

*Yet if we allow it (fear based egotism) to dominate our lives, we will be miserable and do our best to make other people unhappy.*

**Armstrong, In *12 Steps to a Compassionate Life*,**

Instead of reviling ourselves for our chronic pettiness and selfishness, it is better to accept calmly the fact that the cause of such behavior is our old brain. Geared for survival, the reptilian brain was all about me. Without this ruthless self-preoccupation, our species would not have survived. Yet if we allow it to dominate our lives, we will be miserable and do our best to make other people unhappy. Our egotism gravely limits our view of the world, which we see through the distorting screen of our personal desires and needs. ... We are frightened, insecure, and restless creatures, endlessly distressed by our failures and shortcomings, constantly poised against attack, and this can make us hostile and unkind to others. (p. 84)

**Riane Eisler, In *The Chalice and the Blade*,**

In the domination model those on top strictly control those below them. People learn to obey orders without question and to repress their anger against those above, leading to denial, scapegoating and frustration taken out on those below. Everyone is guarded and mistrustful, living in fear and pain. While no one would consciously choose to live this way, people raised in the "superior/inferior" model seldom realize they have a choice.

**O'Brien, In *Character At Work*,**

A merit environment, in contrast to a bureaucratic or political environment, supports individual initiative, open discussion, and the search for the common good. (p. 48)

Once discussion gets going..... there is a strong temptation to want to "win the argument". ... understand that winning for each of us and the group means arriving at the most effective, most meritorious decision. (p. 50)

All of us were born with unlimited potential for openness, but we seem to lose the ability to exercise it as we grow older.... we're conditioned during our formative years by experiencing more win-lose than win-win situations, more shall nots than can dos, more distrust than trust, more competition than cooperation. In such a world, there is every reason to so play our cards close to our vest (p. 55-56)

What are you integrating into your practice considering: Armstrong, Model 1-2, Character At Work, and other Thrive topics? Opening Possible Questions

How do we let the healthy self emerge and develop?

How does a dominator model keep that self diminished and open us to work of the egocentric thinking?

Which is more explanatory to you- the dominator model or 4Fs? How are either concepts useful?

How does fear based egotism impact strength for persisting in play in the spaces of domination?

How does fear based egotism impact capacity for happiness, potential, aliveness in relationships with others?

## **Lunch Conversation**

In your lunch conversation, please consider these questions in light of the quotes below and our recent readings from *Compassion and Character at Work*.

- 1) What does it mean to be alive?
- 2) What does it mean to be happy?
- 3) What is our view of potential of the person, of concepts?

### Needleman Radio Interview on The American Soul, 2005

**Happiness** He(Jefferson) meant there's no happiness without virtue. You can't have happiness until there's virtue....Happiness - a better translation of the word is "well-being," and well-being doesn't mean continual or lots of pleasure. It doesn't mean egoistic satisfaction. It means being what you are supposed to be as a human being. So happiness implies a relationship to a truer self within yourself, and I think Jefferson meant that. And I think if you look in the nature of the great spiritual traditions, how they look at and understand human nature, it's part of the essence of a human being to love, to feel care for others. And we have a very impoverished set of ideas about the human self being just a complicated animal with a complicated brain who evolved out of the slime. That is not a vision that is very profound of what a human being is, nor is it very logical.

### Block and Mc Knight. In Abundant Community

Where the consumer society breeds individualism and its effects of entitlement and self-interest, an abundant community is marked by a collective accountability that can be created only in relationship to other people. (p. 65)

### Axioms in Character At Work (pp. 23-28)

- Work is an essential element of human happiness.
- We do not fulfill our potential in isolation but in conjunction with others
- A superior level of happiness can be achieved only in conjunction with the pursuit of quality

Jacob Needleman, in *The American Soul: The Vision of Our Founding Fathers*, connects the idea of being grounded in our core to the origins of our country,

The original and deeper meanings of these ideals may be astonishingly different from what we now understand them. For example, the ideas of human equality and independence in these communities are rooted in the notion that God, or "the inner light", exists in every human being, and that the aim of life revolves around the endeavor and the necessity for every man or woman to make conscious contact with this inner divine force, ---- which is the source of true happiness, intelligence and moral capacity, and is meant to be the guide to ultimate authority in conduct and assessment of our lives and obligations.

