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Okay. Now we should see people start to join

nothing.

I mean social changes. It's a hot topic.

I'm just wondering if the join link is active yet.

I don't know how she doesn't lose a line.

They can't hear me.

Are we, is that how I say her name number one? And then number two is the link active, but should I be seeing attendees popping in? Yeah, we should be seeing the 10 is popping right now. Uh, because the link is active. Let, just let me get from my team in one minute. Okay. Thank you.

I just know that in the last session people were talking about coming to this session. So I know that there should be attending, uh, the fact that there aren't makes me strongly believe something could be up with the link.

John, I made some empty space for mirror board.

Can you move yourself in closer?

The camera angle is fixed.

I just also Jane

Hmm.

Multitasking

to see what was going on.

I guess we'll hold for a second because people are getting an error when they try to enter this room. I don't want to start without them just because I know I've already talked to, so we are recording. We'll obviously cut this out, but I don't want to start without the live audience because several people have already mentioned that they wanted to attend this one, live three of my minutes.

Okay. There we go.

Starting to see some attendees. Now, some familiar names actually.

So as folks start to enter, I'll point out that we have a Q and a, you should be able to enter in your Q and a, um, and you can also use the zoom chat if you so desire. But, uh, some people have been having issues switching between hosts and panelists and everyone. And if you are not sending it to everyone, then everyone won't see your message.

Um, I am also currently in the chat for player room. So the society track is the square window or whatever. And, uh, I will be monitoring that chat throughout this talk in case you have any questions or anything like that, that you'd like to pop in there. Okay. I think that's all the announcements, like I said, this is the society track.

I'm the chair for this track. And this session is mapping for social change. I'm very excited for this one. Yes. And our first panelist is Mel Conway. Uh, and folks may know him, uh, from yield drinking game. How many times will we mentioned Conway slot at our conference? Uh, yes, but what you may not know is that, um, Mel Conway has a lot of other things, uh, including, uh, really inspiring systems thinker and an educator and, uh, someone who's really passionate about inspiring social change and giving us tools to reflect on change.

So I guess with that, I will hand it off to you, sir.

Okay, here we go. Let's see. Um,

now can you see my first slide and exercise in situational awareness? Yep. Okay. Here we go. Well, hello everybody. Good morning, afternoon or night, wherever in the world you are. Um, that's me at the bottom on Twitter, by the way. Okay. I'm going to tell us a little story about how this got started, and then I'll get into the real story.

Two years ago, I discontinued a quarter century of research on programming, accessibility and return to my first love from a half century before applying systems, thinking to human organization. I started tweeting about cults, mass, disinformation, and propagation of lies in politics. I discovered that there was a common structural element to all of these.

I have come to call it clumping in connected networks. That's a lot of fancy or unfairness. So today I'm going to focus on the structure of unfairness.

It turns out that we're stuck with unfairness. When we scale up to the kinds of connectedness that the internet smartphones and social media have given us, the unfairness comes out of the structure. The top three bullets there about dealing with the structure of unfairness listed here, all show up in politics.

I'm not going to discuss them in this talk. I'm going to discuss the underlying structure. Now personal word about that fourth bullet, which I'm also not going to discuss in this top. My work of the last few years is based on these two articles of faith. First, it is possible to understand what underlies many of the perverse social phenomena that mystify us today, such as how groups of people in the tens of millions can believe public stories, totally unsupported by evidence.

We can do this by looking inside the dynamics of the forces that bind these groups of people together in their common belief. In language that I, as a mathematician can turn into action. There is a way to understand perverse social behavior in terms of clumping and networks. Second. Understanding at this level of detail will lead to new and creative strategies for weakening those binding forces.

But this understanding isn't happening in the public discourse and the strategies aren't appearing, why the answer follows directly from the half century old Conway's law. And I'm reading a paraphrase that the left, the solutions you can find to the problems you have depend on, who is talking to whom and the solutions we need right now require a synthesis of understandings that lie in multiple disciplines that don't talk to each other in particular individual psychology group, psychology politics and the mathematics of systems.

Now over 60 years ago, CP snow delivered a Cambridge lecture that became the book, the two cultures and the scientific resolute revolution to quote Wikipedia its thesis was that science and the humanities, which represented the intellectual life of a whole Western society had become split into two cultures.

And if this division was a major handicap to both in solving the world's problems that handicap in my view is number one in our social problems to do list we've made almost no progress addressing that handicap because of our impermeable institutional walls. I'm dedicating this talk to breaking down a few of those walls.

Now to the business at hand, I'll show you a sequence of four examples that I hope will lead us to a deeper understanding of south social groups. Work. Here are a couple of unsettling conclusions. I've come to first. If you believe that all we have to do is make to make society work better is to make markets work better.

Think again, and I'm going to say this twice, Adam Smith's invisible hand doesn't scale up beneficially. It scales up perversely, Adam Smith's invisible hand scales up perversely. We have an undiscovered such structural problem. In my view, that's the real Facebook problem. It's the structure that we're now still stuck with because of the scale of connectedness that we're dealing with.

Second. There is a causal thread from one of our most powerful social interventions, the public corporation to our current environmental crisis. We can disagree about how determined over the threat is, but we cannot dismiss it. That will be the topic of my last slide.

Okay. In this example, I'm going to construct a thought experiments to introduce a basic concept underneath unfairness. The long tail here, we have four generations of inheritance from the original. The generations are a number at the bottom. Zero generations. Ancestors starting with an asset of a hundred units.

You need to generation each recipients. There are two recipients in each generation passes the exact total of the inheritance onto two successors slightly on equally, either 70, 30, or 60 40 in alternating generations. In the fourth generation, we have 16 beneficiaries each with assets as shown in the red box.

That's the dataset I'll use in the next slide. Here is a plot of those 16 inheritances. This bar chart is a ranked or distribution. It's not your normal X Y plot. Instead, it's a presentation of the, in this case, 16 players in a game ranked in order of winnings with the biggest winning shown by the height of the bar first.

So the value on the horizontal axis is the order number and integer starting with one and going up to the size of the population, whatever it is, that's the common element of a ranked order, a distribution. Now, if things were fair, each recipient would get the average that red dotted red line, a hundred divided by 16 or six.

