MapCamp 2021 - Me vs We

Do we start in 15.

All right. 10, do you starting to find their way in here?

Okay. Lots of people. I'm going to just say some logistical type things. Legitimately get started. Uh, but this session, if you've been in any of the other sessions today, it will be similar and that you can submit Q and a at any old time that you'd like some, you do not need to wait for the speaker to be done with their portion.

You don't need to wait for the, um, discussion portion to be done. You can submit Q and a any time you want. I'll be watching the Q and a, um, generally we've been addressing questions live, but some questions we've been actually writing an answer to. We'll try to get to as many questions as we can. Uh, I'm making an attempt to be watching the Q and a and, um, the chat and Twitter, but please feel free to just nudge me if I'm not getting to something.

Uh, I think. That's it. I'm not sure what I'm missing as far as logistics, but I am Katz Marcela. I am the chair of the society track today at Nat camp. And it's been great fun already. And I'm very much looking forward to this session. Uh, this session is me versus we just to make sure that you're in the right one.

This is the topic that you were looking for me versus we on the society track. So that's where you are right now. And, uh, our first speaker will be my friend, JD. I'm very pleased to call you my friend and pleased to have you here. Speaking on my track, I'm amazed that you agreed to do it knowing. You know what a pain I am.

Uh, but I thank you for that. Very much. JD is really well known in the software architecture community and also doing a lot of things out in the community to, uh, inspire and advance social change. So I'm just very pleased to have you here and so excited to have you open up this session and without further ado, I'll pass it to you.

Thanks, Kat. Appreciate it. I'm really happy to be here. Um, yeah, as Kat said, I'm a system architect and technologist. I love building things with large groups of people, figuring out ways of doing that. So let me share my screen and I'll get going. Everybody. See it. Yes. Okay. Thanks. Okay. Just making sure. Um, so yeah, this is the me versus we panel.

I like to think about what we'd have to change to build a more sustainable and humane future. So let's dive into that and into me versus we switching there, there we go. So, um, who we are as a moving target me is like a unique identity that, and how we, how we define ourselves. Wow. That changes all the time, but we forget, we move, we learn, we change that's me identity.

So there might be an unchanging root attribute. It's an ego might be one example, a UID and a schema might be another at its base. It's a container for a set of changing categories, attributes, change, uh, values and states. It could be any set of unique information or separate and unchanging value that serves to differentiate one thing from another and information theory, it might be called a unique resource or, uh, uh,

let's see, in psychological or philosophical philosophical circles, we might equate an identity with a personal self. When we think about a person there in amalgam of many things, but the generally retain some continuity throughout their life. The person might be made up of goals, behaviors, experiences, personality, et cetera.

You might categorize them based on neurology, biology, relationships, or any other number of contextual buckets. So this is a Johari window. It was invented by psychologists in the 1950s that it included because it's a tool that can help you build meaning within your own self concepts. It can also be used to build greater meaning and understanding across certain attributes, as well as groups of people.

It's a collaborative tool to help you understand yourself and others. It can be adapted for any entity across the sudden, across a set of characteristics, collectives businesses, components, resources, to understand the system on a deeper level as well. It's been proven to increase group awareness and interpersonal communication among groups of people Johari focuses on personal strengths and no carry on flaws.

So there might be some interesting things that could be combined with this, uh, Kuvan with Wardley maps and some of the other tools that you've probably seen here today. So what is we. It's a collection of identities that has its own unique identity. So they're grouped the identity of the individuals within the group are sorted or defined in a categorical way.

And they generally have a common objective or some kind of a sorting mechanism that they can be compared to, uh, or against with other groups. And versus this is a really interesting word. Um, you might think of verses like this, uh, but really the root word of versus is super interesting. It's related to the word word or weird or worth it's related to face.

To ruins and to divination, to predicting the future tuber originally is to bend it's related to destiny, to value and to will versus go back to the origins of humanity, to, you know, the word of God, to where as to both create and to become, to predict the future and ultimately means to bend. So if you think about the word versus today through the lens of conflict, you might try rethinking that the root word has implications for our discussions today, the way this is the all rune or the web of word, it's a symbol that represents all possible paths or an infinity of destinies.

And this is a diagram of where conflict can occur within an individual's identity, as well as within a group's identity, where they conflict defines a boundary and creates a need for handling one of five different ways. Um, there are a number of different conflict, uh, conflict management or handling techniques that you can dive into further.

Uh, boundaries are defined by conflict and variation. The self and group concepts concepts are inherent within language and within the shared understanding the long and the short of this diagram is that wherever there's conflict, there's an opportunity to modify attributes to better meet needs, to complete objectives, uh, to change objectives and to optimize the flow of energy and the amount of effort and friction necessary to change state.

And that is what helps you build collaboration and. To complete your objectives. I can dive into this further later on. If anybody's interested, I probably don't have time to talk through the entire, uh, graph that I've created on this. So from me to, we I'd like us to be aware of our edges where conflict occurs and embrace the understanding that conflict can help us to build more robust systems where there's conflict, there's opportunity to improve and change, to learn and to do better.

Conflict can be an indicator that analysis needs to be formed. Be performed to take a breath, to reevaluate and reform with curiosity and abandon what isn't working, uh, from me to we and forms and reinforces personal and shared objectives. Friction can be helpful to little. You might not be able to move forward too much and it can keep you from moving at all.

We often ignore conflicts within ourselves to our own detriment. When we ignore it to retain a group identity like marching in lock step toward a goal, we may end up running so quickly that we lose connection to what's most important to us. This can cause any group to spin off into cycles of abuse and control.

So, uh, reflects the flow. It's a bi-directional relationship where both the subject and the object change one another. They bend to meet each other at a, uh, and create a whole me versus we is reflexive me too. We as reflexive, they feed into each other and they change and they affect one another's dynamics.

The conflict inherent in me versus we, it allows us to grow, to adapt and to change. Something I like thinking about a lot is what we can do to change, uh, our culture going forward and to make it more sustainable. This is a quote from Rene Ellertson, she's a climate psychologist. Uh, what I think this crisis, the she's talking about the climate crisis.

And she says, what I think this crisis is actually inviting us to do is to step into a fundamentally different lens, which is really moving from that me to we, and it's really stretching our cognitive capacity to think and experience in our CRS and see ourselves as part of a system and as embedded in the system.

And here's another quote from someone I admire as well. It's a, for those who assume and or maintain an objective or subjective posture toward reality, there is mere existence. You must have an interplay of both to create meaning and understanding, to make predictions about the future and to build knowledge, wisdom, and intuition.

I'd like to share a parable of how a changing objectives from me to, we can affect a system. A teacher gave a balloon to a large group of learners who had, who each had to inflate their balloon, write their name on it and throw it in the hallway. Then they mixed up all the balloons. The learners were given five minutes to find their own, despite a hectic search, no one found theirs.

At that point, the teacher said to take the first balloon, they found and hand it to the person whose name was written on it. Within five minutes, everyone had their own balloon. The teacher said these balloons are like happiness. We will never find it. Uh, we're looking if everyone is looking for their own, but if we care about other people's happiness, we'll find ours too.

So who you include matters and individual might not be able to move mountains very quickly, but working together, we can and do think about what large groups of people, you are a part of what you create and what drives those goals. Think about the objectives I'd like to invite you to examine how you might shift your personal goals to create more effective collaboration.