"Our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not our darkness that most frightens us. We ask ourselves, Who am I to be brilliant, gorgeous, talented, fabulous? Actually, who are you not to be? You are a child of God. Your playing small does not serve the world. There is nothing enlightened about shrinking so that other people won't feel insecure around you. We are all meant to shine, as children do. We were born to make manifest the glory of God that is within us. It is not just in some of us; it is in everyone. And as we let our own light shine, we unconsciously give other people permission to do the same. As we are liberated from our own fear, our presence automatically liberates others". -- Marianne Williamson

1. What are you integrating considering: Armstrong, Model 1- 2, Character At Work, and other Thrive topics?	2. What might an individual do to dethrone the ego?	3. What might an organization do to support dethroning the ego?	4, What might a whole community do to support dethroning the ego?	5. What in our society/ community currently promotes staying in the egoic frame?

1 Choose to be present- physically, mentally(mind) is on what's happening in moment), emotionally (be aware of own emotional reactions and have insights into behavior of others- spiritual presence is an awareness of our true nature(truth, beauty and good in me) so when provoked stay there

2 Pay attention to what has heart and meaning- when live from own values, easier to be open hearted with others and fully enthusiastic about your work- p 22 contented when centered -not wishing for what don't have. if you don't pay attention to what has heart and meaning can feel victimized(23) and harder to have a difficult conversation less likely to state point of view without shaming and blaming

3. Tell truth without blame or judgment - your truth, not the truth if don't likely to appease, be a martyr, act out SEEMS SILENCE/VIOLENCE being honest brings out your authenticity-- P 25 frankness not enough to connect with other. Takes personal discipline to not indulge in shame, blame, judge.

4. Be open to outcomes, not attached to outcomes can't control other. If spoke with integrity can walk away feeling good regardless of outcome. If attached have an agenda = be guided by character and not ego. The journey of flexibility

### Summary Four Fold Way

in service of social self

BEHAVIORS

VALUES

Model 1

Model 2

**RATIONALIZE**-want it to be rational, make sense. We work to figure out what is correct and incorrect. We want everything to have a name or label. If we can't name it we tend to avoid it in confusion.

Model 1

Model 2

**LOOK GOOD** - seek to determine our standing in relation to others. These judgments can be made but we are constantly doing it. We keep covered up or share with 3rd party.

Model 1

Model 2

**KEEP PEACE/AVOID CONFLICT** - ATTRIBUTE-we constantly seek to understand why other people act or behave as they do and in absence of knowledge we make up or invent motives. These assumptions usually remain unchallenged or become part of the way we see reality

### RELATIVE, CONDITIONAL LOVE

### ABSOLUTE, UNCONDITIONAL LOVE

The ability to be descriptive, Non-judgmental acceptance.

LOOK GOOD

KEEP PEACE/AVOID CONFLICT

ATTRIBUTE-we constantly seek to understand why other people act or behave as they do and in absence of knowledge we make up or invent motives. These assumptions usually remain unchallenged or become part of the way we see reality

LOOK GOOD

KEEP PEACE/AVOID CONFLICT

ATTRIBUTE-we constantly seek to understand why other people act or behave as they do and in absence of knowledge we make up or invent motives. These assumptions usually remain unchallenged or become part of the way we see reality

LOOK GOOD

KEEP PEACE/AVOID CONFLICT

ATTRIBUTE-we constantly seek to understand why other people act or behave as they do and in absence of knowledge we make up or invent motives. These assumptions usually remain unchallenged or become part of the way we see reality

- Theory X
- The average person dislikes work and will avoid it he/she can.
  - Most people must be forced with the threat of punishment to work towards organizational objectives.
  - The average person prefers to be directed; to avoid responsibility; is relatively un-ambitious, and wants security above all else.

Theory Y

- Effort in work is as natural as work and play.
- People will apply self-control and self-direction in the pursuit of organizational objectives, without external control or the threat of punishment
- People usually accept and often seek responsibility
- The capacity to use a high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in solving organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.
- In industry the intellectual potential of the average person is only partly utilized.

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

PRODUCE RESULTS

STRENGTHEN RELATIONSHIPS

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

SAVE FACE

TOLERATION OF AMBIGUITY

NEED FOR CEARLAINTY

- 1) achieve your purpose
- 2) maximize winning, minimize losing
- 3) suppress negative feelings
- 4) behave according to what consider rational

Lead to: Suspicion, Fear, Mistrust

ALSO see Welwood

Perfect Love, Imperfect Relationships

## Why Trapped in Model I? Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness, 1974.

"Given the disadvantages of behaving according to model I, it may seem strange that our sample should have learned such a dysfunctional mode of behavior and stranger still that they should persist in it. If we accept the hypothesis that model I is prevalent in our society, we would raise the same questions about our society. Although there are no well-documented answers to these questions, we do have some suggestions.

Children learn model I from their parents and from significant others because the behavioral worlds of the family, the school, and other social settings conform to model I. Model I is probably learned through a model-I process—through what Kelman (1958) calls compliance and identification, which are based on learning through rewards and penalties rather than through internalization, according to which the individual tries out new behavior and makes it part of his repertoire because it is intrinsically satisfying.