And a quarter what's important to see is that six of the 16 are above the average on the left. And 10 of the 16 are below the average on the right, the majority of the population tails off to the right below average. That's the long tail. It turns out this relationship shows up all over the place in nature.

Ziff was a linguist study word, frequencies and natural language. The laws named after him, the bars show a general relationship frequency is roughly proportional to the fraction. One divided by the order number in general, it's really one divided by the order number to some low number of power. So it's called the power law.

In this graph. There are two powers shown one and two each bar color totals to one a hundred. The blue bars show one over in which applies to word frequency. The red bar over end squared, which is roughly per Ritos, 80 20 rule. You get 80% of your results from 20% of your inputs. The first two of those red bars add up to 81 of a 100 total.

Okay. Now here is real data on wealth inequality in the United States. Bottom line all wealth. This is real by the way, as of 2019, all wealth is held up is held by the top half of the population. The bottom half has nothing that is people who live from paycheck to paycheck or worse in that top half, you even see the long tail, 30% of the top half is held by the top 1%.

That's the dark red band at the top. The next 40% is held by the remainder of the top 10%. That total 70%, the remaining 30% is held by the remaining 40% of the top half of the population.

Now watch this, I made a few innocent interpolations with those numbers and came up with this ranked order to distribution. 90% of the population has assets below. The average on the right, the last 50% has essentially zero

that's the wealth distribution as of two years ago in the United States.

Okay. Now let's deal with markets. This second example sets us up for the remaining three examples. They are about markets in which the effects of the long tail will show up in the experiment. We have say 10 sellers selling, essentially interchangeable products to say a hundred buyers. Initially the buyers don't communicate with each other, but I'll quickly change them.

Here's the case in which the buyers don't communicate. There are the buyers at the top. I've shown only a small sample of the possible buyers, the BS and transactions, the lines from B to S every transaction opportunity is independent. So useful model is tossing dice at the bottom is the expected rank order distribution of the popularity of the sellers.

They're all equally likely.

Now let's introduce a network that permits any buyer to send a message to any other buyer shown in red. There, we've got lots of those on the internet, many use five star rating systems with comments. We make two assumptions. In addition, some buyers express preferences, some bar, some other buyers are influenced by the.

Expressions something interesting happens. These preferences ricochet through the network, influencing other preferences. When it all settles down, what do we have? Zips loss strikes again, as if law ranked or her distribution. And by the way, down at the bottom glacier peak power laws weblogs and inequality.

That's where I learned about this. You can, you can Google it.

Now. It gets interesting. These companies have to be profitable and there are fixed costs

in large corporate capital-intensive markets. Think oil, steel, autos, web hosting. There's a profitability threatened. The red line at the bottom. Now, dozens of years ago, I read a competition study from the Boston consulting group on market concentration. There was a very clear takeaway for me. You might survive, but you do not want to be number three.

Being number three is hard looking around at the look around at the large emerging tech based markets today and see the dynamic and operation businesses seem to struggle to avoid being number three. So what happens the losers in the long tail start disappearing.

Now,

can you see my printer? That's mega global enterprises. They're swallowing up a loser. Now. How does mega global enterprises. With cheap stock, like cheap, I mean, cheap to existing shareholders, but valuable to the seller. In other words, high price stock MGE must maintain its leadership. So it doesn't slide into, into the long tail.

It does this by growing. The cheapest way to grow is through acquisition. MGE maintains us leadership by growing and using its growth to keep its stock price up so it can grow through acquisitions. Do you see the circularity there?

I call that circularity, the grow or die imperative. It's a dynamic that comes out of the coupling of true internally interconnected markets. That coupling has grown to global scale and led to a problem of sustainability for all of us.

Here are the two markets. MTE has proxies in two couple of markets, the industrial market on the left in which it sells its products and the equities market in which it sells its stock. There is a positive feedback loop between these two Praxis MGE drives its growth in the industrial market through acquisition and delivers.

There it is, and delivers the news of that growth. So the equities market that growth news raises the price of mgs. Which MGE then uses to conduct its acquisitions. MGE must continue this product in order to stay out of the long tail. Now, when you scale this up to global magnitudes, it turns out that we all have been delivered a sustainability problem.

In this last slide, I'll leave you with a suggestion that that dynamic I've been describing has something to do with a sustainability problems. We've been noticing lately. I'll leave it to you to make these connections. Now, the link at the bottom of the slide lists the first five bullets. And to those I've added two more of my.

So my parting question for you is, is there a connection and if so, what is that connection from the grow or die imperative to these global implications? Thanks for your attention.

Thank you. That was wonderful. And very thought provoking. Uh, yes. So that session format or this triad is that we're going to do all three talks and then have an extended discussion and Q and a time. Uh, so with that, we'll go into the next talk, which is going to be SU I believe, right. Okay. Cool. Uh, and Sue is a freelance research artists.

I love the phrase research artist, uh, but she didn't start out that way. So she has a technology background and, um, you know, a variety of really interesting journeys, uh, I think along your path right too. And now you're, uh, really interested in kind of dedicated to social change. And I'm also really interested in how you are looking at social change at a variety of levels, right?

Like municipal and state and, uh, kind of different levels. So I'm really interested in that and I'm very excited that you're joining us today. And I am excited to hear your perspective on mapping for social change. So with that, I'll hand it over to. Well, thank you. Share my presentation now. Hopefully you all can see that.

Um, and this is it. I give you the bird's eye view first here. Um, so, uh, hang on one sec, too many windows open. Here we go. Okay. Since learning of why the map mapping, which was probably a couple of years ago, I, um, I can trying to figure out how to translate it to peace and social justice work. Uh, it didn't feel very obvious to me.

So I made an animation because that's often what I do when I'm trying to make sense of things. I'm not going to play it now, but there's a link on the board and we'll share this board with. You all, um, basically trying to translate the language, uh, of strategy, which is mostly warfare and competition-based into peace and social justice.

So I've been using as a case study, um, or a case a play a case to play with, with mapping is, um, interfaith action for human rights. And I've chosen that organization cause I'm on the board and it's, I have a little bit of a window into how, what our mission is and how we're trying to achieve it. Um, interfaith action for human rights is a nonprofit.