Uh, I read an ticket nones book fair last night about the term inter B. When we think of me versus we, or you versus them, think about what needs to bend, to build meaning and fill in those missing or conflicting attributes. There's an important interplay between the two oh between two or more opposing viewpoints that might be captured with a different lens.

If more people stand together, we can complete a circle of understanding. Look for objectives that reframe dynamics look for ways to be inclusive. And that allow all of us to benefit, allow conflict, to bend the system and build evolvable systems with directional guidelines that help you divine the future we're philosophers or business people, or politicians that create the future.

Each time we interact, this happens when we deeply listen and focus on caring for ourselves and others in times of conflict. And that's what I got.

I was beautiful. Thank you so much.

Uh, so the very first question in the chat is also one that I, I wrote down in my handy dandy notebook. I, as you know, am a conflict enthusiastic, and I know that in this session we have some other conflict enthusiasts, Dave Snowden. Gosh, I don't know what happened there. Um, how do we create healthy conflict, especially when you're dealing with people or cultures who are conflict averse.

So I really do think mapping is a huge tool to help redirect conflict toward the system or the conception of the system like you. So that is one way you can triangulate, right? Triangulation can be used positively, or it can be used negatively. And if you triangulate around conflict, you can actually use it in a positive way.

So that's, that's my take. So think about ways you might try angulate uh, and, uh, negative conflict kinds of situations.

Oh. Any of the other panelists want to weigh in on that before I move on to the next question? So I think, I think every society has a conflict resolution mechanism, even if they're conflict averse. And so, um, my, my first thought on it is, is simply healthy. Conflict is not necessarily seen as conflict in, uh, in a conflict diverse place, a disagreement isn't necessarily fully a conflict.

The big problem is power dynamics. I think more so. Right. So, so how can you create conflict resolution mechanisms that are accepted and, and used by people that feel like healthy? Not, you know, not challenging power, not challenging, you know, place in society, kind of things were, were those things for sensitive.

Um, And, uh, and, and I'm not by any means stating that that is easy because we have seen a number of times where there have been movements forward, and then there's been backlash from a group that feels like they're losing something in that movement forward. Um, so, um, yeah, so, I mean, I, I don't know that I have a great answer other than to say.

I think that the healthy thing to do is to look for, um, for mechanisms that already exist in the society for conflict resolution and attempt to move to, to co-op those in a sense to a new area of conflict that people might be uncomfortable with discussing. Yeah, there's probably a lot to unpack there with power.

I think some of you will have seen the, uh, rant slash fireside chat that Simon Wardley Kent Beck. And I did a couple of months ago, uh, but even different sorts of power can be threatening to each other. So it, it, you know, it just gets really complex. Like you said, James, and it sounds really easy. Oh, just go about things in this lovely manner, but it becomes really difficult and practice.

So, uh, you know, I think that, um, conflict and organization as a sign of health, I think that, uh, productive conflict is good. Uh, but, but what I tend to worry about more is actually, um, undiscussables like things that can't be discussed because, um, there are certain, uh, aspects inside of organizations where both sides are uncertain, whether they would win in the conflict.

So they avoid bringing the topic up to avoid, uh, the win lose situation, where they're not confident that they will be the winner. So I think the most conflict tends to be both sides, think they're right, but there's a set of conflicts inside of organizations that often prevent them from moving forward in which both sides are unsure that they would win in a fight.

And so they actually refuse to discuss it. Um, and that type of conflict that hidden under the ground conflict, I think is. Damaging for progress and most organizations, um, I tend to like to play with con uh, conflict clouds or, or conflict resolution clouds, um, as a way of trying to explore that with organizations and I think, um, very, very frequently you will find core conflicts inside of organizations as being a driver for this thing.

Um, th the only other thing I'll say is that, uh, it's really important. Um, in philosophy, there are a bunch of antiquities and paradoxes where the conflict is pro is productive specifically because it can not be resolved and it is a way of making movement happen. So not all conflicts can be resolved. And that's where we're thinking through as well.

In fact, you know, there, there there's a lot to be said for paradoxes, enabling actual insights. So. Yeah, that was actually one of the key points in the last session. Caitlin brought that up, right? There are certain situations where if a conflict is resolved, that's actually extremely unhealthy for the system because the system needs that tension.

Yeah. Just like I said, it's the same as friction. But one thing that came up for me with all of this is different cultures have different conflict resolution styles, and it's really important to be aware of those different conflict resolution styles and what you're stepping into when you're trying to resolve conflict because in the inner mountain west, it's different than everywhere else in the world or not, maybe not the world, but at least in the U S where direct conflict is seen.

Culturally like bad, whereas other places direct, direct conflict resolution speaking about, you know, speaking to someone directly and saying, Hey, I have an issue with this is a cultural no-no and you have to be aware and hopefully train people out of that.

I think that I, I would say that most of the series are aware that conflict can escalate, that there can be positive feedback loops in conflict that are just not, do not result in outcomes that work positively for anybody. Um, even even the small groups that, that maybe have a little more say in how things get dealt with.

Um, so I think that there are mechanisms, you know, That allow for the fact that there are conflicts that have to be there have to be ways to resolve conflicts, even if you don't do head to head face-to-face. I was watching like, uh, you know, a Sopranos clip the other day that, you know, where they sit down and they have a, you know, a leader who's a third kind of a third party, be the judge who makes the final call on, on how they're going to resolve whatever the issue is.

And, you know, these are people that would happily, you know, kill each other and they felt like that was necessary to get their way, but they, but they adhere to whatever that decision was because otherwise it was just going to escalate into an explosion of negative. So it, you know, I think the other thing I look at with, with these kinds of things with me versus we is really where are the feedback loops?

I'll talk a little, a little bit about that in my talk, but, um, but I think that's, you know, a big part of it really is kind of looking at, um, Uh, where the feedback loops are and are there ways you can put circuit breakers in those feedback loops that wouldn't be accepted by, by the society. So that's not even always possible.

Hmm. Imagine that are the king of distributed systems that's over here talking about feedback loops and circuit breakers who would have Duncan? Uh, yes. Okay. Uh, we do were accumulating questions and comments in the chat and the Q and a, so I'll try to get to the next one. Next one is from Mario. Hello, Mario, my friend.

Uh, do you believe there's more polarization today or is it just more visible due to mass media and social media? And we'll start with JD. Um, there's more people, so there's probably more conflict, you know, but there's, I don't know if. I think actually people have gotten better overall at conflict resolution.

And as we collectively learn, we teach each other. So I don't know today compared to what, uh, I definitely think there's a transparency and visibility thing happening and that we're more aware of it and that we're more sensitive to it. And I don't think that's a bad thing. It really does come down to, you know, like what I was talking about with mapping, reframing, like putting, putting the conflict a different frame, because something I always think about is if you're seeing a back and forth kind of interaction, it usually means you're not seeing the whole feedback loop and that, that, so making it transparent is the first way to start seeing that the interactions in that feedback loop.

I will just Mario I know was, uh, uh, a different conference where this kind of came up about polarization and specifically in social media and how very little intervention it requires from nonhuman actors. So bots or whatever else to drive a really disproportionate amount of polarization. And for me, that's something that is fascinating in the worst possible way.

Right. But the conflict that we have now and now has these non-human accelerants kind of in the mix. And I'll be honest with you. I don't think I love that. Well there, I mean, there is a famous experiment done by the, um, Santa Fe folks that, um, basically they took, uh, a checker board and they had black and white checkers and then they, they kind of laid it out and then they, they had criteria that they did this digitally, but they had criteria that said, okay, checkers are going to be able to move.