The learning of model I meshes with two social mechanisms that, according to many researchers, are typical of everyday life in our society—*attribution and social evaluation*. (Argyris 1969.) *Attribution* means unilaterally assigning intentions to others, without public testing. *Social evaluation* means that individuals privately compare themselves with others, without open testing. Both processes reinforce and are reinforced by Model I.

Once individuals find themselves in organizations, they are apt to encounter behavioral worlds in which model I again predominates. The assumptions of the special kind of rationality inherent in engineering, technology, and economics (Argyris, 1964), when applied to organizations, suggest that people are taught that if you want to succeed in human relationships and get a task accomplished you should behave according to the following directives. (1) "Focus on task-oriented behavior—get the Job done; individuals are not rewarded for trying harder but for winning. (2) Focus on behaving rationally and de-emphasize and suppress feelings; the more emotions are expressed, the higher the probability for interpersonal difficulties and eventual rejection. (3) Focus on controlling others by designing their world; reward and penalize them and expect them to be loyal, which means focusing on values implicit in the first two directives (Argyris, 1962).

Adults programmed with these values tend to create human relationships that emphasize competitiveness, withholding help from others, conformity, covert antagonism, and mistrust while de-emphasizing cooperation, helping others, individuality, and trust (Argyris 1962). Under these conditions, people may learn to give and receive feedback that creates the impression of genuine confirmation or dis-confirmation but does not in fact provide it. Interpersonal diplomacy, being civilized, withholding feelings, and suppressing anger and hurt are but a few common examples of what individuals are taught to do to help maintain harmony in interpersonal relationships. Goffman's work (1959) provides examples of how individuals learn interpersonal diplomacy and policy in order to live a world of pseudo-authenticity.

Adults are probably taught to value attribution and social evaluation just as they are taught the logic of engineering and economics. They teach these values to their children by modeling them and by requiring compliance with them and/or encouraging identification with them. To the extent that adults use model I, they will tend to show low self-esteem, low trust, low openness, and little public testing and learning. With such characteristics, compliance & identification are probably the two major processes for learning Model I.

Reasons why people tend to go on using model I have been woven into our argument. Most people are not aware of their theories-in-use and hence are unaware of model I. One consequence of model I is that it rewards suppression of feedback (which people need if they are to modify their behavior) and suppresses the negative consequences of suppression. After years of countless experiences of supposedly having been saved by these defenses and tactics of deception, individuals may internalize them. They teach these defenses to their children and design the world so that it not only reinforces the defenses but considers them attributes of maturity, poise, dignity, and adulthood. Under these conditions, individuals may believe that they value learning, self-acceptance, or being original but be quite unaware of how to behave according to these values.

People who behave according to model I tend to develop group norms to support the model—for example, in the form of organizational structures and policies—and become accustomed to them. Model I conditions cluster and reinforce one another, whether the individual wishes them to or not, and tension, inter-group rivalry, self-sealing attributions, or political lying become viewed as being as natural as apple pie. Once these phenomena become part of the social landscape, individuals see less need for changing them and may even design ways to circumvent or adapt to these processes. Even those who recognize self-sealing behavior on the part of colleagues or friends are quick to discount these behaviors; they say, "If you knew him as I do, you would know that under that ruthless exterior there is a heart of gold." Pages 82-84

## INTRODUCTION TO COMPASSIONATE COMMUNICATION.

BY MARSHALL ROSENBERG- transcribed from a video taped presentation

Let me clarify the purpose of Non Violent Communication. It's purpose is to do what you already know how to do. Why do we need to learn today something that you already know how to do? Because sometimes we forget to do this. We forget because we have been educated to forget. Now, what is that I'm talking about that we already know how to do? The purpose of this process is to help us connect in a way that makes natural giving possible. What do I mean by natural giving? Let me do you a song to make it clear what I mean by natural giving.