We work in Washington, DC area. So Maryland, Virginia, and DC, and the mission of the organization is, and the use of solitary confined. In Maryland, DC and Virginia prisons, since DC doesn't have their own prisons, they use federal prisons. We do have a little bit of a wider swath there. So about a year ago, I came across the work of outdoor Ebraheem, uh, and dug into his book, um, measuring social change performance and accountability in a complex world because it, it really, um, a talk he gave that I found an online keynote, um, that was shared with me, really bridged this gap for me.

He was working in this space of social change and has been he's a professor at Tufts. And he, um, was at the intersection of strategy and social change, which I it's, I've just found this book, just an amazing wealth of information. So he lays out. When he calls a social performance model and, and this isn't really how he lays out the model and his book, I've sort of taken the model, which is these four core elements here in the middle and just expanded it out, um, to include some of the descriptions that he includes and elaborates on in the book.

But the, um, the core of the model is, um, complexity in Florida, which I think a lot of people will resonate with. And what really struck me though, is this frame of accountability that he has there. It's multiple accountabilities. We're often accountable to our funders and our donors and our grantors, as well as the people that we serve.

And he describes accountability as a relationship of palace. And asks the question, how can we shift away from accountabilities of compliance to accountabilities of strategy, which I found just a really generative idea as I started mapping the interfaith action mission. So the, in terms of the complexity form stuff, he has, um, you know, this in order to have a, uh, social performance model, you need a social change model and idea about the cause and effect of how you're going to go about making this change.

And so the theory of change and the logic model also known as results change in his language, um, are contingent on how, how predictable is the cause and effect going forward for your mission and how much control do you have over that mission? So I'm going to jump over here to a blow up of this. So, these are sort of, this is the contingency framework.

So let's say you were mission was to provide meals, to homeless people in a large city that has a low uncertainty. We know how to do that. People have been doing that for decades. Cranking out meals is not difficult, but there's a low control in that scenario over the larger problems of homelessness. So that he would say is low control, low uncertainty.

So you wouldn't have a niche strategy. So feeding, homeless people, homelessness, sorry, getting all those people in DC is the mission of an organization, uh, called Miriam's kitchen in Washington, DC, I should say, was the mission, um, their initial mission and they have done and still do that. Um, we've done it for decades, um, but they started to realize that there were so many other needs of the people who came.

To them for meals. And they started doing case management and other services, and they had eventually adopted a new strategy, an ecosystem strategy, where there was more of a, well, the new mission was to end chronic homelessness in Washington, DC. So it was high uncertainty. How do you do that? And high your control over the problem higher than just providing meals.

I, you Raheem frames it as high control. I would just say higher. Cause I think it's still, um, kind of questionable how much control you do have in that scenario. So of the cases in Abraham's book, he gives a case study for each of these four quadrants. Um, I thought Miriam's kitchen's challenge was the most similar to interface actions.

So I really dug into that case study. There was so much great detail provided. There was the results chain. There was an ecosystem map that was given that shows, you know, all the players. And I took two passes at mapping these in kumu. I made some Kuma maps of this original results chain, and then I tried to move it around and put it on an evolutionary axis.

I'm not going to go into this unless folks are interested later. And then I did another one of the system mapping. I had much more luck with that one, the system map ecosystem map for Miriam's kitchen. Cause it could actually see the moves they made job. Also go into later. If folks are interested, I'm going to try and stick tight to my schedule here though.

And then, um, I, I took the lessons from those mapping exercises and what I had learned from Abraham's book, I made a mashup template, which was taking Ebraheem social model, which I kind of stretched out. I had made this in kumu and then I, I took sort of the components of his, his social performance model and, and stretch them across the top of where are the maps that I could sort of see where the gaps were in our work.

And then along the vertical axis, I put his results chain, which are sort of like buckets. Like we have, um, this is hard to see, but if anybody wants the kumu links to this, I'm providing them and the inputs, activities, outputs, individual outcomes, it's like societal outcomes. And this was boon for me because I've wrestled with these multiple accountabilities and multiple scopes the whole time I've been trying to do these things.

Exercises for societal change. So then I took this template and I took a pass at mapping, um, interfaith actions, uh, mission. And I did two of these maps. I did one using online worldly map, uh, our, the wet online Wardley mapping.com, which I'm sure a lot of people are familiar with. And I did another using my kumu mashup and, uh, some of the insights here.

Um, I tried to sum up insights, puzzles, and next steps in creating this talk. Um, one insight was I was dead wrong about. Which contingency framework we're operating in. We are so, so this is Abraham's contingency framework again, and the approach that kind of goes with it and, and Miriam's kitchen had sort of a standardized and streamlined approach for delivery, delivering meals.

That makes total sense. And then they had to expand that sort of include that for meal, provide provision, but also expand that to orchestration for their ecosystem strategy. And we are much more in the low control, high uncertainty in terms of ending solitary confinement. So that is, he calls an emergent strategy and the approach should be much more iterate and adjust sort of way.

Find your way through. Um, and it just for information and integrated strategy, is he appropriate? He says for when you have, um, it's basically a coordination strategy because you have multiple niches, you're just trying to coordinate a whole bunch of niche strategies, niche services. So I looked least closely at that case study in the book.

So, um, what are my other insights? I found one of my big struggles was around the original, um, Matt, which I am going to show you here. Let's see. This was the results chain that I made that I took from the book. And I'm just doing it on it. So you can see some of the language.

It's almost like a whole bunch of strategic moves that are laid out in arcs into the future. So time was really messing with my head when I tried to worldly map the now, because that was another insight. Like don't try and project into the future until you got your map. And then look at moves, like map.

The now was one of my big insights. And so when I tried to map this, I ended up with a bunch of these sort of what, what I'm borrowing a term from Ben Mosher of like user journeys, but they're almost like strategy journeys. So you can see like the language is sort of like, um, local organiz organizations and agencies are more aligned in their approach to ending chronic homelessness.

This was for the ecosystem strategy strand. So it's, it's, it's like saying they will come to be more. Aligned in their approach, they will come to have a unified front. Um, and so I had to really abandon that. So that was one of the big insights, um, in, in terms of that user journey across the top tool that Ben does, I find that really useful.