And they're going to want to move to basically a situation where they're more checkers like them around, but, but they could change the, the amount of, uh, of, um, Force behind that decision. Right. They could change like how much has to be different. Um, and there's some other factors. And basically they showed that it took a very, very minor amount of desire to lean towards being around others.

Like you, very small amount for the board to completely segregate. And, um, so tribalism is alive and well, you know, I would argue that, um, if you look at what's going on in Ethiopia, you're looking at, you know, what's going on in, uh, some, some of the, uh, uh, south American countries right now. Um, and then in the United States and in the UK, right?

I mean, tribalism is alive and well, and that's that this desire to kind of find quote unquote common ground in ways that aren't always healthy, uh, is certainly, um, is certainly something that I think is, is alive and well now, you know, we've existed as a species for. You know what a hundred thousand years or whatever the number is that they throw out there.

And so this isn't new, um, what might be new and I'll talk a little bit about this as well, but, um, what might be new is, is just the, the, um, the, the scale at which we can broadcast conflict. Um, and so there's not really ways to isolate pockets of conflict in the way that there were in the past

great point. So, uh, I will, uh, come out really quickly on Schelling's model, social model you were talking about it's called the showings model of segregation. Um, it hasn't held up empirically very well. Frankly, several studies have shown that it doesn't show empirical, uh, resilience, but it's very interesting for a particular reason to that.

I'll talk about during my talk. Um, shelling was part of the Chicago school and Shelley made major innovations in the social policy in the United States and argued that we should use mathematics to determine social policy. And the impact of that is belief in things like this mathematical theory, proving that black people like to live with black people, white people like to live with white people, completely avoiding the fact that.

Black people have no real estate power. They can't move. And not only that, but their neighborhoods are being trashed because they don't have racks. And that like, there's a whole other set of very obvious reasons by white people don't move to black neighborhoods. Right. Um, so I think, uh, that, that's very interesting, but the other thing I'd say is like, there's this really interesting image, uh, in, in Erin Harris kind of Aaron's work where she, she talks about like a rocket taking off from the planet and it's like the moment of the blue marble and things like this.

And this is like an opening in history where, uh, we, we see the idea of globalism start the idea that we could manage the planet, that the planet was an observable object that we could manage. Um, and I think that honestly, part of the massive amount of conflict we have right now is the realization that the globe that we imagined that we could control doesn't exist.

And we are returning to nationalism and localism. Um, and, and as a result of that, we're returning to a state of conflict that, um, are basically a set of mourning for the fact that for instance, when you, when the, uh, the countries of the globe meet up in France to do the Paris accord, they were asked to bring with them calculations of how much energy and resources they needed.

And they sat down and they added it up and they were like, this is like 10 times the planet's resources. It's what you imagine is your future cannot exist. The globe cannot exist the way you imagine it. And so we're stuck right now in, um, in a place where we have to, re-imagine what it is to live on the planet.

And that alone is causing a huge amount of conflict. I think. So that's, that's my answer. I think there is more conflict right now. Yeah. And I think, I think to go along with that, I I'm coming to the conclusion that, that the economic flow in, on the globe is. In direct conflict with the social flow that, um, that we see and we desire.

I mean, you know, more and more people live in more and more spread outs of families are interconnected across classic. The Grove. There really is an opportunity to kind of create a, more of a situation where we understand each other more when we come back. But the economics has set up in a way that, you know, there very few people on the globe are actually funneling most of the flow of money in their direction as much as possible.

Um, and so that's in real conflict because then, you know, the, the, the positive outcomes of integrating, um, and, and really, you know, I, I, I think these days economic matter more than land in a lot of ways. And so, um, even though they're connected, I know, but, um, but there's, you know, there's a situation where, where people are not able to get any economic leverage if they join the.

Community and that's, you know, that, that becomes a situation that is not tenable either. And so, um, yeah, I, I mean, I totally agree with you. I think there's more conflict than in, in part because, um, because you know, our try our tribalism and our ability to, to mash and, and kind of reduce the tension that comes from that is in very much in conflict with the way that, um, you know, that we've set it up, that survival takes place now.

Um, and it's, it's a difficult situation. I, it has to resolve at some 0.1 way or another. So we'll see if it's, you know, if it's utopia or horizon zero Dawn, we'll figure that out, but it's one of those. Awesome. Thank you. And I will just take a minute because this is the cat's hotel show to plug the work up.

Friends, Yulia yachts, Ashana that Jabe. And I used to work with. She is currently researching this kind of intersection of, uh, social conflict and economics. And she was supposed to be at Nat camp, but she had to fly to Nepal or something like that. So maybe next year we'll be able to get her on a panel.

And this brings us to James, your portion, your talk here. Uh, and as I already mentioned, I mean, James lists of accomplishments, professional accomplishments is like a mile long. So I'm, I'm not going to read that aloud right now, but, uh, suffice it to say that James is, as I mentioned before, it kind of the king of distributed systems and also just a really inspiring thinker when it comes to complexity.

So with that, I'll hand it off to you. Well, thank you. I appreciate that. Um, you get the right screen shared here.

There we go. Uh, so what I want to talk a little bit about here is sort of the effect of information flow on me versus we outcomes. And this really, I think, meshes fairly well with JBS talk. Um, uh, as you'll see, as we move forward a little bit, because what I'm really looking at here is some of the stuff, some of the things we were talking about, sort of, um, very, um, so what, you know, as I kind of have listened to and talked with Simon over the years about sort of this meat versus wheat piece of it, um, you know, his, his, uh, his analysis of.

Something that has really kind of triggered a lot of thought in my mind, in terms of, you know, what can we do to create a sense of, of, you know, of mutual, um, mutual, uh, skin in the game, basically for, for, um, for societies and, and where they overlap, having that skin in the game kind of work for, for both the sets of, of communities that we're talking about.

So this is really, you know, a question about, you know, given some of the, the aspects of, of society and the things that we've seen happen in society, the way that we've evolved, the ways we interact both locally, um, nationally, globally, all of that stuff. Um, You know, are, are there parallels to the way that digital systems work or are going to work as they, they move in the future?

And also are there parallels in the way, and this is something that I know mark Burgas, um, has studied a lot in terms of just the basic concept of space and time. Um, but are there ways that digital systems can teach us something about the way our world works? And in this case, I'd be looking at, at the way that our societies, um, come together and evolve.

Um, and so the first thing I'll note is. What we are building in both cases is really a large graph with a flow of information moving between them. Right? So, so your interactions with your family, with others in your society is really about exchanges, uh, in large part about exchanges of information, including, you know, everything from, from, um, you know, validating, uh, love and, and support for each other all the way out to, you know, dark more dry forms of information, like, uh, like work related, um, reporting or things like that.

Um, and, and, you know, obviously digital systems are about sort of the exchange of that information as well. And so the question becomes how to changes in the way that we can integrate. And the way information can flow in the system affect outcomes to the way that the system behaves and the way that, uh, that individuals behave in the system.

And so I wrote a book about. You know, a vendor of an integration and, and, uh, welcome you to take a look if you want to, if it's relevant to you. But, um, but out of that, you know, I, I, you know, I used the worldly mapping extensively and I actually used it in conjunction with, uh, mark versus promise theory, um, to kind of really lay out kind of an idea of what are the systems involved.