**The lyrics below are sung by Rosenberg in DVD.--**

**I never feel more given to  
Than when you take from me-  
When you understand the joy I feel  
Giving to you.**

**And you know my giving isn't done  
To put you in my debt,  
But because I want to live the love  
I feel for you.**

**To receive with grace  
May be the greatest giving.  
There's no way I can separate  
The two.**

**When you give to me,  
I give you my receiving.  
When you take from me, I feel so  
Given to.**

**"Given To" by Ruth Bebermeyer 1978**

You all know how to do it. And that's what I'm interested in; our remembering to stay with that quality of giving moment by moment in any connection. But we also know that it is easy to lose it. It's easy to lose that connection so (we don't) enjoy that quality of giving which is possible in every moment in every contact that we have. In spite of how precious that is, we forget (and don't play) the game which that song is about which I call "making life wonderful". It's the most fun game I've ever heard. Instead much of the time, we play another game called Who's Right? Have you ever played that game? It's a game where everybody loses. So isn't this amazing that we all know about this quality of giving that the song is about. It's possible every moment. We find that the richest thing to do. And much of our life we end up playing Who's Right. Now the game of "Who's Right?" involves two of the most devious things that human beings have ever come upon. One, punishment, because if you're wrong in the game of "Who's Right?" then you deserve to suffer. Can you imagine a more diabolical concept to educate people? So if you haven't already abstained from punishment, I'm sure by the end of the day that it will no longer be part of your consciousness—no more punishment. You won't do it in your families, we will get rid of it with criminals. It just makes things more violent. We'll find other ways to deal with (the issues). We got off target, according to Walter Wink, a theologian, who writes in his book *The Powers That Be*, about 5,000 years ago. We got off target because we started to get some wild thinking that human beings are innately evil. And then when you believe that, that humans are innately evil, if things aren't going as exactly we'd like, what's the corrective process? The corrective process is penitence. See if people are evil, the way to bring about change when people are behaving in a way you don't like is to make people hate themselves for what they're doing. So, for these political reasons and theological reasons, we've started to develop a language is that I call jackal language. It's a language that cuts us off from life and makes it very easy to be violent. Very easy to be violent. In fact in that book I mentioned Wink says that in domination cultures—one of the things you have to educate people in is to make violence enjoyable. See and we've done a good job of that. We've made violence enjoyable in our culture. The two hours of night, from 7-9 when children are watching television the most in 75% of the programs they watch the hero either kills somebody or beats them up. And when does this happen? At the climax of the program. We've been educated for quite a while to make violence enjoyable. So even though I think what that song was about is closer to our nature, this natural giving, we've been educated to make violence enjoyable. And educated in a way we can even be violent to our children. So what is jackal language like? HE USES A HAND PUPPET OF A JACKAL. Jackal language is a language of moralistic judgments. You think in terms of who's right, who's wrong, who's good, who's bad. When you mention change, yes, we want change at times. So how do you get change in the jackal system? Watch a parent try to bring about change in a child. This is a parent teaching a young child to say one of the most important words in jackal. P. Say you're sorry? C. I'm sorry P. You're not really sorry, I can see it, you're not really sorry.. C(crying) I'm sorry.. P OK, I forgive you.

Can you imagine a game like that? Can you imagine a parent responding to a child that way? And if a parent is going to do that to a child in their own family, what are they going to do to people from other cultures who behave in a way they don't appreciate? So of course you're going to have violence, where ever you have this kind of thinking. In cultures that don't have this kind of thinking, you don't see violence. You see? So that's how we got off target even

though we could be playing the game make life wonderful each moment, we have educated for quite a while to play another game- "Who's Right?" So what are the parts of this game "Who's Right?". I've just mention one part- it's moralistic judgments. Learning to go up to our head and think basically in terms of right and wrong/good and bad/normal and abnormal/. I learned this game very well; I speak several dialects of jackal. I grew up in Detroit, we spoke a rather harsh dialect of jackal. For example, if I'm out driving and someone is driving in a way I don't like and I want to install change, I roll down the window and yell—Idiot!! Now theoretically, the person is supposed to repent. I confess I was wrong sir. I'll change the error of my ways. It's a great theory, it didn't work. I have tried it more than once. It doesn't work. So I thought it was that particular dialect of jackal, so I decided to get some more cultured use of jackal. So I went to the university and got a doctor's degree in professional jackal.. Now when someone is driving in the way I don't like, I roll down the window and yell – psychopath. It still doesn't work.

There's another part of this language of jackal—Amtssprache. That's very important – a language that denies choice. Denies responsibility for our actions. I use the word – amtssprache- for this part having read an interview with Adolph Eichmann, the Nazi war criminal. In his trial for war crimes in Jerusalem, Eichmann was asked was it hard to send tens of thousands of people to their death? Eichmann answered candidly, to tell you the truth it was easy. Our language made it easy. That answer shocked his interviewers, and they said what language? Eichmann said my own fellow Nazi officers and I had our own language-we called it Amtssprache. Amt in German means office and Sprache means language. I'd call that bureaucratic language. He was asked for some examples and Eichmann said. It's a language in which you deny responsibility for your actions. So if somebody ask you why you did it, you say you had to. Then you don't have to feel bad you did it, you see. You're not responsible. But why have to, Jackal? Superior's orders, company policy, they made me do it. I couldn't do else wise. Very dangerous language- amtssprache.. Very dangerous.