I took it that approach for my online Wardley mapping version, which allowed me to map, um, interfaith actions, main moves, which was really helpful for me. Um, but I, I just took this, this arc through the system in a way, and I think there could be a lot more work done with that across the top. I included sort of the institutional pipeline since that pipeline has some dovetails with our work.

But I think that. Pipeline could really be used as the basis for the ecosystem map if we were to do that. So is the other thing I, I learned, we don't really have a system map. We haven't spent time making that map. And so you can see here, um, I, I colored this, one's her bright green, and I have this in Kumo too, which I can share so people can play around with this.

Um, we don't really, we haven't really done that work yet. We also, we don't have a formal system for densifying, um, and building new capabilities. They do emerge through our work. We have a couple new things that have come on board. We, we have pro bono legal work now down here at the bottom. Uh, you can see, we have, um, started, uh, connecting.

Things that we're hearing about managing the, um, prison population, like the use of attack dogs in DC, or we hear that and it's, it's horrific, it's talking about human rights violations. And so we've gotten sort of into this, um, soliciting pro bono law firms to take up lawsuits in those cases. And, um, so that's new things that are capabilities that are emerging, but it's very ad hoc comes up through the conversations in terms of, um, let's see puzzles.

How might we be more accountable? Sorry. The, my accountability is here are these, um, Orange dots. So how might we be more accountable? Not only to our donors, which are here and our grand tours down here, but also to the people that we primarily serve, who are incarcerated people. That's a really difficult challenge because we don't, communication is so difficult.

I'm a pen pal with someone in a federal prison. And we, we have so much trouble even getting letters through. They just disappear sometimes. Like, so that's one of my puzzles. Um, how might we map more the ecosystem and the possible next steps? Um, for me sharing this, these maps, this work that I've done with the board to see how our strategic priorities, which we have spent time with as a board.

Could be, um, mapped and further using this tool. I've been a sort of closet mapper in the context of interfaith action. Um, and so that would be once that the other thing is the next step might be to share this work with Abraham himself, Eleanor Abraham, because I think wildly mapping could bring some kind of shared language to the work of system mapping, which is very ad hoc right now, you know, this type of system at, for, um, mirrored Miriam's kitchen was the only one of the cases that had this kind of ECOS system map.

And so it, and, and I find it really valuable to put that in a worldly frame. So I think that's a 15 for me. So I'm going to stop talking. All right. Thank you so much. So I was, again, very. Thought provoking. And I haven't read that book before. I'll have to check it out. Okay. And with that, we'll have our final panelists before we go into the Q and a, and this is my friend Tara McGrath, and she is amazing.

And we have had a chance to collaborate before in some pumps that were here doing math camp together. She's the head of product innovation for the digital capability at Novartis, but she has done again, just a wide variety of things. She has worked in nonprofit. She has been in academia, just all over the place.

So I'm very excited again for just a completely different perspective on this. So with that, and. I everybody. Yeah. So I'm Tara I'm and I'm going to talk to you a little bit about my journey as a stupid fish. And you've heard from Mel, you've heard from Sue, which had incredibly articulate and engaging patients.

Um, I'm just going to talk about something that's very, very simple in the true spirit of being a stupid fish. So let's start off with making the assumption that there's two types of people in the world. I know that there's lots of more types of people in the world with, just for the sake of this story.

Let's just assume there's two. So there's those who want to make things better for others. And there's those that want to make things better for themselves. What kind of words do you think of when you think of the people that want to make things better for others? It's always really good for. It's really positive where it's so like good, selfless, kind, wonderful caring, and the ones that want to make things better for themselves.

There's this sort of negative associated with them. So we've got selfish. So serving maybe a positive is probably a bit more rich, right? And if you think back to male's diagram of the wealth distribution, maybe that's opened the upper sections of there. The story of this fish who happens to be me, unfortunately, is where I struggled between going between one type of person to the other type of person over and over and over again.

So I'll start at the beginning. And so once upon a time, a fish wanted to make the world less, but not good, not amazing, not better, but a little bit less bad. It started off at about age six where the fish had a major meltdown in the middle of no man's land in Cyprus because she couldn't figure out whether.

Which side was the good guys on which side of the bad guys. So would not leave the middle of no man's land until she had more information. So she could make a decision and decide which side she was going to move towards. It ended up with dad picking them up and carrying her off at age 15, they wanted to help people that were, that they had experienced negative things in their closer community.

So concert was one of those things. So the fish created an open source concert treatments, cause she wants to help people close to them at 17 at the fish decided to create a fuel efficient stove because she wants to help everybody in the world and reduce indoor air pollution for women. Now, this was the big one.

So the Irish government, obviously from my accent, you can tell where I'm from. I decided that this was the best thing ever. A 17 year old woman girl had taken this idea and was going to help save the world with her amazing idea. So they took her and a film crew to Ethiopia to test out this stove, surrounded by hundreds of women, um, testing this stove, tears and claps, one woman whispered interior and said, um, this is great.

How are we going to cook our food? Because we eat injera and that's flash, and you've just made a posh. So she very quickly during her first lesson. And I don't know why that moved, um, ask the people what they need before you make it for them. So the fish decided that he just learned a lot more. So they've started to get some studying done.

Initially they want to do product development and learn about industrial design point. The fish decided to study international development and food policy. That's where she gets into all the nitty gritty of what Sue has been describing. Logical frameworks, sustainable plans. She learned about micro finance.

She learned about agriculture. She learned a bit statistics, but so much time was spent figuring out how to read grant applications, which she was pretty confused about. Second lesson. Most of the job for a charitable organizations are unfunded. Which is a really difficult thing because you looked at what, um, suits spoke about.

And there's, there's a lot of work that has to be done on the other side, once that funding comes into place. So I made an attempt at trying to map this, um, and there's a whole lot of money involved or a whole lot of time involved in custom doing this. So you think about the users, we've got people that are experiencing poverty.