But the core thesis of the book was really looking at what happens when these two elements, the protocols and the interfaces that enable integration between things, what happens when they standardize, what happens when everybody can understand very clearly and very easily, how they can receive a stream of real-time information from another party.

And that there's not a lot of custom programming, not a lot of custom effort that has to go into it. And, and really the, you know, the, the, um, the outcome of that. Um, thesis has really, it says it's going to be a massive revolution to the way that information moves in the planet and the way that we build, um, you know, the systems that we need in order to, um, to do business, to, uh, to react to, uh, things that are happening socially in real time, et cetera.

Um, it's going to be so much cheaper to integrate with somebody else's time data, that it will create a positive feedback loop I'm arguing, um, that will drive a huge amount of new integrations. So. Um, out of that part of the book is I came up with a sort of four basic patterns that I could use as, as just sort of a language to talk about different ways that these integrations might happen.

Right. So you, um, and I won't go in depth on any of these, cause I'm going to focus on three of them a little bit more detailed, but you have sort of the idea of collecting a bunch of information and doing something with it. And then, um, taking that aggregated information or process information, and then passing it in a more direct fashion to specific consumers.

There's the idea of taking a very specific set of data coming from one or just a few producers, um, doing some work on that data and then taking the results and distributing that tool Y number, this is really sort of broadcast kind of. Um, the signal processor is just that you take a bunch of information from one area, you do a bunch of processing, you send it out to a bunch of other consumers out there and facilitators like a broker kind of pattern, right?

Where you match incoming messages with requests, for outgoing, for that information on an outgoing side. Um, so you could see that as, you know, sort of like, like a stock market matching or matching, um, available, uh, cargo to be shipped to available space and trucks, that kind of stuff. Right. Um, but I want to know that if you take a collector and you basically then send that directly to a distributor, and then that distributor does something, something that's really kind of the equivalent of a signal processor pattern.

So you can think of that. Uh, so, you know, just sort of, um, The idea really kind of being then that, that you can put any kind of entity in between a collector and distributor. And that thing becomes a signal processor of some sort. Um, and then really the question is what the distribution is, how many consumers, right?

If you, the, the thing that changing the interface and changing the protocol will do is it will explode the number of consumers that you can reach easily and cheaply with the same set of information. So we're talking about, you know, launching a massive scale and the ability to broadcast your process information in a much to a much broader set.

And so for human interaction, we actually have had in the last decade or two. A fundamental change to the interfaces and protocols that we can use to exchange information with each other. And that is social media. We have created a situation where when I, as an individual receive a piece of information, I think is interesting.

I can turn around and broadcast that information, or I can, I can comment on it and kind of manipulate the interpretation of it. I can do a number of other things that make that available to a broader set of, of people. It's a, it's a very fundamental change to the way that we integrate real-time ideas between, uh, between, uh, the parties that are, you know, with an individual able to work in the middle as a signal process.

And so we have this, you know, this world now where we have influencers and, and a, and any individual can play a role as somebody that can take a bunch of info. Interesting information from a bunch of parties decide what they think is useful comment, um, you know, both positively and negatively on that and make that available to a broader set.

And the problem here is that if you begin to insulate where you're getting your data from, and you begin to insulate where you're sending that data to you get a feedback loop, you get a feedback loop that reinforces itself, regardless of. What the content of information is, um, whether that information affects other people outside of that group or not, um, whether it's true or not, or whether it's false, you know, all those things don't matter.

You, you were able to amplify and we, and there is a, a term that I just saw recently. Um, you know, you have propaganda and this is. Ganda I think that's ample again, that is the term that somebody was trying to kind of create around this, right? So you have this ability to kind of amplify specific ideas and concepts, and it doesn't matter if you're, you know, what your group is, any number of groups I could put, you know, I could put a, um, real estate agent versus, you know, sharing only with other real estate agents in here.

If I wanted to, I could put any number of, uh, of, uh, underprivileged or, or so, you know, socially challenged groups in this area. Um, uh, I can put any power in here. I could put, you know, billionaire sharing with billionaires, which is happening, which is, you know, there's, there's a tight social network going on here.

Um, and all of those things are really helped by having digital forums that allow you to amplify the concepts that you're sharing as an individual processor. And spoiler alert. I'm not coming up with a lot of solutions in this presentation. I'm presenting something here as a topic to be discussed and something to think about as we move forward with this, because really to me, this is the source of the intense conflict that we're seeing right now in, um, in Congress and in our politics and in our country.

It's, it's that ability to very, very quickly, um, build a feedback loop that's insular that reinforces itself that also broadcasts to a very large number of people. So my question, as we kind of get closer towards the discussion part of this section is, okay, so we have that kind of situation with individuals.

What happens if companies are the decision makers for the thing that does the signal processing, right? What happens when all of a sudden. Hour and not just companies. I should also say that it could be individuals as well. It could be the folks build digital systems that make decisions about when to broadcast data, when to process and make available data and build signal processes that meet and are designed to meet their own objectives.

And I want to make something very clear here, at least for the time period that we're in right now, any digital system that's fully automated is going to be, um, it's going to be encouraged to reinforce the behavior that serves the needs of the owners of the organization that, that are delivering it.

Right? So it ultimately comes down to, they will, they will train systems until they, they, you know, change the business environment to, to their objectives. But not just that they meet the needs of. Specifically the board of directors, the stockholders, the CEO, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So this is going to set up a situation of conflict.

In my mind, that's going to look an awful lot like human conflict, right? Companies as tribal entities that are going to sort of have this situation where they are going to influence the way that, that the, this digital social network works. And by the way, you know, and then eventually I believe politicians will eventually catch up.

The question is whether that will be in time to, to, you know, assert any real power over the way the network works. And so you have all these companies, in addition to all these other groups, in addition to governments and dictators and others, basically trying to influence the system, this digital system to exchange information, to achieve outcomes that meet their individual objectives.

And this is in my opinion, it's going to make our digital environment increasingly political. In addition to, uh, you know, in, in terms of, uh, you know, competitive conflict, all those things that are, that are, you know, often very good. Um, there are going to be increasingly. Uh, political questions are going to come out of how data is exchanged.

And we see some of that with GDPR and things like that today. But I, I think, um, I think there's going to be much more granular issues in terms of this as we move forward as well. And so for, in terms of me versus we, then it really becomes a question to me of if we change, you know, as we work with social media and as we change systems to kind of behave in a more social environment, can we find the feedback loops?

Can we find the, the laws, the, um, the, uh, the, the system design principles, the culture, um, uh, that begins to put some taboos around things that you can do that are very negative and that can actually hurt the system. I mean, taboos are, they can be. They can be terrible for groups that they negatively affect, but they can be incredibly positive for society as a whole, if they avoid behaviors that are, um, that are dangerous to that, that group.

So, um, and I think that's pretty much it. So I kind of leave that open question out is, you know, what is it that, uh, we can do, um, as, uh, as folks that are in the various industries that we're in as a society as a whole, um, as, uh, as a members of nations or members of the global community, um, you know, what are some of the things that we can begin to do to understand, uh, ahead of time, the ways that, uh, we can curb some of the behavior that we saw with the introduction of social media, in terms of the way that our, our, our digital systems will begin to interact in the same way.

Yeah, and I leave that open for whatever questions might be hanging out there. Awesome. Thank you. This was extremely thought provoking and really appreciate it. And we deal of course have questions before I jump into them. Just a small suggestion when I come to the table with a lot of problems and no solutions, I refer to that as opening a conversation.