We have giraffe schools. I use the word giraffe, you see, as a symbol for non violence. You'll see today the language we're going to study is the language of the heart. And so I use giraffe language for that because they have the largest heart of any land animal. HE USES A HAND PUPPET OF A GIRAFFE

Giraffe requires always being conscious of choice. We never do anything that we don't choose to do. We have giraffe schools throughout the world(he lists). And in giraffe schools we want to make sure that teachers and parents never use Amtssprache—it is one of the most dangerous languages in the world. To teach a child you have to do so. So I was saying this one time in St Louis to a group of parents and teachers, and a mother got very upset. She said, "but there are some things you have to do whether you like it or not. It's our job as parents to teach our children what they have to do. There are things I do every day I hate to do, but there are just things you have to do".. So I said can you give me an example? She said," it's easy there are so many, let me think. Like when I leave here tonight I have to go home and cook. I hate to cook . I hate it with a passion,but I've done it every night for 20 years even when I have been sick".

Well I said I'll be very happy to show you another way of thinking, another language, and I hope it will open happier possibilities for you. Well I'm pleased to report she was a rapid giraffe student. She went home that very evening and announced to her family that she no longer wanted to cook. I got some feedback from her family. The feedback came two weeks later when I swung through that city again and was doing an evening workshop. And who shows up but her two older sons. They came up at the beginning to introduce themselves and I said, Hey, I very glad you came up here, I've been very curious about what's going on in your family. Your mother's been calling me regularly telling me about all the changes she's made in her life since the training, I asked what happened that first night when she said she's not cooking? The oldest son said to me, Marshall I said to myself thank God. I said help me understand that one? He said , now maybe she won't complain at every meal. You see natural giving, what I started the day off with – anything that we do in life that isn't coming from that energy we pay for it and everybody else pays for it. Anything we do out of fear of punishment, everybody pays for. Anything we do for a reward, everyone pays for. Everything we do to make people like us, everyone pays for. Everything we do out of guilt, shame, obligation, everybody pays for. That isn't what we were designed for. We were designed to enjoy giving from the heart.

Randy. July 30, 2006 -2nd

This is another attempt to connect the depth of what world religious traditions tell us to practical behaviors for everyday life especially what healthy organizations need today to thrive.

This is as simple as living the Golden Rule- do unto others as you'd have them do unto you. However I've grown to have a much deeper understanding of this rule. And no longer see this as so simple.

"As long as people are motivated solely by self interest, they remain at a bestial level. But when they learn to live from the heart ,becoming sensitive to the needs of others, the spiritual human being is born," Karen Armstrong states in Great Transformation. She continues, "the one and only test of a valid religious idea, doctrinal statement, spiritual experience, or devotional practice was that it must lead directly to practical compassion".

Buddha taught the practice of compassion , the release of the mind from the toils of self seeking is enlightenment. This can bring us into the presence of God. Compassion dethrones the ego from the center of our lives and puts others there, breaking the carapace of selfishness that holds us back from experiencing the sacred.

This compassion seems to be directed at the front half of the rule- do unto others. I'd like to examine more the second half. For me, paradoxically, it holds the key - As you would have them do unto you. Being admonished to eschew selfishness, I'm in a contradictory fashion asserting our diminished self is holding us back from truly living the Golden Rule.

There's a quote - that I've heard several times over the last few years that begins to capture some of the point I'm trying to make- it's only recently I've understood this and have made the connection to the Golden Rule.

"our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate. Our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not our darkness that most frightens us. We ask ourselves , who am I to be brilliant, gorgeous, talented, fabulous? Actually, who are you not to be? You are a child of God. Your playing small does not serve the world. There is nothing enlightened about shrinking so that other people won't feel insecure around you. We are all meant to shine, as children do. We were born to make manifest the glory of God that is within us. It is not just in some of us; it is in everyone. And as we let our own light shine, we unconsciously give other people permission to do the same. As we are liberated from our own fear, our presence automatically liberates others". (Marianne Williamson)

This begs a host of questions; one I'd try to tackle is why our light frightens us? Marshall Rosenberg, who has devoted his life to the pursuit of peace, suggests as domination and hierarchy became the predominant way of life, 5-8 thousand years ago, a subtly of power and control was concentrated and it evolved a life alienating communication that stresses our innate evil and deficiency. We learned there was something wrong with whatever feelings and needs we were experiencing. As this plays out generation after generation, we learn early to cut ourselves off from what's going on within ourselves and renders a slave like mentality. The language of wrongness, should, and have to is perfectly suited for this purpose. The more people are trained to think in terms of moralistic judgments that imply wrongness and badness, the more they are being trained to look outside themselves- to look to authorities-for the definition of what constitutes right, wrong, good, bad. A minister friend recently suggested, perhaps this is what the Fall was about. We went from a sense of inherent goodness in ourselves and others to judging ourselves and others.