We've got, um, people that are there's inequality. There's a whole load of issues. There's human rights violations, but you also have to interact with governments, individuals, corporates, philanthropists, community groups. And I focused on just the corporate companies. And you can look at this a little bit more later if you'd like, but this was almost everything was in custom.

So a huge amount of time, a huge amount of effort. And then after all of that, the funding might come and it might go to another four of the tardies that they're looking to work with. So, and the last lesson was that charitable organizations have very little time and resources to do that. And if that didn't make the fish cynical, these are the things that she was hearing.

So I want to you to take a minute and just read through some of the things that the fish was hearing in this context, after spending lots of time looking for funding

before we ever got to do anything with anyone in a project.

So the fish gave up and they decided to be one of the people that made things better for herself. So at age 29, The fish went to work for a corporate organization because surely they do things much better. And then a brand, the age of Turkey, which was ready to join one of the committees again and got to see how corporates interact with charitable organizations.

So remember she had spent a lot of time talking to Tara, to corporate organizations for funding. Uh, no, she was in a corporate organization who was making the decisions. So we started to try and map what it was like from the corporate side. And I think this links to where melon was talking about. So this is the mega mega global enterprise.

That's what it was at other companies, but it's okay because they do CSR and they give some money to charities. And so they spend an awful lot of time with governance and you can look through this map a little bit more Carey. Um, but if you look at the charity partners at the interactive. What they want is funding.

And they probably want non-restricted funding, which helps them to like pay for salaries and things like that. Um, and then what they deliver is pretty clear. They run programs to make the world better with their expertise. Um, on the, what Sue spoke about was very clearly outlined that they think they know what they're doing there, but all of this other work is all around here.

And often they have to hire a consultancy to manage this work because the expertise isn't in a not-for-profit. So that's one of the big challenges. So there's a huge level. There's a huge level of government governance, but trying to find funding, but there's different needs. There's massive investment of time and budgets on both sides before anything gets done.

The language is different. Um, but moving towards something more similar with product, but that's another talk because I think volume and things are burgeoned together. A bit more, the relationship is on equal. So that's where Sue, you mentioned about accountability and that power relationship, which is hugely on equal and sustainability is absent because often these happen on unity.

So you've got to go back in and do it all over again. Um, I use the counterproductive framework and I feel like all of the things that we do fit into what are the worst things that would happen. So if anyone's interested in Tris, I'm happy to talk a bit more about that. Um, so how are we going to get anything done if we spend so much time in these custom areas?

So there's a clear need to strategically map together early to new things out of custom.

And I want to leave you with this coat of white have spent my career feeling like a stupid fish.

Thank you.

That was lovely. Thank you very much. Okay, so now we'll have a 40, 45 minutes, uh, discussion and we do have questions from the, uh, audience. Uh, so let's see, I'll remove the spotlight on go. All right. Now, can everyone see our lovely panelists? I hope he can. Okay. Terrific.

Okay. So we do have questions here and we covered a lot of grants. So I would assume, well, okay. Even more questions, because we talked about social change from three really different perspectives. So the first question, which is directed towards Mel, but I have a feeling that it's relevant to everyone. Um, and this is from Jonathan.

He says, thanks, smell for the tuck. Uh, you are inferring that antitrust and competition authorities are not effectively regulating mergers and acquisitions to maintain competition. Is that correct? So I think the question here is really around competition and market.

I'd rather change the subject to the current problem, which is. What we call quote the Facebook problem, which is, um, the use of social networking. I don't really have a comment about competition in general. I mean, antitrust has worked in the past in the more industrial model, but our current problem has to do with connectivity and the scale of connectivity and the fact that it's creating new, new phenomena like riots and, uh, insurrections.

And we don't have a theory about that. And what I'm saying is that our classical approaches don't really address that because there are these new phenomena which arise from the scale. So I'm, yeah, I'm not quite agreeing that classical antitrust doesn't work. It may have worked. For the classical organizations, but it is, I assert that it's not working to deal with what social networking is doing within society now.

Yeah. I'll put my 2 cents in here, even though no one asked for it. But, um, so I have been doing some research, actual research, not like. You know, sitting, looking on my cell phone at Facebook memes, uh, but actual research about I buyers. So these are, I don't know if they have them all over the world, but they certainly have them here in the United States.

These are real estate buyers who buy homes. Right. Uh, but basically without any of the traditional real estate process, so this like Zillow and offer pad and all of these. Right. And, uh, but they're using that right. Then the network effects, it's definitely a network play, uh, to buy up real estate. And of course there are lots of unintended consequences of that, like driving up real estate prices and making housing completely unaffordable and large metropolitan areas.

Uh, but even that, so that's not a social movement, right. Like a capitalist thing that we got going on. That's a market, even that I would just point out that the antitrust regulation and even other sorts of regulation that are designed to protect consumers through fostering competition, none of those are being effectively applied to, uh, I buyers, which I think is a great example of, uh, a proper network play in, uh, you know, capitalist market.

Uh, so Jonathan, I hope that you're sufficiently depressed along with the rest of us now. And we can, uh, I don't know if we want to hear from Sue or terror on that one. Do you want to do anything besides cry to your comment cat by the way, but go ahead, Jonathan. She said, please.

Um, I get a letter a week from an individual quote whose addresses in the next town offering to buy my house for cash. And I, I'm pretty confident that who's really talking to me as wall street. And so what we have is another example of two markets being coupled, which is what I showed for the mega global enterprises case.

Now the private real estate market and the finance market are being coupled by this new connection and heaven knows what that's going to lead to. It's another, perhaps another growth grow or die imperative, like the first one. So, uh, this is just another example of this coupling of independent things that's happening.

Yeah, I think so from my perspective, from my context, and thinking about like a charitable organization, we definitely have that survive piece as well. So if you think about that power and accountability thing, the owner who is actually making the decisions that the not for profit is making because of the accountability to the Lord, large corporates or to the government government agencies or to whoever.

Paying that money. And then what is the motivation for them to do that? Is it I'm doing bad things. So I'm going to invest in this to make it seem better so that it's yeah. To, to put another level of depression into it. That's another element that I can see. I don't know what I have to offer. It counters the depression or not, but I, I kinda think it does in a way, I think about competition a lot, because it just seems to be as presumed as what's driving a lot of our collective emergent phenomenon.