So I think that's what we're doing here. Yeah. Uh, so we have a few questions here. I'll I'll just go through that. In order. The first one is from Jonathan, who has been like a superstar attendee, very, uh, high level of participation there. So thank you, Jonathan. The idea of digital platforms beginning to regulate content is still quite novel.

Do you think this will expand and become more mainstream, therefore be a major factor in information flow? Yeah, I, I, I do. I look at China in terms of the, the great firewall and I look at some of the suppression of content within the countries, um, areas, and, and, and I, I personally believe that some aspect of that has been, uh, spread to pretty much every country on the planet at some point, maybe not the isolation as much, but certainly the regulation of content, um, will increase.

And I think part of that is because we have. You can see this in the difficulty that the police department has in dealing with like online bullying and, uh, you know, and, you know, law enforcement, at least in the United States has a real struggle with dealing with some crimes that are sort of purely digital in the way that they're delivered and, and, and, and occur.

Um, and we've, we've discovered a number of, you know, of gaps in our law that we've had to fill over the last decade or two. Um, so I, I believe, I believe, I don't know that I love that. I believe this, but I do believe that there's, um, there is some sort of regulatory element that will come into play.

Certainly I know, like my company, I don't know about your company, but my company absolutely regulates some of the aspects of what I can share with within my corporate community. Um, and so, um, Lucky to it. Very cool about it. But, um, but there's, there's definitely going to be more aspects of kind of understanding and then as it gets more political, as it becomes more important to understand the flow of your data across the system from a, from a power dynamics perspective, that's where I don't know.

I don't have an answer in terms of how that's gonna turn things, but I, I, I worry that, uh, you know, I do worry that we're going to see increasingly splintering views of the way that we can interact online. Uh, as a result of that really comprehensive answer, I really appreciate it. And you brought up a couple things that I think are tied closely to some of the other questions in the Q and a, um, you brought up policing and you brought up nation states and the role that they have.

To play in this one thing that I will bring up just to be antagonistic because we already covered, I love conflict. Um, all of my white boards back here are our notes about the Patriot act, which kind of set the stage for a lot of, uh, what we now have as like social media platforms. There was investment from the United States government, right.

And, um, basically surveillance capitalism based business models. And so for me, it's really interesting that we're in this place of, of turning to our governments and saying, Hey, please break this thing that you spawned, because you said it was going to be basically too expensive and not possible for the government, uh, to.

Like investigate crimes online and to gather intelligence online. Right. And so now of course we have police forces that are unable to pursue digital crimes. Right. Uh, because they were not intended to do that. Right. It was kind of like let's outsource this. Uh, so I am really curious if you have thoughts about more thoughts, I guess, than what you already mentioned about the role that nation states will play in this.

Yeah. I, I, um, sort of very critical to that, right. There's the idea that, that the government wants to fully control the flow of information. And then there's the idea that the government wants to be able to monitor the system and be able to take action on, on information that they, they, they want to see an, I don't think I know of a single nation that has decided that they're just going to let information flow and they'll react to what happens in the physical world, but they, they won't react to what happens as much in the digital world.

There's always an element of, Hey, we want to be able to understand how information flow is creating behaviors within our environment. And I make that sound all very nice, but I mean, that's surveillance they thing. I mean, the, you know, it's, it's freaky now how, you know, we have a number of echoes around the house and it's freaky now how often we say something and then there's an ad that pops up somewhere within.

Two hours of us having talked about this topic, right? So there's that surveillance again, it's asymmetrical, there's two ways you can go about it. In my opinion, there's probably more than two ways, but two, the two extremes are you allow that full asymmetry to continue to happen. And you live with the results of what society is like with that.

Or you require that to be fully transparent to everybody. So every piece of information the NSA can collect is available to anybody else who wants to take that information and do research on it and figure out what they want to do, including, you know, going and digging into deep into the internal workings of every company out there, et cetera, um, which also you'd have to live with the results of that and that the societal effect of that.

I'd love to hear other people's thoughts on that. Um, to be honest on the panel,

just the role of nation states in terms of. You know, using information to influence me versus way or day influence, uh, those kinds of outcomes.

Yeah. You're both sending me mixed messages, covering your mouth and.

I feel like, uh, you know, I think it's a really hard question. Um, censorship is, is an issue, uh, that especially the United States, we have a lot of, a lot of concerns over, um, transparency around, uh, you know, transparency of information I think is the thing that I find to be lacking most of the time. Um, like I, before censorship, I prefer to like have better information, like geolocation, et cetera, around where is this information coming from?

Whereas the source of the information, et cetera, um, That type of stuff. I think, um, at least could start. I mean, you know, it's, it's, it's pretty common these days, you know, you wake up on Twitter and there's some crazy, you know, anti Biden thing trending. Um, and it's been pushed by a Russian bot farms on lifelong to get the thing up there.

And, you know, you have to spend the morning telling people like, this is, this is disinformation and it's, it's been, you know, it's, it's been planted intentionally by a bot network, like Twitter, should that, that, Hey, why Twitter? Can't figure out where the bots are. It seems a little strange to me, but also like just label where the stuff is coming from.

So we have a better idea of some of this information. Um, yeah. And, you know, there's gotta be some sort of, um, you know, uh, The more kind of a policy-based thing that I can imagine being desirable is, is really trying to go back and, and, uh, did this integrate or, you know, remove, uh, the, the, the kind of Facebook feedback right cycle, which is that.

Promotion of highly confrontational, highly, um, you know, bad information, um, is profitable like that. That's a set of policies. We should be able to say, listen, it's just like, we're not censoring you, but you can't make money doing that. Um, you, you can publish whatever you want, but you can't run advertisements next to information that looks like this, things like that, that, that basically starved out the, you know, the economic, uh, drivers that drive the desire to publish this information in the first place.

Again, I don't know that. Promote it to your point, Jay, to promote it. It's not publishing it. That's the problem. It's the amplification. That's the problem, right? If you can, financially incense, the organizations that do that, that provide the platforms to amplify to, um, to be careful about what they amplify.

Um, and to amplify things that are, that have positive outcomes for the society as a whole, then, then you get great. Um, you know, then you get the behavior that you want out of it. But unfortunately, you know, there are advertisers that believe in misinformation that want to find and have a place to advertise the talks to their people.

Right? And so that's a really unfortunate truth. Um, and that's why, you know, policing is not just police forces. It's also journalism. It's also, you know, the basics of, of sort of somebody digging in and doing some truth, digging to make sure that something, uh, is in fact worthy of being broadcast. Um, and, and that's a hard thing.

Again, all of this, all of this is a complex problem of interconnected relationships between things where, where they don't always reinforce each other in the right way. And. That's that's the fundamental, that's the fennel mono problem. Yeah. I mean, I, you know, I I'll throw in one more thing because we've talked about kind of feedback loops and complexity.

Um, I generally find that a lot of this mal adaption comes when there is a feedback loop that has no back pressure. So the, the problem here is that there is no back pressure, uh, in the system. There's no penalty for doing things that are maladaptive. Right. Um, and that, that in particular is something that I think probably can only be created by policy that back pressure.

Um, because in a capitalist system that, you know, we, we try to avoid putting that pressure systems at all. So anyway, oh, the only back vectors is financial incentive, right. Is a hundred percent, right. That's the only back pressure. And so that's not, again, our economic system is not aligned with our social system.