Rosenberg goes on to suggest that critical self concepts prevent us from seeing the beauty in ourselves, we lose connection with the divine energy that is our source.

So Rosenberg believes if we can break free of this dominator way of thinking,talking, acting, judging ; we can engender compassion which he describes as the flow between myself and others based on a mutual giving from the heart. He says, "once we focus on what is observed, felt, and needed rather than diagnosing or judging, we discover the depth of our compassion. It's a gift when you reveal yourself



nakedly, honestly, at any given moment, for no other purpose than to reveal what is alive in you. Not to blame, criticize or punish. Just, here I am, and here is what I'd like. This is my vulnerability at the moment. This is a way of manifesting love. This is the Judeo Christian love your neighbor as yourself and judge not lest you be judged.

This repeating generational cycle of keeping our needs and feelings in the dark- from us and others- and the accommodating, spiritless ways of life engendered makes us very unaccustomed to this light. From this place of darkness it's hard to hear the Golden Rule as anything more than a rule to be followed and we stay oblivious to what our feelings and needs are which are really essential to live out the second half of the rule.

Perhaps the enigmatic admonishment of Jesus in Luke 14:25-26 "If any man comes to me without hating his father, mother, wife, children, brothers, sisters, yes and his own life too, he cannot be my disciple" makes sense if we see it as leaving this conventional, accommodating world of darkness- moving beyond this world of hierarchy and extreme judgmentalism.

So it seems to me back to the practices that Armstrong mentioned in engendering compassion, I need to find in my heart what afflicts me and refrain from inflicting that pain on others. I also need to begin a practice of Kenosis (the emptying of self as suggested by St. Paul) in knowing all the self judgments I've heaped on myself. I need to transcend my frightened ego that often needs to wound or destroy others in order to shore up the sense of false self I've evolved in this dominator scheme of judging self and other. I need to gain access to what is alive in me- what is my light. Rosenberg suggests some universal needs- such as autonomy, interdependence, celebration, integrity, spiritual communion. In this world of darkness and fear of our light, we've seldom explored or pondered what these look like and how they ground us as Godly creatures. Are these needs what we like others to do unto us? In this discussion of why we've stayed in the dark and fearfulness of our light, I'm suggesting regaining this light can make all the difference paradoxically in living in spirited fashion the Golden Rule. Knowing what is healthy in wanting others do for us is a great start.

In considering the first half of the rule, Rosenberg suggests.. what a gift it is to be able to know at any given moment what is alive in someone- to receive their message empathetically, connecting what is alive in them and making no judgment. To see the beauty in the other through our presence in the moment. He goes on to suggest a practical spirituality (not that dissimilar to Armstrong's comment at the beginning) - the greatest gift of joy springs from connecting to life by contributing to our own and others' well being. Spirituality and love are more about what we do than feelings.

Living in a material world, I've shallowly seen compassion as the ultimate of giving - like giving the shirt off my back to even the enemy. I'm beginning to see compassionate giving is much more about a presence and empathic connection in a non judgmental way to the other or to my self. I'm not a fixer of others' problems or a dispenser of material but rather an honoring presence.

**Basic Exercise**

Think of a situation in which someone did or said something where your needs were not met. Using the following template of the NVC model and a separate sheet of paper, express yourself in writing based on what you have learned. Turn to pages 19-22 for feelings and needs words.

1. When ....  
(Write down a clear observation)
2. I feel ....  
(Turn into feelings that are arising inside)
3. because I need (or want) ...  
(State the need that wasn't met)
4. Would you be willing to ...  
(Make a clear doable request)

**Example**

"When you leave your workstation in the front entrance, I feel concerned because I value people's safety. Do you mind if I would agree to place your workstation in the closed front row?"

"When you tell me that I'm too demanding, I feel hurt because I need to be understood. Would you be willing to tell me how you feel hearing me say that?"

"When you turn in your report two days later than agreed, I feel confused and disappointed because I value trust and integrity in our organization. Would you agree to do the following: whenever you experience a difficulty with workloads or deadlines, to discuss it with me immediately so that we can explore options together?"

"When you talk to my team your sister while she's playing with 2, I feel sad because I want us to be comfortable with each other. Would you be willing to talk her whether she's willing to share it with you right now?"