And that I did a series of animations with a guy named Mike who looks through Krishna at the London school of economics on cultural evolution. And I do. Uh, at a lot of things through the lens of evolution and Michael, uh, really made his research, shows that competition isn't enough for evolution.

There's always these, these ag aggregating. And I think Mel, and one of the early drafts of your talk, you talked a lot about affinity groups. So those that is, that has to be non-cloud right. We're we're, we're, we're not competing. We're actually clumping together to help each other and to create a community.

And so I think that there, even though we get a little down about the competition, I don't think that's the only driving force at play here.

Yeah. Yeah. I can speak to that again. Um, I've got a graphic of a line of geese following each other. There, there are phenomena in individual psychology that we're not accounting for. And there's one in particular that is attachment theory, which psychologists have all kinds of words about in children.

But I think it hasn't been recognized that it applies to adults too. And in fact, it's really the underlying phenomenon between some of these really weird group things we're seeing happening. And that's why, and that's why I brought up CS snow in my second or third slide, because we got people who need to talk to each other, who aren't talking to each other, um, the psychologist and.

Mathematicians and the system, people need to start talking to each other. Okay.

On that note, we did get a few questions and then, um, some comments in the chat and everywhere I'm trying to connect to crash chat Q and a Twitter. Um, but we got a fair number of questions and comments about the match-ups. So Sue, you did some mashups right. Of different approaches. And then Tara, you mentioned some other approaches that you use.

And I personally know from working with you that you are like the queen of mash-ups. Uh, and so I think there's something there, right. With how do we, how do we. Build bridges like Sue, you were talking about. And maybe one of the ways that we do that is by making mashup, mashups that the different models that we use in different disciplines.

Uh, so I would, I would love to hear from you folks on that, and maybe we want to start with Sue since you really featured those match-ups. So, um, someone in the chat pose a question, what issues do I have when I make that it's hard. It's just, it's a lot of thinking to, to first internalize a new model, like Abraham's model took me awhile.

It's a really rich, rich, dense book, but chock full of stuff. But now that I've done it, I feel like it's, I'm just excited to do more. One of the next steps I didn't talk about was I've been working with a. Um, we've been developing, uh, a model of trust. And one of the things that we did in that group, we've been meeting on, on Miro for a little over a year.

And we worldly mapped, uh, an organization that realized it had a trust issue between its C-suite and the rest of the organization. And it was so interesting to see how it revealed moves. So I'd love to maybe formalize that trust model as one of the wildly mashups, because it's, it's been so generative to me as it's still emerging, but, uh, it's called the heart pent smart model of trust named after Joyce departments who created it.

So, um, that's one thought, like I'm all for it. I'm in to the mashup.

Um, well, I, I can come in. So I used to think that going back to being a stupid fish, but I used to think that I was being super silly by always trying to mash everything together. Um, and then somebody lately told me that that was my superpower. So now I'm flipping it over and thinking about how, because I, if the connectivity with different things, I'm absolutely not a wordy mapping expert, but I'll try and give it a go.

And what if I don't, and I don't know why the presentation seems to have disappeared a little bit, um, on our mural board or I have different conferences that are pushed underneath different areas. So when thinking about. What I learned the first lesson that I learned around empathy, that empathy mapping piece is really important.

So if I had the tool of an empathy map at the point when I was designing my super wonderful fuel efficient stove, that would've been really useful. And then a tool that I would have brought in the results to mapping the same with the counterproductive framework from trays. It's something that I've adopted from Antarctica, but it's like, what's the worst thing that you can do.

Um, and then we're working through, through those areas. And so that helps me to do prediction. So when I'm trying to map something that I haven't done yet, or I, I can think of like, use that one to Lincoln with that. Um, and I have. Been spending a lot of time on we're trying to put all the canvases that I use into one place, um, which is an, how they connect to each other and which ones are complimenting each other, but there's never kind of like one fixed piece.

Um, but the challenge I do feel with it is when I am talking to somebody that is super, super familiar, I'd like, like so familiar, I guess it's very similar to the quote that Mel used at the start. If someone's so familiar with one specific way of doing things, trying to communicate with them in a way that matches things together is like, it's almost like an uncanny value feeling.

It's like, it's kinda the same, but it's kind of different. So it's making me feel uncomfortable. So I don't want to engage with it. And I found that that's a challenge.

Yeah. Yeah. That's a great way of describing that. Like the UN and Kenny valley, I've talked about disfluency before, like, uh, you know, sometimes it's really good to make people make the tools that people have really conspicuous to them. Because a lot of times we're just swinging our hammer and not even thinking about the hammer.

And other times it's just a bunch of overhead, you know, to make people think about the tools that they're using or what they're doing so requires great care. And that's definitely a super power. And I think, uh, so we have a really unruly participant, uh, named Simon ward. Phil, I think tried to do a little mashup of its own and put multiple questions into just one question.

So if I may, which I definitely may, because I'm the moderator, I'm going to disect that into a couple of different questions. Um, so the first one I definitely noticed, even though this is the social change session and not the me versus week session, there was a thread of me versus we. Across all of your three talks, but I think the thing that was there that no one said, but everyone implied was that we is one of the actors contained in a week.

Right. So am I doing this for myself? Or am I doing this for others? Well, perhaps if we change the scope a little bit, you can understand how you, how doing things for yourself and doing things to improve the system or kind of the same thing at a certain level of zoom, maybe. Uh, so I, I, I paraphrase that, right?

Like as an observer of your sessions, that's the thread that I'm pulling out. And I, I am curious to hear from all of you how wrong I am in that. And I, I lied to go to Tara first so that she can tell me that I'm a stupid. Uh, I don't, I don't think that you are wrong because I think there's, there was something that I left out of.

My, um, my presentation was I had a sort of graph and not math because I've been listening to lots of assignments, talks, uh, how, like people that do good and people to do bad and yet like PE and charts, sorry, charities that want to do good and, or corporate that want to do good and corporates that are bad.

And there is a me in all of, all of those areas and there's a, we in all of those areas and there is no, like there's no black and white, there, there is a level of everything. And every like every action has an equal and opposite reaction. So sometimes when the intent is to do something. There can be negative consequences.