It's, it's two different things. Yup.

Um, uh, one thought that came up is every time you're looking to create a role, there's probably either been a conversation or there needs to be a conversation when it comes to policing. I think that policing is a last resort a lot of times. And there's, I hope that there are other ways of, uh, negotiating differences.

Um, other thoughts that come to mind are every, every claim that's made, everything, that's stated, everything that is happening has a level of truthiness and a level of, you know, kind of, you know, like, uh, someone saying, I verify this statement, you know, and this is, this is how verified it is. Becomes an important aspect of misinformation or having systems that actually can rate claims that are being made.

I think become important. That's another thought I had, I've got a lot of thoughts around this. I'm trying to organize them in it's it's big, it's a big topic. It really is. It's a huge topic, but you know, we're, we're undergoing, you know, maybe I'm, maybe I'm just biased a little bit as a little confirmation bias here, but we're undergoing a fundamental change to the ways we can interface with each other globally.

And, and, you know, the system will settle at some point, there might, there might or might not be a major conflict that comes out of trying to find that point of settling, um, but, uh, the system, but for the foreseeable future, we're going through this churn right now. And we will keep continuing to go through that.

All right. Thank you so much for that lively discussion, Jay, I'm cutting you off because it's your time to speak anyway. So, uh, for those of you who don't know Dave bloom, he is in a, um, what is it? The transfer digital transformation office, global transformation office at red hat. And Jabe is just an amazing person.

And I'm so lucky to count him as a friend for so many years. And I am really pleased to have him join this panel and, uh, you know, launch into what will no doubt be like a very red face, uh, lots of just stipulating type rant.

Cat knows what she, what you ordered. And then if there's a tick tock thing that says, I, I understand the assignment, I understood the assignment. I feel like I should make that after this. Um, okay. Um, so I have three topics that I want to go through really quickly, uh, phenomenological pronouns, the, uh, deconstructing, a binary and the sociological imaginary.

Um, so I'll try to get through all of those three. This is kind of like notes for people to do more research on. Uh, but I'll try to make it all make sense a little bit. Um, so let's start with phenomenological pronouns. So, uh, in phenomenology, uh, there's a really interesting, uh, you know, part of point of view, which is that the first person point of view is very important.

So me or I is a unique position that one holds in the world. Um, and in particular, the pronoun I, um, or me is unique in that it is it's, it's in deck, it's an indexical pronoun, meaning that, um, He can't be mistaken. So when I say I and me, uh, I can only be referring to me. There's no other person that I can re be referring to when I used the term.

Um, there should be never be any confusion about what I mean when I say, uh, unless I'm trying to deceive somebody, for instance, Uh, there's, there's a difference here. When you think about you. Um, I'm going to point out that I'm pointing to use singular right now, and I'll get into a little bit more of that in a minute, but you is not as clear, it's not as indexed, right?

Um, it is what we call an occasional expression. Um, and you can, you, uh, can note this because I just called all of you, you, first of all, but second of all, when I say you stop that, you could say who me and that's it like a natural experience people have in the world is that when someone says you, they try to figure out if it's the, if the, if the pronoun is referencing them or not.

Right. And so that's what we call this an occasional expression. And what we mean by that is that it is, um, evaluated in a context and it can only be evaluated in context. You can't be evaluated outside of that context. Um, and so in this way, uh, cause some of these pronouns like you, um, it's important to.

Let's we'll just call it a map right now. It's important to have a map, to know who you is, um, because that helps us to understand what the occasion is referring to. Now. There's also, uh, in, in, in many languages, but I like, uh, Gaelic and Irish, uh, in particular, uh, there is a plural, you, it is a, you can point towards a group of people and say you, um, in the United States, this, uh, you can see this play out in several different cities that have, um, high Irish, um, uh, populations, um, that adopt this, uh, term because they, they wanted to be able to say you, so, uh, plural.

So, but they didn't have a word for it. Wasn't given to them in English. So they made up words like y'all all Yins use. All of these terms are, um, Um, attempts to recover from a European languages, this plural. So there's an idea of like you as an individual, but also you as in a group of people. Um, and this is also a kind of interesting and confusing in that indexicality where the occasional, any of the terminology.

Um, so I put that out because I think that, uh, that when we talk about we, we can, we can use this idea of you to kind of get at it a little bit more because there's different ways as well, right? There's a, we, which is an inclusive way. So one could say, um, we humans as in like all humans, um, and that's an inclusive way.

Um, but of course there's also a set of exclusive, we, we not, you, we are, uh, are participating, uh, this is like one team versus another team. When we, when we look at all these different, uh, kind of, um, pronouns from a phenomenological perspective, um, the, the, um, outcome of it is that the only thing that we're really super confident about what we make statements, uh, that we should always understand and statements to say me or I, and then all the other ones, um, end up being negotiations.

Um, and you should know, uh, interesting thing about you. Um, and we, uh, uh, that I tried to point out is that they can be not only, um, descriptive, but they can be accusatory. Um, in other words, uh, there is a sense in which all of those, uh, we U style pronouns are inductive. They, they, they are making a guess.

They're not making a direct statement in a way. Uh, we've got, got some confusion going now, already. I hope we got some, a little weirdness about what, what, what even, uh, the words we're using means. So let's try to see if we can deconstruct a binary just to see if we can figure this out a little bit more so.

Well, the way that I always hear Simon talking about these things and the we versus a me versus we points out, uh, I think that this is a binary, um, and it meaning that there are two extremes to the poll. Um, the first step to deconstructing a binary though, would be to say that it's not just black or white, but there's somehow some gray.

So the weird question that we first have to ask ourselves, in order to deconstruct this binary would be to say, how could we be a me that's somewhat, what wish or how could we be a, we that's somewhat mish. How could we get in between these two things? What's the middle, like, um, in order to deconstruct the binary, um, Uh, we got, uh, Margaret Thatcher will do the work for us on one side right away.

Right? So Margaret Thatcher just immediately says, there is no such thing as you plural, there is no weed, there is no society, it doesn't exist. There's only individuals. This, uh, idea of course is not actually Margaret's idea. She adopted it from a bunch of people. Um, and, and it is the outcome of a long intellectual tradition.

Um, but the fact that politicians like Margaret and Ronald Reagan could say it out loud and that their ideas about the lack of lack of weakness in, um, in government, um, have lasted for a very long time. And that may maybe, maybe the, uh, the. Uh, outcome of, of the current COVID crisis will be that we will become more accepted.

Again. Maybe there's been a turn against things like, um, um, you know, uh, conservative, uh, efforts to reduce spending, uh, things like this. So there's this, this one side we can get rid of right away. There is no such thing as, as, as, as weak also. Uh, but what about like this other stuff? Right? Um, why, w what about me?

Is it, is there a way we could get rid of me? Is there a way we could blur me a little bit? So the first thing I want to point out is that. The, the impact of this policy, uh, that says there is no society. Um, it has to do has, has some specific, very, um, pernicious and awful, uh, impacts on individuals. Um, and those lots of individuals in the world right now have issues, um, that they cannot deal with because their structural or, um, social, uh, systems interactions that they can't resolve as individuals.

And I, I tend to grade them across these, these different things. Uh, Mark Fisher writes extensively about kind of the passive version of it, which is, um, that, uh, one of the reactions that many individuals have to, uh, the current state of the world and the way that, uh, there is a denial of social, um, social pressure, uh, uh, or social stuff, Uh, is, is they become incredibly depressed.