**How You Can Use the NVC Process**

Clearly expressing how I feel without blaming or criticizing	Empathically receiving how you feel without feeling blame or criticism
--	--

**OBSERVATIONS**

1. What I observe that annoys, reminds, inspires, gives me my emotional that does or does not contribute to my well-being.  
"When I see, hear, ..."
1. What you observe (see, hear, remember, imagine, feel from your emotional) that does or does not contribute to your well-being.  
"When you say/hear ..."  
*Remember: report one thing clearly*

**FEELINGS**

1. How I feel (emotion or sensation rather than thought) in relation to what I observe.  
"I feel ..."
1. How you feel (emotion or sensation rather than thought) in relation to what you observe.  
"You feel ..."

**NEEDS**

1. What I need or value (rather than a preference, or a specific action) that causes my feelings.  
"... because I need/want ..."
1. What you need or value (rather than a preference, or a specific action) that causes your feelings.  
"... because you need/want ..."

**REQUESTS**

1. Clearly requesting that which would enrich my life without demanding.
1. Empathically receiving that which would enrich your life without having my demand.

**REQUESTS**

1. The concrete action I would like to take.  
"Would you be willing to ...?"
1. The concrete action you would like to take.  
"Would you like ...?"  
*Remember: report one thing clearly*

**Hermetic cycle(church) Eval**

*Hermetical thinking, for more information about Hermetical thinking or to order the Hermetical Communication series call 1-800-411-0211 or visit www.DRM.org.*

• 24 •

Pink

## Making Concept-a-cide Illegal

I recall a headline recently from the Winona Daily News editorial page suggesting egos should be parked at the door. Wish I have a dime for every time I've heard that in my nearly 40 years around Winona. I could probably have a goodly sum even from the times I've said it.

In the work I've undertaken with the Charter for Compassion with one of its central goals being dethroning the ego, I've done much thinking about this parking issue for the ego lately. In one of the first videos we watched of Karen Armstrong, the Charter's champion, we heard her say unfortunately it seems that most people are in this egoic position and would rather be right than compassionate.

When it comes to being right, it seems that when an idea is presented and if it doesn't fit how we see the world-- whom, we just dismiss it. We could say this is downright unpatriotic if we go back to a vision the founders had regarding the obligation of free speech and community. Jacob Needleman, in talking about his book on the founders in a radio interview on Speaking of Faith (now On Being) said we should expect more than this truncated wants to be right thinking-- "it means you have an obligation inwardly to work at listening to the other. That means I don't have to agree with you, but I have to let your thought into my mind in order to have a real democratic exchange between us".

I remember a couple years ago, I was to give a talk to a group. The night before, I was at a party and a friend who was going to hear me said, "Randy you pack lots of ideas in your talks". I told him I would commit concept-a-cide and take out some ideas. Some how, today, I was thinking about that word? That's essentially what we do when we dismiss the other's idea without even giving it a chance of changing our thinking. It's dead on arrival!!

You might consider this ideal musing, but last year I read of research being done on how we process scientific information. Obviously, there's a wide range of views, for instance, about climate issues from it's all a hoax to serious and growing, irreversible processes are taking place. So whose science do you believe?

Here's some insights from a group of researchers from Stanford, Yale, and the Universities of Washington and Oregon." Our research suggests that this form of protective cognition( a fancy word for the ego's wanting to be right) is a major cause of political conflict over the credibility of scientific data on climate change and other environmental risks. People with individualistic values, who prize personal initiative, and those with hierarchical values, who respect authority, tend to dismiss evidence about environmental risks, because the widespread acceptance of such evidence would lead to restrictions on commerce and industry, activities they admire. By contrast, people who subscribe to more egalitarian and communitarian values are suspicious of commerce and industry, which they see as sources of unjust disparity. They are more inclined to believe that such activities pose unacceptable risks that should be restricted. Such differences, explain disagreements in environmental risk perceptions more completely than differences in gender, race, income, education level, political ideology, personality, or any other individual characteristic".

So this wants to be right ego has such a way of filtering information to maintain its view of reality. Given, this wants to be right mentality, these researchers are scratching their heads trying to think of ways to communicate scientific information so citizens can make informed decisions in policy voting. They've gone to elaborate ends, testing if citizens will more likely consider evidence if it's presented by an "expert" who seems to represent their value. Or can a diverse set of experts be assembled to vouch for the information. It all seems very involved - how to trick this wants to be right mind so the ego considers some information that it doesn't want to hear.

I'm sending in my suggestion. I think we need legislation on making concept-a-cide illegal. Twenty five years ago, I was writing articles on teaching critical thinking skills. I thought considering evidence was a part of critical thinking skills. Shouldn't ideas have rights? How can they be stamped out without consideration? Thomas Jefferson would be aghast- what about his dream of education for the citizenry to carry forth the work of democracy? Anyone want to join this campaign for giving ideas rights to live and be considered? Let's stamp out concept-a-cide!!