I find that a lot in my career as well. Um, so I guy is in the audience and I'm going to say something that he's going to laugh at, but you're not wrong, which is, it was just something, but also there's no right answer. It's sort of everything is intersecting and I will draw that diagram.

Sue, do you have any stage wisdom for us on this? Well, I don't know if it's Sage, but I have some connections that we make. Um, I, when I was trying to get ready for my talk, I mapped, I did this like massive kumu map and I used as the frame. Um, Marshall Ganz is public narrative frame, which is the story of self, the story of us, the story of now.

And just try to like spray brain dump, just few in a QMAP. And, and so for me, it's, it's always the dovetail of those things. There's things that are really important to me, for whatever reason. I can't even explain why am I interested in improving human rights in prisons? I've never been in prison, never had a family member in prison, but it I'm fixated on it.

Like it just feels so unjust. It pisses me off, frankly, that we would waste so much human potential and deny people an opportunity to become themselves. So I do have a lot of, of passion around the me. We, I guess I, I bought a little bit about moving from me to weed because I think as Tara pointed out, there's there's the, the, there, there, there you need to bring.

Because the me is the thing that gets me angry about injustice. Um, the other thing that you said, Tara, about unintended consequences, that didn't make it into my talk, but I become a Quaker in my adult life. It's part of like, I love the brand, right? The peace brand. And I love sitting in silence, but the Quakers were the creators.

I mean, at least in part contributors to the modern penitentiary, talking about best intentions, leading to things that you do not want. I think this is why we need these performance systems to measure because we will create things that we don't want. If you, if you just want to end chronic homelessness in DC, you could ship them all out the homeless people, you know, like you still need to keep making sure that you're, you're adhering to your, your humane mission and not just achieving the mission

achieving. Yeah, may I request two minutes for an indulgence? I have a speech. Okay. Of course there is a way to transform me versus we, and to both, what you have to do is to back up one level and to see that me and we are two different levels of description for a single phenomenon. And I'd like to do it through analogy.

Um, if you, two centuries ago, if you went to your doctor with chills and fever and shakes, this was like in 19 1800, he would say, well, you probably have the vapors. And what I can do for you is bleed you. Okay? And about a half century later, the germ theory of disease started entering the practice of medicine.

And people realized that were things going on at two different levels of description. There's the. There's a presentation, which the patient brings. And then there's the underlying process, which is what's going on inside the body. Okay. So you need two different levels of description for that. So you're already talking about two different levels of language and then enters biology and you start tying the two things together and biological research explains how things working together at the process level, present new phenomena at the presentation level.

So I've actually, I've been writing about this for two years. I'd call it a model of emergence and it involves two element, three elements. You have two levels of description and then a level of glue, which is a process that connects the two. So there is a social model and that's basically my research.

Which incorporates both me and we, and now the question is, you know, and I, I can see there's a way to develop an understanding. It does not put these two in opposition, but understands the two as part of a single process. Now, the question is, what are you doing with I, you know, I'm ready to talk to people about it, but again, as Tara points out, you need people who are willing to sit down who don't speak each other's language.

Uh, and by the way, I want to inject, I saw a note from Mathias Fay, who I know from, from domain driven design, they have a model for doing this. Uh, it's what Eric Evans described is developing a ubiquitous language. We need to have a process. Getting people together, the me, we, the me and the we people to develop a ubiquitous language so they can talk about this using a single language and a speech.

It was a beautiful speech, insincere sincere taking a second to plug Eric Evans. I will say that for me personally, when I think about, uh, that I am a, me and I exist in a we, right. Uh, I found the work of Judith Butler who just completely. Destroys, whatever ideas you have of yourself or your, I have your me rights because it's nearly impossible to define yourself without the we, right.

Um, and it's actually really hard to draw the line of what is me and what is we, uh, so very interesting there. And then lots of folks who have been around the mapping community over the past couple of years will be tired of hearing people, plug Carol Gilligan, but sorry, folks. Uh, we have to plug, plug Carol Gilligan again in her work, which is about the underlying ethics that we have.

Right. And, uh, do we believe that people are that things that happened to them or do we believe that we care for collectives? So, I guess now we can talk about the second part of Simon's question. I think maybe, um, so basically the second part of his question is what are we going to do about this? Right.

We have a lot of people and organizations who seem to be acting in self interest or to get power. And we could have a whole separate discussion about what kind of power that we're talking about. Uh, but there's not necessarily a huge, uh, perceivable desire to dig into the system and change it. Those of you who know me know that I would also argue at that point, but this is my panel.

It's all of yours. So, uh, the question is, how do we change any of this? How do we get these actors, these players interested in changing the system? Hmm. I don't know who wants to go first on this question?

I can suggest something. Um, uh, you know, I think in terms of global warming, which is just the ultimate impossible problem. Um, and the first I would make a distinction between description and intervention and the problem, one of the problems I see is that we have all kinds of. People who are invested in description like journalists, for example, and commentators.

But the transition from description to intervention is blocked. And, um, part of the reason is it takes a different skill set. And I think this accepting that to intervene, if you want to, if you want a germ theory, instead of just bleeding as a way of dealing with the problem, you've got to go inside and look inside, which means you have to think in terms of two levels of description at the same time.

And so the answer to the question that I propose is create a model. In other words, create an organization, create a team that is committed to doing this for one problem and watch that team. Work the process of working together in order to develop a single language to solve that problem. And you know, it make a global warming is too big a problem, but pick something, find a team that's willing to commit to the process and then do it in public.

I wish I answered, uh, my, my thoughts are well, yeah, that'd be great if I knew the answer to that. Um, and Mel, that was inspired some of my, my thinking and I guess the thing that I, that strikes me the most is the language like the common language and how do we get the people in the room who disagree with each other?

'cause that's like, if you look at the systems that you're talking about, like Facebook, I only see people that really agree with me. I only see, I only hire people that have similar perspectives and opinions to me in most cases. And why you might say it's a diverse hire, but you still have the same, like values ethics.

