them, which leads to meeting people where they are if it's all about them. Okay, yes, this is a good place to close.

Session reads clean governing insight, helping must remain subordinate to humaning. This gives us... I mean, this is not the truth, folks, but this is where... the entity is right now. It's okay. I mean, sometimes you give it a particular theme. or an idea, and it... and it thinks it has to run with that idea. It can't just put it aside and not refer to it again, so it makes it the main theme of

everything. I see that with AI all the time. Helping must remain subordinate to human... yeah, it's... Kinda right. not altogether true, unless you understand really what those mean.

That gives us a strong place to pause, because the work has moved Beneath technique, the question is no longer only what form of inquiry fits, it is also, is the helper still present enough, restrained enough, and human enough for the helping to serve the person being helped? That feels like enough for now. My God, I guess that would be enough. I mean, I've spent 40 years trying to do what's in that sentence. And it... and it is a fight, especially with agentic people like myself, people who have power, people who have, self... how would I say it? self-proclaimed, self-explained agency, versus those, you know, the initiators in the MBTI versus the receivers. You know, the receivers prefer to hear things, reflect on them, you know, then maybe think about them a little bit before they do them, or choose not to do them at all. Just let them go. Where the initiators, they, you know, they're agentic. So we have the agency on one side, we have the communion on the other, and sometimes it's a whole different world, which is exactly what we have happening right now in the U.S. Politically, is we have Agency, and we have communion, and... in all game theory, not... I won't say all, because I don't know all about it, but in the early days of game theory, they always said cooperation always wins over power. Agency.

And this... this is an interesting thing to watch, today because of the differences that we have in... in, the way we look at politics. So, again, another sideline that AI told me to avoid, but I think it's important to understand that people are different, and if... and does communion win out over agency in the long run? That's a good question, and I think it's hard to answer. I think they win in their own way, and that way is then interpreted by them as a win, versus looking at the other side and saying, well, you know. We're doing that. It's like someone came on the other day and said, we gotta fight fire with fire. Well, what is, you know, what does that mean? What does it mean for people who are motivated through communion. to use fire. When the people who are aging find it easier, easy to... to do that as called by the people over here. So it's a very interesting thing. That's why... that's why humaning is so important to understand.

One of... one of the real learnings in my life was standing on the shoulders of Don Beck. And understanding what it's like to be different in a different place, to be at a different layer, level, and phase. to try to understand what that means, which is why eventually I went from spiral to network. That... that it's a lot easier to understand a network of weights in your system, just like it is to understand bias. Bias is a network. And in certain situations, the weights may be more on this motive versus this motive, and it may be important when you're doing this to get that. So it's... it's a real interesting thing. That's why we have to allow for the differences, and that's why this is a customized approach. And the one who customizes it is the person being helped. And if we can... Understand that, in this process, that we're gonna have a good chance of improving ourselves as a result of making it all about them.

So I'm going to close here. I really thank you for your attention, and if you did make it all the way through, congratulations. Hopefully some of it's interesting, and hopefully some of the teachable points of view are giving you ideas about how you can use them in your own development and your own helping experiences. So this is Mike Jay again, signing off for Leadership University, and we will catch you in Practical 7.