Uh, unfortunately mark, who, uh, everybody should read his work. He's lovely mark succumbed to his own depression. Um, and while writing about it, which is awful. Um, there's two other ones though, that I like to expand across and say that there's there's um, in these situations where individuals are put in a situation where they can't resolve their problem, uh, therefore they're asked to do other things in order to deal with their problem or cope with their problem.

We, we see some other effects. One of them is the precautionary versions of it, of precautionary means like try not to do harm. And in that case, what we see is medicalization medicalization of individuals and, and an emphasis on self care. So I like to think of self care in this really weird way.

Everybody should do it. It's important, but self care is the fact that we need self care is kind of like saying the entire world is that radiated with poison. So when you go out there, you have to come in and take some time to. The radiate and kill the poison off of you, or otherwise you might die. So you need some time for that.

So it might be better to be in a world where self care was like more optional and less like actually required for survival. So that's the kind of precautionary version of it, the proactionary version of it, including betting gambling, and risk-taking, uh, you should, uh, hopefully hear, uh, overtones of stock market, um, you know, taking risks, uh, the, the idea of kind of, um, uh, living, um, and taking risks with your job.

Um, and things like that. All of these things are activities that are primarily driven. The behaviors are primarily driven by the fact, the context that individuals find themselves in forces them to behave in these different ways. Um, all of which are maladaptive. They're not, they're not good things to do with your life, right.

Where does this stuff come from? Where do these ideas about individuality come from? Well, I, you know, you can trace at least, uh, the modern version of it back to our friend Descartes and cookie toe. Uh, I think therefore I am, I think, uh, you know, just to say really quickly, um, this is like one of the weirdest statements anybody has ever made.

If you spend enough time thinking about it, W who thinks, what about, where, how, like, what are you are a completely disembodied thing? How does that work? It doesn't seem to make any sense to me at all, but lots of people like it. So there's this idea that you can strip away the world and come back to this single statement.

And from there build logically productive, uh, systems above it that allow you to explore the world from there. This, I think, um, has some really interesting kind of historical play through. So you get the cart, uh, and from Descartes you get things like rational actor theory, and all of which are based on kind of like the ideas that, uh, people like Adam Smith, uh, uh, proposed, uh, individuals and greed and things like this, uh, have, have, uh, added additive effects that create a rational overlay eventually, uh, with the assumption that people are rational, they do rational things and they know what's in their own best interest.

Um, Herbert Simon down there in the corner, uh, you know, eventually comes around and says, Hey, listen to you. That's not entirely true. Like people aren't perfectly rational mold, uh, but however, they do make satisfying decisions frequently. In other words, they're capable of making decisions that are better for them or worse for them.

They're Hey, interestingly, I think that basically what Simon is doing here is, is kind of like, um, uh, a tactical retreat. Uh, he wants to save the economics, uh, that he loves. Uh, but he wants to, uh, try to write it with the fact that it's clear that rationality isn't playing out well, so that he gets to satisfy saying, right.

Um, this has some really interesting impacts. Uh, Simon was part of the Chicago, uh, Chicago school, um, and the Chicago school, uh, major interventions in the United States in a public policy where, um, the work of people like, um, Mary Flett and others, uh, around democratic engagement, uh, at work, um, and, uh, democratic engagement and social functions, uh, were.

Um, influenced by the Chicago school and influenced negatively as in replaced, by an attempt to do almost entirely mathematical or entirely rational or satisficing views of social policy. Um, where the idea here is that the unit of analysis is individuals' decisions. You get things like behavioral economics and things like this come out of this.

Um, in this, in this theory, you know, kind information is the thing that needs to be created and you get the birth of the information, um, uh, economy and, um, knowledge, economies, and things like this, all of this comes out of these ideas. Um, another thing that I think is interesting is that, uh, Simon's, uh, framing of this eventually influences what we think of as.

Uh, he restates the concept of design away from the idea of like modifying material things towards the idea that what design is, is problem solving. It's, it's kind of abstract and even potentially universal, uh, in his book, artificial, uh, the sizes artificial, he proposes that all designed, um, questions will eventually be answered by computers.

They can all be resolved by computers eventually. Uh, the problem is just enough computational power. Uh, of course he avoids answering some really interesting questions. Uh, one saying that like, whose problems should we solve? And, uh, that, that, uh, thread is taken up by force riddle around wicked problems, um, to, to point out that some problems aren't even definable, um, nevermind computation, um, Uh, there's some other objections that we could make to the idea of the individual.

Um, you know, uh, Vichtenstein basically says there's no such thing as private language. So the thought I, uh, I think therefore I am could be unheard or unseen by other people. It could be in your head, but the words themselves are public they're public material. There, there is no way that you could make sense unless you would have a discussion with someone else already.

The words themselves are kind of public material. They're, they're not part of your own, you didn't, you weren't born with those ideas in your head. Um, they came to you through social interaction. So language is necessarily social. So even thinking, nevermind thinking, uh, this weird idea, uh, is a social activity.

Um, so maybe we don't exist that way. Um, whose role, um, uh, with, with simply ask, Hey dude, uh, what are you thinking about? Like, what is it that you're thinking about? Like. You have to be thinking about something. It's not like nothing you're thinking about. You have to be thinking about something. His argument is, is that all thoughts are intentional or towards things.

Um, and so no. How do you, how do you answer that Renee? And then a hider comes along and goes, Hey dude, like, uh, you can't simply be, you're kind of thrown into a world where things already exist and they already have meaning and they're already in motion. They're, they're moving towards their intended goals.

Other people are here. They have intentions. The hammer that you picked up is intended to be used in certain. Language is already here. All those things preexist, you, you, uh, you can't exist by yourself. You, you cannot exist by yourself. All these things were already here and in emotion before you even got here.

So he puts the idea of the individual being in time. So that there's a, there's not a status, there's a movement constantly. And then we get our friend, Andy Clark, who basically says, Hey, dude, what are you thinking with? Like, not just are you thinking with your brain and neurons, but did you use a calculator to calculate things?

Did you write anything down? Did you use a pencil? Um, did you use any of your sensory room at all to make any of these, these decisions? Um, this is the way in which we become embedded and bodied, extended and acted as cognitive beings are where the decisions we're making are not actually based on rationality, uh, in that kind of purely information format versions of it.

Right. Now, uh, we can see, I hope that no, the me doesn't exist. Right? So the way I be Starkey about it, just to say that all these people have been saying, you're suggesting that problems can be solved by individuals, but as you know, there's no such thing as an individual. So we can't rely on either of these sides of the binary to resolve it.

So how, what are we gonna do about this? How do we deal with this? Well, there's a way, uh, that Latour. Uh, to triangulate a problem and it's different than normal triangulation. It's not trying to find a center, but let me, let me talk about it really quickly. First of all, I kind of added the, we exclusive to the knee side of the equations, because I think they're both roughly the same thing.

If we can accept that me as an extended me like a social media, then there's a, there's a me that I can point to. That is a group of people. Um, and there's some direct problems involved with me as, uh, nationalism. Isolationalism hard localism, uh, really pernicious versions like ethnocentrism and ethno states.