We're not going to get anything done unless we talk to the people that are opposing that. So how might we like make the we and the knee include the others, the opposition, the people that challenged this type of thinking that 10 people that don't engage with this. Um, and that's one of the big challenges of, can we use our kryptonite to make us stronger?

I wish I had more of an answer, but that's my, how might we that, that's why I'm suggesting a model and not doing it. Uh, but doing it on a model that is a team of people who are committed to the process. So yes, you don't deal with that issue. Initially what you do is you create a demonstration that it can work and then you, then you figure out how to trick, how to scale this model.

Wow. Um, where to even start, because this is breaking my brain a little bit. Um, I, I don't, I have this weird aversion to trying to get other people to do things maybe because I'm like stuck in my terrible twos. And if somebody tries to get me to do something, I'm like, then I don't, even if I want him to do it, then I don't want it to, so that's like first off, like I try not to get people to do things.

Uh, mal you said something that really provoked my attention. It just caught my attention. This transition from description to intervention is blocked. And so I think, um, rather than focusing on getting people to, to see that this is critical and important, I think shifting the focus to what's blocking people.

And I think that's hyper-local. And so I, I, in terms of having people do this in public, I'm all, I'm all for it. I don't know if anybody's ever seen Mike Haber and Ben Mosher, and I try and map in public, but it was a hot mess of mess and just chaotic, but that's one of the reasons I really appreciate your hams book, because these are organizations that have bought into.

We're doing this in public. It really requires you to shift your thinking about accountability. You have to be willing to make mistakes and own up to them and be like, yeah, we, we blew it with that move. And here's what we're thinking of doing next in terms of accountability too. I can't help thinking about, you know, Tara, what you said about getting the people you don't agree with in the room.

Um, I want to share this video of this talk with the interfaith action board, but I also want to speak to some things that really bothered me about the way our work happens, which is that correctional officers, secretary of corrections, wardens. It's really easy. It Republicans, it's really easy to make people though the opponent.

That we need to beat, and I don't see any way forward with that frame. I don't think it's possible. And so I want to get correctional officers in the room and say, what do you need? I mean, the three reasons, solitary confinement, primary reasons, or user punishment for wrongdoing, individual, or a whole group safety of an incarcerated person.

They need to be isolated for their own safety or safety of a correctional officer. It's a population management technique that says, if I just take you out of the picture, you terrify me. If I take you out of the picture, I will be able to do my job today was so partnering with those communities to figure out what tools might work better.

Besides forcing someone into isolation, which we know is torture like it is. It's creating people, leaving the system in a much worse state than when we got them. It's not rehabilitative in any. A lot of the most interesting, well, the project that I, that made me leave where I was was that, um, I worked with a group of sex workers in, um, in a specific country.

I don't want to go into too much detail or, you know, my guests, your organization, um, but a group of sex workers who wanted to try and improve the lives of their children. Um, and they formed a small community organization. I worked with an organization that supported them. It was the best organization I've ever worked with with the most incredible people that were driving change and they were driving and they wanted to continue the work that they were doing because that was paying for their kids to do stuff, but they didn't want their kids.

I would on the street at nighttime because they needed to use their homes for their work. So. I worked for an organization. Your organization went through a bit of a struggle. We had to close up project and I pitched to every single organization to try and form that project. And all I got backwards.

Could you pick something more palatable? Can we have somebody that's? So that's the type of like opposition that really it's the type of, it's not opposition, but it's the type of relationships that work on create change, but the structure in society that we're in and the type of impressions that people got from Facebook and campaigns, that's there, it doesn't allow for that to happen.

And I don't know how to change that. Like, I feel like Mel, your models would help us to figure out how to shift some of that. I have a book to recommend, uh, I have a colleague, his name is Gilbert stile, S T E I L. He has written a book called the collaboration response. He has done this successfully as a consultant in which in a one, two or three day workshop.

People get all components of the organization in the room and he has a process for getting them to arrive at a consensus. Um, one of his incidentally, one of his cases was sponsored by the UN. He went to Bangladesh. I think the case may have been a glider and a sodium salt diet, and some of the constituencies he had in the room where the sex workers on the truck drivers, for example, because that turns out to be a very important part of the process.

So this is a book in which he describes how to do it for in, in a couple of days on a limited problem. And so there's a model there that you can work with.

Cool. Thank you very much. When I think some people were posting that information in the chat, if anyone wants it. And I fully acknowledged that we did not get through all of your questions, uh, but uh, these folks are all easy to find. You can definitely approach them. I don't know if any of you are planning on popping into the square window, chat in the platform, but, uh, folks can ask questions there or you can find them out on social media.

Whatever the case may be. I'm sorry. We didn't get to all your questions. I hope that you still found lots of value in the session. I treat the fact that there are so many questions as an indicator that lots of value was had. Uh, but at this time I would love to have just maybe like a closing insight from each of the panelists, if possible.

Uh, and I know I'm putting on the spot, so whoever would like to go first can go for it.

I have mine at the ready. I thought about my accountabilities and talking here, and there were many of them. It was in one of my early versions of my presentation. And one of those of course, was to you all who show up and to interface action. The people who have been doing this work for decades, I'm a newbie to human rights where.

But also to myself for the hours and hours that I have put into nerding out on worthy mapping, it's just nerdy entertainment, unless I share it, which is why I agreed to do this. Like, it's not, I don't love speaking in public, but I think we're, we're doing some of what we're talking about in terms of doing the messy thinking in public.

Um, okay. My suggestion is do something in public and, uh, I, the, the concrete thing would be former group that will solve a problem.

Um, mine would be always try and think about how to communicate in a way that the other person will understand. And not to be the cleverest person in the room. It's okay to be a super fish if people understand too. Yes. Yeah. Cool. Thank you so much, Mel. Does Ruth have any closing thoughts that she'd like to share with us if she's still hiding?

Oh,

goodness. Well, thank you everyone so much for being here and please pop into the square window chat. I will be there. And I think next we have the Q and a with Simon and Chris, and then next on this track. So after that Q and a is maps, ethics, and power. So power came up a lot in this session. All I'm saying is we've got a theme going here.

Okay. Uh, thank you everyone so much. I really enjoyed it. Thank you so much to our panelists and to all the participants catch you later. Bye.

Right? I think we're good.