Character At Work-Wm. O'Brien	
Qualities for Self	Qualities for Organization
<p><b>LOCALNESS</b> -distributing power so that decisions can be made as close to scene of action as possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-self direction, responsibility, self discipline and sense of efficacy</li> <li>-trust wisdom of intuition</li> <li>-understand freedom</li> <li>-high level of personal responsibility and confidence, yet detached so also verify with those having specialized knowledge</li> <li>-each person uses job to develop personally and serve organization's mission</li> <li>-work primary vehicle that people can achieve satisfaction and happiness(engage whole person)</li> <li>-trained to see way other than command and control by surfacing the fear based mental models that surround it</li> <li>-understand power and its positive and negative uses</li> <li>-empowering individual means encouraging them to develop best possible self while still having sense of order in org</li> <li>-internally generated motivation builds capacities such as: creativity, ingenuity, and relationship building skills</li> <li>-develop a healthy balance between focus on self/other/take on something larger</li> <li>-mature individuals find it easier to resolve conflicts, see from others' perspective.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Discipline not imposed, trust self discipline</li> <li>-guides relationships between people at various levels</li> <li>-ways to establish relationships in which each level contributes to the growth and fulfillment of others(optimal relationships between levels in org is painstaking task)</li> <li>-maintains balance between freedom and order (no command and control)</li> <li>-role of senior leaders help people grow through coaching, mentoring, evaluating, and inspiring</li> <li>-an ethos of expertise/not bunch of experts(humility)</li> <li>-Distributed power to capable people to increase org's adaptability and self reliance(what's best way to use and distribute power)</li> <li>-dispersed power and high personal</li> <li>-job design makes uncomfortable if don't grow</li> <li>-relate micromanagement with high expectations</li> <li>-Localness= spirit/way of life that grows from: personal conviction/ accept individual responsibility &amp; self direction, and common values and shared aspirations</li> </ul>
<p><b>MERIT</b>- evaluating decisions based on their worth, not on how much they please the boss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-liberate ideas</li> <li>-merit environment requires a strong sense of responsibility and willingness to speak out(advocacy)</li> <li>-individual needs to know and believe in purpose of organization</li> <li>-individual must operate from facts, if no evidence-no place in discussion</li> <li>-take responsibility for thinking about merits of own ideas rather than just raising questions or making suggestions because want to see change</li> <li>-can participate in open discussions and see winning for long run and not short term self interest</li> <li>-constantly strive to understand and challenge own mental models</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-merit environment supports individual initiative, open discussion, and search for common good</li> <li>-organization needs clarity of purpose</li> <li>-hold open discussions and ensure employees have core skills in conversation and systems thinking</li> <li>-a culture of continually challenging own mental models</li> <li>-out of continual testing and challenge of individual actions, new insights will emerge that will generate fresh strategies and shape goals</li> <li>-manager's role teach how vision and values apply to local need</li> </ul>

<p><b>OPENNESS</b>-allowing for the free flow of information throughout the organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-all of us built with unlimited potential for openness but environments of shoulds and distrust close us down</li> <li>-there's very little incentive to be open</li> <li>-ideas presented as tests(tentative) not as self posture; seems often there's drive to get on agenda and maximize personal wins</li> <li>-listen and inquire about beliefs of others;test assumptions and be open to others testing</li> <li>-share own thinking(unless others know how we think, they can't correct our misperceptions</li> <li>-often choose security over risks; be forthright</li> <li>-open to gap between espoused &amp; practice</li> <li>-uncovering our hidden assumptions &amp; bring our beliefs(what say) &amp; actions(what do) into harmony and contributes to our personal growth</li> <li>-people are active participants</li> <li>-journey into adulthood set in 3 forces:genes, exercise of free will, environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-unfiltered flow of idea throughout organization</li> <li>-incentive to be open</li> <li>-advanced sharing of information so people prepared for meeting</li> <li>-impossible to have openness without trust</li> <li>-don't put spin on things; complete forthrightness</li> <li>-without open environment, we are unlikely to ever discover difference between what we do and say</li> <li>-openness create environment</li> <li>-openness builds competitive advantage because it nurtures cooperation and stimulates thinking and creativity of people closest to problem who spend years in environment</li> <li>-openness in spin free environment/ ecology has crucial impact on personality and maturity</li> </ul>
<p><b>LEANNESS</b>-being stewards of the organization's resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-nourishment comes from being independent, self reliant and capable of identifying with and contributing to a larger cause</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-big mistake in times of prosperity to live high as it makes dependent on externals and spirits are starved</li> <li>-flush organization can be distraction and keep us from knowing self</li> </ul>