Right? So those are all negative meats. Um, on the other side, uh, we could say, okay, so there's the we inclusive and everybody likes the idea of we inclusive. Let's all hug, but is there negative parts about that? Well, if we look at the we isms, we get technocratic, uh, solutions, uh, globalism, neoliberalism, hard globalism, and conceptions of universalism as a way of solving these problems.

And so the question here, I guess, is like, can you place yourself on a gray in between these two? Um, often people will find that they agree with some of the things on one side and some of the things on the other side I've made them extreme. So hopefully. Purely agrees with either side, but this, so you end up in some middle point and on different topics where you lay on the line might change.

Now, the interesting thing about that is that, um, if we want to change the world for, and make things different, we need to recognize that this binary, if as long as it exists, thought, has this defined dynamic, it just goes back to. There is no change. There's just movement across this line and that's what we need to avoid.

Or we need to change. We need to break the binary, dissolved the binary peak, deconstruct the binary to create a new possibility. Right. And so what do we look at here? So the new vector, the new, uh, direction in which we might want to move is towards cosmopolitan localism, flurry Versal ism, or polycentric the idea here is that there are multiple power centers, multiple.

And exclusive ways. In other words, the idea that, um, th that, uh, it's important to pay attention to context and locality, but it's also important to negotiate across these weeds. So multiple centers of power, as opposed to single centers of power , as opposed to universalism, meaning that we should stop trying to resolve everything to a universal answer, a global answer, um, and, and accept that there's multiple localities.

Um, and this, uh, has a fancy term called cosmopolitan localism. Uh, cosmopolitans comes from the Greek theory that you would both belong to the city that you lived in and the state that you lived in, and that you lived in two bay, basically two different levels and localism being the idea that it's important to have these localities, um, okay.

Quick grant, hopefully before cat catches me and tells me to stop the sociological imaginary. Um, so let's, if we want to get towards this stuff, the first thing we got to do is get rid of history. Um, I kind of did the clever, his story, um, and, and understand the difference or the relationship between me story and we story.

So, um, What do we mean, what do I need to be of that? Uh, there is an idea of a hermaneutic loop here, and the idea of the Herman gloop is that it's important that I understand how my story fits into our story. And it's important that our story helps me understand my story. There's a relationship between these two, to the extent that I can't find my story in our story.

I feel like I've been cut off and I don't. I become less interested in, in, in our story, first of all, but second of all, um, I can't locate myself. I can't make sense of my world, uh, using the resources, uh, and knowledge and narratives of the social world. So reconnecting these two things, the me story and the we story, uh, into a, uh, uh, a history is what we mean by a social imaginary, um, to understand the social imaginary is to understand what is going on in the world and be able to create.

My personal issues, the things that I'm trying to resolve with the structures and social patterns that are actually out of my control. And the reason that's important is because the only way I'm going to then solve issues that arise from social structures is by creating a power base with other people to change that structure so that I can serve me as opposed to suppressing my needs.

Um, so how do we imagine ourselves in, uh, our problems in relation to, uh, social issues? How do we imagine them in relationship structures? How do we imagine, um, that we are part of that thing or not part of that thing? How do we imagine those relationships? This is what we mean by a social imaginary. Well, one of the ways to think about this is, is, uh, by a guy named gills and he talks about this idea of multilevel perspectives and he says, there's landscape, which is.

Long lasting policies and rules there's regimes. Uh, you can think of these as companies that are working together to stabilize a marketplace, for instance, and there's niches niches could be like basically startups trying to disrupt the regimes. So there's three different levels. Um, and they're important to kind of recognize, I want to focus on the regime stuff momentarily, and we'll look at regimes.

We can look at this idea of, of two levels of, of regime, uh, Regina production that create, uh, consumed indirectly consumed value. So carbon market, uh, oil, gas, uh, electricity, et cetera, you don't consume those things directly. Regimes of consumption, the things that you buy that rely on the regimes of, uh, production in order to produce value for you.

It's important that we understand the relationships we want to have with these regimes. We want to have power with the regimes of consumption. Those are the things that we can influence directly as consumers by withholding, purchasing by purchasing different things, et cetera. But this is not going to fix the climate crisis.

If we just do power with regimes of consumption, the real thing we want is to invert the current power over dynamic with regimes of production, regimes of production currently have power over us. We need to have power over them. Um, cloud primary example of this right now in the United States is, uh, you know, one Senator from West Virginia is holding up massive amounts of legislation in order to continue to produce coal, which nobody wants anyway.

So I think it's really interesting to think about this from a worldly perspective. And just say, like, I think that Wordly mapping does an interesting job of hitting some of these ideas from mills. Uh, clearly examining the structure, trying to understand components and relationships, trying to understand the mechanics of what's changing, trying to understand human nature, um, and how things interact with each other human nature.

Uh, it's kind of the pioneer settlers thing, that type of stuff. Um, but I think, and I think you can see glimmers here of this idea of polycentric, uh, behaviors by looking at these teams these ways and saying that there's different power structures inside the organization. And. But I do think that there's this really interesting question, uh, for, for us to answer, um, inside of, uh, are the mapping, which is, um, this, these power to ideas, like having expertise, uh, having practice and doing something that allows you to be competent and have agency to do something I'm a really good, uh, SQL, uh, engineer.

So I have the power to modify the database, et cetera. Um, but there's also these power with dynamics around collaboration, cooperation, and shared purpose that I tend to call shared practices. These are the things that like dev ops, you, people tend to focus on the inner world, interrelated practices, things like CIC, things like that.

The thing that I think is frequently missing from the map is like, literally, where are where's the shared practices? What we can primarily see in these maps is the local practices. The circles identify areas of local practice. They fail to, uh, identify shared practices. They fare to, uh, fail to identify overlapping things.

Um, and I think that's a critical aspect of doing that. Uh, I think this is my last slide Kat. Um, the last thing I have to say is that I think it's great that we're having conversations about power over versus power with, but the primary thing to understand, I think, um, as a community is that there's a massive amount of advocated power.

Uh, we, we, we resign our power constantly. Um, and we can see this in organizations where there are too many options, analysis, paralysis, committee role, all these things where we aren't, um, uh, we are exercising power. We aren't creating coalitions and we're allowing. Disorganized rabble, uh, to, uh, to try to take the day that's my rant.

And as I fully predicted and did try to set the expectation with the audience, we have essentially no time for questions, but please rest assured this session will be one of them that we do a slow watch party for. So if you haven't been to as low watch before, that's where we will watch the talk and just pause it at certain points and have a little bit of discussion in a small group.

So definitely look out for that. It should be like a month or two out. I'm not totally sure, but look for some communications. About that? Uh, yes. And there's, like I said, not much time for anything, but I will encourage both the speakers and the attendees to hop over to the square window chat. After this session concludes I will be there and I'll be happy to like post resources or, um, anything like that.

So please join us over there and hopefully some of the speakers can pop over there and answer some additional questions. I am so thankful for the three of you joining today. Uh, I think this was a really energizing way to end the day and get us thinking about things and, and prepare us to kind of confront some of those oddities that we have learned to take for granted.

Everyday life. So I'm really, and truly grateful for the three of you joining us today. Uh, and I will remind everyone that, uh, after this, we have a short break and then we'll have the fireside chat with Simon Wardley and Dave Snowden. Uh, and that should be, you know, obviously incredibly spicy exactly as we would expect.

So I hope to see you all over there and, uh, thanks for joining us on this society track. Really appreciate it. Thanks for having us.

Thank you so much. I really appreciate it everybody. And see over there in the chat.